



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

2023-0011-INVI-P – Allegations of Violations of Outside Employment and Suspected Favoritism During a Hiring Process.

Supervisor: Suspected Violations of the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) “Standards of Conduct” and “Government Ethics” Policies; and the AOC IT Resources and De Minimis Use” policy.

Substantiated

Subordinate Employee: Suspected Violations of the AOC “Standards of Conduct” and “Government Ethics” Policies. Substantiated

The AOC Office of Inspector General (OIG) received an allegation that an AOC supervisor employed a subordinate employee to conduct outside employment for their personal Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) business. AOC Ethics rules prohibit supervisors from requesting, hiring, or retaining AOC employees to work on personal projects. Additionally, the allegation stated that the supervisor and subordinate employee used AOC office phones to conduct outside employment business. Furthermore, the allegation noted that the supervisor’s Jurisdiction was in the process of hiring an assistant supervisor and the subordinate employee was alleged to be a leading candidate for the position, further creating a conflict of interest due to the supervisor’s responsibility as the selecting official on the hiring panel.

The OIG initiated an investigation into violations of AOC policy, including Order 752-2, Standards of Conduct, April 25, 2014; Order 38-1, Government Ethics, November 1, 2018; and AOC Order 8-5, AOC IT Resources and De Minimis Use, February 20, 2018. Testimonial evidence provided by the supervisor and subordinate employee, along with documentary evidence confirmed that both employees were in violation of Order 38-1, Government Ethics, November 1, 2018, for failing to properly provide the AOC with a “Notice of Outside Employment or Self-Employment Form.” Both the supervisor and subordinate employee are also self-employed HVAC mechanics who each admitted to having their own HVAC businesses and to occasionally referring work to each other. Additionally, the supervisor admitted to the OIG that they “probably” used their AOC issued electronic devices for personal business.

Furthermore, the OIG reviewed the applicant resumes for the assistant supervisor position along with the supervisor’s notes and scoring of the panel interviews of the applicants selected for the first and second round of interviews. The OIG determined that although the supervisor appeared to conduct adequate documentation of the hiring process, they failed to disclose their personal relationship with the subordinate employee, which created an appearance of impropriety and lack of fairness in the hiring process.

Final Management Action: The OIG substantiated that the supervisor and the employee violated multiple AOC policies and the administrative violations were submitted to the Acting Architect of the Capitol for action deemed appropriate, if any. The case is closed, and management action is pending.