

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

***REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT'S
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT,
Fiscal Year 2006-2007***



Conducted by the

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.
Inspector General

July 2, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT'S GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT, FISCAL YEAR 2006-2007

		PAGE No.
<u>PURPOSE</u>		1
<u>BACKGROUND ON THE DEPARTMENT'S AUDIT</u>		1
<u>REVIEW METHODOLOGY</u>		2
<u>REVIEW RESULTS</u>		2
	COMPLETENESS	2
	FINDINGS	3
	QUALITY	3
	OTHER RELATED MATTERS	3
	Prior Recommendation	3
	Loans	4
	Personnel Packages	4
	TEAMS II	4
	CONCLUSION	4
	RECOMMENDATIONS	5

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT'S
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT**

PURPOSE

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG), pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 135, reviewed the Los Angeles Police Department's (Department) Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Selection Criteria Audit (Audit). The Audit was completed in the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2006/2007 and received by the OIG on April 2, 2006. This review assessed the completeness, findings, and quality of the Department's Audit.

BACKGROUND ON THE DEPARTMENT'S AUDIT

The Audit, conducted by Audit Division, assessed the Department's compliance with Consent Decree Paragraphs 51(b)(d), 106(b)(c)(d), and 107(a)(b)(c). Those Paragraphs, along with Department policies and procedures, address selecting officers into GED units, limiting their tour assignment, and reevaluating GED officers when certain sustained complaints and/or adverse judicial findings are received during their tour of duty.

Audit Division selected a sample of officers assigned to GED units and Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) units during Deployment Period No. 2, 2006 (February 5th through March 4th), evaluating various GED selection packages.¹ Three different samples were used to evaluate a total of six audit objectives.² The samples were considered sufficient to make statistically valid Department-wide Consent Decree compliance determinations. The table below summarizes the compliance percentages reported by Audit Division.

COMPLIANCE PERCENTAGES REPORTED BY AUDIT DIVISION

Objective No.	Objective Description	CD ¶	Compliance Percentage
1a	Eligibility Criteria for Selection of Officers	106(b)	100% (64/64)
1b	Eligibility Criteria for Selection of Supervisors	106(c)	91% (10/11)
1c	Use of TEAMS and TEAMS II and Written Consideration of Certain Sustained Complaints, Adverse Judicial Findings, or Discipline Received <u>Before</u> the Officer's Selection	107(a)	94% (60/64)
1d	Evaluation of the Selection Process	107(b)	47% (30/64)
2	Limited Tour Assignments	106(d)	100% (62/62)
3	Written Consideration of Certain Sustained Complaints or Adverse Judicial Findings Received <u>During</u> the Officer's GED Tour of Assignment	107(c)	WITHHELD ³

¹ GED selection packages generally contain an officer's Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS 1.5 or TEAMS II) report, TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER), Performance Evaluation Reports and/or Transfer Applicant Data Sheet.

² Greater detail on Audit Division's methodology and findings can be found in Audit Division's Audit Report.

³ Audit Division indicated that of the 338 officers in its population, 10 received sustained complaints during their GED tour; however, they did not meet the Consent Decree criteria to require written consideration. As such, a determination of compliance for this objective was withheld.

As noted in the table, the Audit found the Department in significant non-compliance (47%) with Objective 1d - Evaluation of the Selection Process. Specifically, the Audit found that the documentary requirements of the selection packages were not complete as dictated by the Consent Decree and Department policy (e.g., the selection packages lacked oral interview documentation and the two most recent Performance Evaluation Reviews).

REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The OIG assessed the completeness, findings, and quality of Audit Division’s Audit by reviewing the final Audit Report, Audit Work Plan, Audit workpapers, and a Microsoft Access database used to compile the Audit’s findings.⁴

Audit Division utilized three different samples to evaluate the Department’s compliance with the Consent Decree. The following table depicts the number of GED selection packages evaluated by Audit Division and how many of those packages were evaluated by the OIG.

Objectives	Number of GED Selection Packages Evaluated ⁵	
	Audit Division	OIG
Objective 1 (a-d) – “New Officer Selections”	75	29
Objective 2 – “GED Tour Extensions”	62	21
Objective 3 – “Current Suitability”	10	10
Total	147	60

The OIG discussed the results of the review with Audit Division and they indicated general agreement with the findings presented in this report.

REVIEW RESULTS

COMPLETENESS

To assess the Audit’s completeness, the OIG reviewed Audit Division’s Audit Report and supporting workpapers to ensure applicable Consent Decree mandates were addressed. Per the Department’s Annual Audit Plan (Fiscal Year 2005/2006), the Audit was to assess the Department’s compliance with Consent Decree Paragraphs 51(b)(d), 106(b)(c)(d), and 107(a)(b)(c). The OIG determined that the Audit sufficiently assessed those mandates. Additionally, based on the OIG’s review of Audit Division’s sampling documentation, it appears Audit Division selected from a complete population of GED officers/supervisors.

