

MARICOPA COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
Bureau of Internal Oversight
Audits and Inspections Unit
BI2017-0059



Bureau of Internal Oversight
Supervisor Note Inspection Report
Date: 5/29/2017
Inspection #BI2017-0059



Sheriff Paul Penzone

To: Captain Roska S0878
Division Commander
Bureau of Internal Oversight

From: Sgt. Reaulo #S1678
Inspections Sergeant
Audits and Inspections Unit

Subject: Sworn Supervisor Note Inspection Summary,
April 2017
BI2017-0059

Date: May 29, 2017
Report Period:
April 1-30, 2017

The Audits and Inspections Unit (AIU) will be conducting inspections of supervisory notes on an on-going basis to determine if the notes are in compliance with office policies and promote proper supervision. To achieve this, inspectors will utilize the IAPro System and a sample of randomly selected employees from each district/division for review. These entries will be uniformly inspected utilizing a matrix developed by the Audits and Inspections Unit in accordance with the procedures outlined in policies, EA-11, GB-2, GJ-35 and Administrative Broadcast #16-124.

Matrix Procedures:

- Determine what district/division the notes originated from
- Ensure the supervisor completed two supervisor note entries per deputy each month
- Ensure the supervisor completed a minimum of one performance based entry per deputy each month
- Ensure the supervisor conducted a monthly review of body-worn camera footage
- Ensure the supervisor conducted bi-monthly reviews of EIS data
- Each Blue Team entry inspected will be counted as one inspection

Criteria:

MCSO Policy # EA-11, ARREST PROCEDURES (Section 14, Parts D, E):

“Supervisors shall take appropriate action to address all violations or deficiencies in investigatory stops or detentions, including non-disciplinary corrective action for the deputy; or referring the incident for administrative review or criminal investigation. Supervisors **shall track**, through the Early Identification System (EIS), each deputy’s deficiencies or violations and the corrective action taken, in order to identify deputies who need repeated corrective action.”

“Command level personnel shall review, in writing, all supervisory reviews related to arrests that are unsupported by probable cause or are otherwise in violation of Office policy; or that indicate a need for corrective action or review of Office policy, strategy, tactics, or training. The commander’s review shall be completed within 14 days of receiving the document reporting the event. The commander shall evaluate the corrective action and recommendations in the supervisor’s written report and ensure that all appropriate corrective action is taken.”

MCSO Policy # GB-2, COMMAND RESPONSIBILITY (Section 7B, Parts 1, 2 & 4):

“Supervisor notes shall be of sufficient quality and frequency to facilitate the preparation of an accurate and detailed performance review, but at a minimum an entry shall be completed every month. Supervisors shall complete supervisor notes on sworn employees every two weeks at a minimum.”

“Supervisors who have employees that are on an extended leave of absence shall complete a supervisor note to document the beginning date and end date of the absence.”

“Supervisors shall conduct two reviews per month of each sworn, and one per month of each non-sworn subordinates’ EIS information for the purpose of identifying and responding to any conduct patterns or concerns including, but not limited to racial profiling, improper immigration enforcement, investigatory stop violations, detentions unsupported by reasonable suspicion or otherwise in violation of policy. This review shall be documented within the Blue Team Supervisor Notes.”

MCSO Policy # GJ-35, BODY-WORN CAMERAS (Section 10-10B):

“On a monthly basis, patrol supervisors shall conduct two random reviews of traffic stop video footage from each subordinate’s body-worn camera recordings.”

“The methodology and checklist for consistently reviewing body-worn camera recordings can be found at the following shared drive location; U:\BIO\FORMS.”

“The monthly reviews shall be documented in the EIS Blue Team Supervisor Notes application.”

MCSO Administrative Broadcast Number 16-124 (effective 12/7/2016)


“MCSO commander and Supervisor **review**, on a regular basis, but not less than bimonthly, of EIS reports regarding each officer under the commander or Supervisor’s direct command and, at least quarterly, broader, pattern-based reports”.

