

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

***REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT'S GANG
ENFORCEMENT DETAIL SELECTION
CRITERIA AUDIT***
(Fiscal Year 2007/2008)



Conducted by the

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.
Inspector General

June 27, 2008

**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 2007/2008 and received by the OIG on April 2, 2008. This review assessed the completeness, findings, and quality of the Department's Audit.

BACKGROUND ON THE DEPARTMENT'S AUDIT

Audit Division's Audit assessed the Department's compliance with Consent Decree Paragraphs 51(b and d), 106(b, c and d), and 107(a, b and c). These 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 from Deployment Period (DP) No. 12, 2006 through DP No. 11, 2007 (November 12, 2006 through November 10, 2007), and for Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) details in DP No. 11, 2007 (October 14 through November 10 of 2007).¹ Three different samples were used to evaluate a total of six audit objectives.² The samples were considered sufficient to determine statistically valid Department-wide Consent Decree compliance percentages. Table No. 1 summarizes the compliance percentages reported by Audit Division.

TABLE NO. 1 - COMPLIANCE PERCENTAGES REPORTED BY AUDIT DIVISION

Objective No.	Objective Description	CD ¶	Compliance Percentages	
			Prior Year FY 2006/07 Audit	Current Year FY 2007/08 Audit
1(a)	Eligibility Criteria for Selection of GED Officers	51(b) and 106(b)	100% (64/64)	98% (62/63)
1(b)	Eligibility Criteria for Selection of GED Supervisors	51(b) and 106(c)	91% (10/11)	100% (18/18)
1(c)	Use of TEAMS II and Written Consideration of Certain Sustained Complaints, etc. Before the GED Officer's Selection	51(d) and 107(a)	94% (60/64)	98% (79/81)
1(d)	Documentation of the Selection Process	107(b)	47% (30/64)	63% (51/81)
2	Limited GED Tour Assignments	106(d)	100% (62/62)	100% (39/39)
3	Written Consideration of Certain Sustained Complaints, etc. During the Officer's GED Tour Assignment	107(c)	WITHHELD	WITHHELD ³

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

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

³ Audit Division indicated that of the 330 GED officers and supervisors in its population, 16 received sustained complaints during their GED tour; however, the associated allegations were not of the type that required written consideration. As such, a determination of compliance for this objective was withheld.

As high-lighted in Table No. 1, Audit Division found the Department non-compliant (less than 95 percent [63%]) for Objective No. 1(d) - Evaluation of the Selection Process. Specifically, Audit Division reported that the documentary requirements of the selection packages were not complete, as required by the Consent Decree and Department policy (e.g., the selection packages lacked the two most recent Performance Evaluation Reviews, current TEAMS II reports, and oral interview documentation).

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 work papers, and 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 quantity of GED packages audited by Audit Division and reviewed by the OIG.

TABLE NO. 2 - QUANTITY OF GED PACKAGES EVALUATED

Objective No.	Sample Description	Quantity of GED Packages Evaluated ⁵ by:	
		Audit Division	OIG
1(a, b, c & d)	New GED Officer and Supervisor Selections, etc.	81	34
2	Officers/Supervisors in a GED Unit Over 39 DPs	39	19
3	Officers Who Received a Sustained Complaint While Assigned to a GED	16	11
	Total	136	64

The OIG discussed the results of the review with Audit Division on June 24, 2008, and they indicated general agreement with the matters 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 2007/2008), the Audit was to assess the Department's compliance with Consent Decree Paragraphs 51(b and d), 106(b, c and d), and 107(a, b, and 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 that Audit Division selected from a complete population of GED officers/supervisors.

⁴ The OIG's review of supporting work papers 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 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 the OIG reviewed the Audit Report to ensure the findings were properly presented. Based on the OIG's review of sampled GED packages, Audit Division's findings were well supported and properly presented.

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. However, the OIG noted one item worthy of discussion for Objective 1(d).

Objective No. 1(d) – Evaluation of the Eligibility Criteria for Selection of GED Officers

Audit Division reported a compliance rate of 63 percent for this Objective, noting that 51 of the 81 transfer packages were in compliance ("transfer package" method). In order for a transfer package to be deemed in compliance, it must contain all eight required informational or documentary items (items).⁶ Based on this methodology, it is more difficult for the Department to achieve 95 percent compliance. The OIG noted that the transfer packages were only missing 36 of the required 648 items (eight items per package) which represented approximately six percent of the total required items or a 94 percent compliance rate ("total items" method). The most common items that were missing were the employee's two most recent Performance Evaluation Reports, TEAMS II Report, and evidence of an oral interview. For future Audit Reports, Audit Division should consider calculating and providing the compliance percentages both by the "transfer package" method and "total items" method.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

Although not mandated by the Consent Decree, Audit Division conducted additional test work in eight areas to assess the Department's performance regarding its ability to track and effectively monitor officers and supervisors assigned to GED units. The OIG commends Audit Division for this additional test work, but would have preferred that supplementary information be presented in the Other Related Matters section of its Audit Report for GED extension and loan packages.

⁶ The required information or documents in the transfer packages were a Transfer Application Data Sheet, Teams Evaluation Report (TER) signed by the Area Commanding Officer, TEAMS II Report, evidence of an oral interview, employee's two most recent Performance Evaluation Reports, evidence on the TER that the Divisional Employee Folder and Department Personnel Package were reviewed, GED Review Checklist for New Selection, and evidence on the TER that the Use of Force Review Division was contacted.

GED Extension Packages

For their review of GED extension packages, Audit Division reported a compliance rate of 82 percent, noting that 32 of the 39 extension packages were in compliance ("extension package" method). In order for a GED extension package to be deemed in compliance, it must contain all nine required items. In reviewing the packages, the OIG noted that the extension packages were only missing seven of the required 351 items (nine items per package) which represented approximately two percent of the total required items or a 98 percent compliance rate ("total items" method). The most common items missing were the TEAMS II Report and the review of the Department Personnel Package and Divisional Personnel Folder. For future Audit Reports, Audit Division should consider calculating and providing the compliance percentages both by the "extension package" method and "total items" method.

GED Loan Packages

For their review of GED loan packages, Audit Division reported a compliance rate of 17 percent, noting that three of the 18 loan packages were in compliance ("loan package" method). In order for a loan package to be deemed in compliance, it must contain all eight required items. In reviewing the loan packages, the OIG noted that the loan packages were missing a total of 21 items of the required 144 items (eight items per package) which represented approximately 15 percent of the total required items or an 85 percent compliance rate ("total items" method). The most common item missing was the Intradepartmental Correspondence (Form 15.2) to justify operational needs. For future Audit Reports, Audit Division should consider calculating and providing the compliance percentages by both the "loan package" method and "total items" method.

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. The Audit appears to have been thoughtfully planned, carefully executed, and comprehensively reported.