

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

October 25, 2013
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: COMPLAINT INVESTIGATIONS AUDIT (IAID NO. 13-002)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Complaint Investigations Audit.
2. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

Pursuant to the Department's Audit and Inspection Plan, Internal Audits and Inspections Division completed the Complaint Investigations Audit to assess conformance with Department policies and procedures surrounding the complaint investigation process.

If you have any questions, please contact Gerald L. Chaleff, Special Assistant for Constitutional Policing, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Charlie Beck', with a stylized, looping design.

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
COMPLAINT INVESTIGATIONS AUDIT
(IAID NO. 13-002)



Conducted by
INTERNAL AUDITS & INSPECTIONS DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

August 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS Complaint Investigations Audit	Page No.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PURPOSE	1
METHODOLOGY	1
SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS	1
Table No. 1 – Summary of Audit Findings	2
DETAILED FINDINGS	3
Objective No. 1 – Conduct of Investigations	3
Objective No. 1(a) – Audio/Video Recording of Interviews	3
Objective No. 1(b) – Interviewing of Witnesses/Complainants	3
Objective No. 1(c) – Prohibiting Group Interviews	4
Objective No. 1(d) – Interview of All Involved Supervisors	4
Objective No. 1(e) – Canvassing the Scene to Locate Witnesses	5
Objective No. 1(f) – Collection and Preservation of Evidence	6
Objective No. 1(g) – All Digital In-Car Video System Recordings Included, if Any	6
Objective No. 2 – All Allegations of Misconduct Appropriately Addressed	7
Objective No. 3 – Evaluation Based on Sufficient Information, Appropriate Standards of Credibility and a Preponderance of Evidence	7
Objective No. 4 – Department Notification of Resolution to Complainant	8
Objective No. 5 – Department Referral to Criminal Prosecutorial Authorities of All Complaints Involving LAPD Officers with Facts Indicating Criminal Conduct	9
Objective No. 6 – Completeness of the Investigation Files	9
Objective No. 6(a) – Availability of Audio/Video Recordings	9
Objective No. 6(b) – Completeness of Audio/Video Recordings	10
Objective No. 7 – A Comparison of the Officer, Complainant, and Witness Statements	10
Objective No. 7(a) – Consistency between Summarized Statement and Audio/Video Recording	11
Objective No. 7(b) – Significant Inconsistencies Identified and Reported	11
Objective No. 8 – Identify and Report Training Needs	12
Objective No. 9 – Adequacy of the Investigation	13
CONCLUSION	13
ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
COMPLAINT INVESTIGATIONS AUDIT
Conducted by Internal Audits and Inspections Division
Fiscal Year 2013/2014

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department or LAPD) Audit and Inspection Plan, Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) conducted a Complaint Investigations Audit to assess the Department's conformance with Department policies and procedures related to the complaint investigation process.

METHODOLOGY

Internal Audits and Inspections Division obtained a list of complaint investigations from the Complaint Management System that were closed during December 2012, and obtained a statistically valid stratified sample. The population sample consisted of 102 investigations that were conducted by Internal Affairs Group (IAG), Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), and 124 investigations that were conducted by Chain of Command (COC). Statistically valid samples of 23 PSB investigations and 34 COC investigations were selected for a total of 57 investigations.¹

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine if they were applicable to each audit objective. If the investigation was not applicable to an objective, the investigation was excluded from the total number of investigations being measured for that objective. Consequently, the percentages for some objectives were calculated based on a subset of the sample.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

The Department met a 95 percent or higher percentage standard in 16 of 17 objectives. The following objective reflected a less than 95 percent performance standard:

- Availability of Audio/Video Recordings (93%)

A continued emphasis of improvement in this specific area will assist in providing commanding officers with the necessary information to thoroughly evaluate and appropriately adjudicate complaint investigations.

A comparison was not made to the prior year's audit due to changes in the audit's methodology.

The audit measured 17 objectives/sub-objectives, referred to hereafter as objectives.

Table No. 1 on the following page, illustrates the current year findings by objective.

¹ A 95 percent confidence level with a precision of plus five percent and a one-tail test sample size was utilized for the PSB and COC sample selections.