⁴ The OIG’s review of supporting workpapers was based on a randomly selected one-tail sample size calculation with a 95 percent confidence level, an expected error rate of six percent, and a plus precision of seven percent.

⁵ Not all GED selection packages were applicable to each objective.

FINDINGS

To assess the Audit's findings, the OIG reviewed Audit Division's supporting work papers to ensure the findings were adequately supported and reviewed the Audit Report to ensure the findings were properly presented.

Based on the OIG's review of sampled GED selection packages, Audit Division's findings were well supported. However, the OIG noted an additional concern that was not identified by Audit Division. Regarding Objective 2 (Limited Tour Assignments), one selection package contained a Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) report that was printed the same date as the Commanding Officer's approval which was after the Supervisor review date.⁶ This could indicate that the TEAMS report was not evaluated by the Supervisor when he conducted his evaluation of this employee prior to submitting it to the Commanding Officer.⁷

QUALITY

Based on the OIG's review, Audit Division's Audit was properly supervised and planned, in that the Audit's methodology allowed for proper assessments of Consent Decree mandates. Additionally, the Audit Report properly delineated the Audit's objectives, scope, and the status of prior audit recommendations. Finally, the Audit Report was issued in a timely manner (within a year of Audit Division's last audit), used a fair and unbiased tone, and was found to be convincing, clear, and concise.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

Prior Recommendation

In its Audit Report, Audit Division reported on previous recommendations and their status, which, included the following one:

"It is recommended that Planning and Research Division define the "two most recent" Performance Evaluation Reports – Lieutenants and Below (Form 1.78) (Per) as those due immediately prior to the start of the selection process."

Status: Pursuant to the Civil Rights Integrity Division Recommendation Status report dated November 14, 2006, this recommendation is pending a feasibility analysis.

The OIG noted that this recommendation has been in progress, in one form or another, since Fiscal Year 2003/2004, and as of today continues to remain in progress. The OIG agrees with this recommendation but questions the length of time it has remained in progress. During our

⁶ A TEAMS report delineates an officer's complaint/discipline history, use of force history, assignment history and commendation history.

⁷ Control No. 1277THEXT04.

review, the OIG identified five of 60 GED selection packages where one or more of the included Performance Evaluation Report(s) did not cover an entire year.⁸ Given that these officers were brought into highly sensitive GED units, the OIG believes Department policy should also specify an overall time period (e.g., at least a year of Performance Evaluations must be assessed).

Loans

Audit Division also evaluated four officers and four supervisors on loan to GED between February 5 to March 4, 2006. Audit Division did not identify any Consent Decree related disciplinary issues that would preclude their loan to the GED, but did note documentary concerns. In addition to those concerns, the OIG also identified one package that did not contain evidence that the approving supervisor met with the officer prior to the selection.⁹

Personnel Packages

Part of a supervisor's review process of a GED candidate is to review the employee's Divisional Employee folder and Personnel Division Package. The OIG noted that Audit Division does not review these packages as part of their testwork for the Audit. Since these packages may contain additional information for an employee that is pertinent to their selection into GED, the OIG recommends that Audit Division review the employee's Personnel Division Package as part of their testwork in its next Audit.

TEAMS II

Due to the recent rollout of TEAMS II, in June 2006, the OIG reviewed the employees in its GED samples to determine if the complaint information in the Discipline section of their TEAMS II report was complete. The OIG noted that nine (15%) of 60 employees had one or two closed complaint investigations referenced on their TEAMS II report with a blank allegation(s)/disposition(s). Since TEAMS II is a new system, the OIG recommends that Audit Division, in its next audit, review the sampled employee's current TEAMS II report to ensure that all discipline/complaint information is properly reflected. The OIG has sent Intradepartmental Correspondence to TEAMS II and IAG management regarding this concern for appropriate action to be taken.

CONCLUSION

Overall, based on the OIG's review of Audit Division's GED Selection Criteria Audit, it appears the Audit was complete, performed in a quality manner, and the findings were well supported.

⁸ Control Nos. 00OSBSPSEL01, 00OSBSEL01, 04HOBKSPSEL02, 10WVASEL02, and 1277THSPSEL03.

⁹ Control No. 17DEVSEL01.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Audit Division should review the employee's Personnel Division Package as part of their testwork in its next Audit.
2. Audit Division review the employee's current TEAMS II report in its next Audit to ensure that all allegation/discipline information is accurately reflected.