Conditions:


MCSO’s assigned Court Monitors provided a sample of 37 Deputies from all Patrol Districts/Divisions for the April Supervisory Note Review. It should be noted that the completion of a Supervisory Note inspection is dependent on when the AIU receives the sample from the Court Monitors (which may be 30 or more days in arrears).

Our inspection revealed that 98.04% of the inspected sample met the requirement for two Supervisory Note entries per Deputy and 94.12% met the requirement to complete at least one performance based supervisor note per deputy. 78.43% of the inspected sample met the requirement for supervisor documentation of bi-monthly EIS data review. It was also noted that 100% of the inspected sample was in compliance with the requirement to complete monthly reviews of body camera footage in accordance with MCSO Policy # GJ-35 as illustrated in the bar chart below:

Current Compliance Rate: Patrol Supervisory Notes, April 2017



Note: The overall compliance rate of 92.65% is an average of the four measures (Minimum of two notes per deputy, Minimum Performance Notes, bi-monthly reviews of EIS data and Body Camera Review).



The following potential deficiencies were observed during the inspection period:

District/Div.	Supervisor Note Recipient	Assigned Supervisor	Commander:	Potential Deficiency:
District One	Sergeant	Lieutenant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked documentation of a performance based entry.
District One	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (no entries were identified)

District/Div.	Supervisor Note Recipient	Assigned Supervisor	Bureau/Division Commander:	Potential Deficiency:
District Three	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (only one entry was identified)

District/Div.	Supervisor Note Recipient	Assigned Supervisor	Bureau/Division Commander:	Potential Deficiency:
District Five	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (two entries on the same day do not qualify as bi-monthly)
District Five	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (two entries on the same day do not qualify as bi-monthly)
District Five	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (two entries on the same day do not qualify as bi-monthly)
District Five	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (two entries on the same day do not qualify as bi-monthly)

District/Div.	Supervisor Note Recipient	Assigned Supervisor	Bureau/Division Commander:	Potential Deficiency:
District Seven	Lieutenant	Captain	Chief	Only one supervisor note was completed and there was no evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (only one entry was identified)
District Seven	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (only one entry was identified)
District Seven	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (only one entry was identified)
District Seven	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (only one entry was identified)
District Seven	Deputy	Sergeant	Captain	Supervisor notes lacked evidence that a bi-monthly review of EIS data occurred (only one entry was identified)

A total of **Seven** BIO Action Form are requested from the affected divisions. **The form shall be completed utilizing Blue Team.** It is permissible to complete one BIO Action Form for a supervisor covering multiple potential deficiencies identified in this inspection.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that Supervisory Note Inspections continue at the Division level to provide assurance that the compliance rates continue to show improvement and remain constant over time. To accomplish this goal, the following criteria must be met:

1. **On a monthly basis**, a minimum of (2) Supervisory Notes shall be completed per Deputy and shall be used to specifically document the following requirements:
 - a. The Deputy’s work performance
 - b. The review of randomly selected traffic stop video footage
 - c. The bi-monthly review of subordinates EIS Data
 - i. Documented in two supervisor notes with the “Notes – Reviewed employees EIS Information” allegation
 - Or**
 - ii. One supervisor note with the two dates the review took place in addition to the “Notes – Reviewed employees EIS Information” allegation. The two dates will serve as evidence that the reviews were bi-monthly.

Date Inspection Started: 5/29/2017
Date Completed: 5/29/2017
Timeframe Inspected: April 1-30, 2017
Assigned Inspector(s): Sgt. Reaulo #S1678

I have reviewed this inspection report.

Capt. B. Roska #878

Captain Barry Roska S0878
Division Commander
Bureau of Internal Oversight

5/29/2017

Date

T.R. Skinner #898

Chief Russell Skinner S0898
Bureau Commander
Bureau of Internal Oversight

5/29/2017

Date