TABLE NO. 1 – SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

OBJ. No.	DESCRIPTION OF AUDIT OBJECTIVE	FY 2013/14 PERCENTAGE MEETING THE STANDARD		
		PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BUREAU	CHAIN OF COMMAND	TOTAL
1.	CONDUCT OF INVESTIGATIONS			
(a)	Audio/Video Recording of Interviews	(22/22)	(20/20)	100% (42/42)
(b)	Interviewing of Witnesses/Complainants	(22/22)	(21/21)	100% (43/43)
(c)	Prohibiting Group Interviews	(21/21)	(21/21)	100% (42/42)
(d)	Interview of All Involved Supervisors	(9/9)	(5/5)	100% (14/14)
(e)	Canvassing the Scene to Locate Witnesses	(18/18)	(12/13)	97% (30/31)
(f)	Collection and Preservation of Evidence	(3/3)	(4/4)	100% (7/7)
(g)	All Digital In-Car Video System Recordings Included, if Any	(4/4)	(2/2)	100% (6/6)
2.	ALL ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED	(23/23)	(34/34)	100% (57/57)
3.	EVALUATION BASED ON SUFFICIENT INFORMATION, APPROPRIATE STANDARDS OF CREDIBILITY AND A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE	(23/23)	(27/27)	100% (50/50)
4.	DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATION OF RESOLUTION TO COMPLAINANT	(20/20)	(29/29)	100% (49/49)
5.	DEPARTMENT REFERRAL TO CRIMINAL PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITIES OF ALL COMPLAINTS INVOLVING LAPD OFFICERS WITH FACTS INDICATING CRIMINAL CONDUCT	(2/2)	(0/0)	100% (2/2)
6.	COMPLETENESS OF THE INVESTIGATION FILES			
(a)	Availability of Audio/Video Recordings	(22/22)	(16/19)	93% (38/41)
(b)	Completeness of Audio/Video Recordings	(22/22)	(18/18)	100% (40/40)
7.	A COMPARISON OF THE OFFICER, COMPLAINANT, AND WITNESS STATEMENTS			
(a)	Consistency Between Summarized Statement and Audio/Video Recording	(20/21)	(19/19)	98% (39/40)
(b)	Significant Inconsistencies Identified and Reported	(22/22)	(19/19)	100% (41/41)
8.	IDENTIFY AND REPORT TRAINING NEEDS	(3/3)	(3/3)	100% (6/6)
9.	ADEQUACY OF THE INVESTIGATION	(22/23)	(34/34)	98% (56/57)

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Internal Audits and Inspections Division provided a draft copy of the audit to the Commanding Officer of Internal Affairs Group. Internal Affairs Group expressed general agreement with the audit findings and conclusions.

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATIONS AUDIT
Conducted by Internal Audits and Inspections Division
Fiscal Year 2013/2014

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department or LAPD) Audit and Inspection Plan, Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) conducted a Complaint Investigations Audit to assess the Department's conformance with Department policies and procedures related to the complaint investigation process.

METHODOLOGY

Population

Internal Audits and Inspections Division obtained a list of complaint investigations from the Complaint Management System that were closed during December 2012, and obtained a statistically valid stratified sample. The population sample consisted of 102 investigations that were conducted by Internal Affairs Group (IAG), Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), and 124 investigations being conducted by Chain of Command (COC). Statistically valid samples of 23 PSB investigations and 34 COC investigations were selected for a total of 57 investigations.¹

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine if they were applicable to each audit objective. If the investigation was not applicable to an objective, the investigation was excluded from the total number of investigations that were being measured for that objective. Consequently, the percentages for some objectives were calculated based on a subset of the sample.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

A comparison was not made to the prior year's audit due to changes in the audit's methodology.

The audit measured 17 objectives/sub-objectives, referred to hereafter as objectives.

THIS SECTION INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

¹ A 95 percent confidence level with a precision of plus five percent and a one-tail test sample size was utilized for the PSB and COC sample selections.

Table No. 1 below delineates the audit results by objective.

TABLE NO. 1 – SUMMARY OF AUDIT FINDINGS

OBJ. No.	DESCRIPTION OF AUDIT OBJECTIVE	FY 2013/14 PERCENTAGE MEETING THE STANDARD		
		PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BUREAU	CHAIN OF COMMAND	TOTAL
1.	CONDUCT OF INVESTIGATIONS			
(a)	Audio/Video Recording of Interviews	(22/22)	(20/20)	100% (42/42)
(b)	Interviewing of Witnesses/Complainants	(22/22)	(21/21)	100% (43/43)
(c)	Prohibiting Group Interviews	(21/21)	(21/21)	100% (42/42)
(d)	Interview of All Involved Supervisors	(9/9)	(5/5)	100% (14/14)
(e)	Canvassing the Scene to Locate Witnesses	(18/18)	(12/13)	97% (30/31)
(f)	Collection and Preservation of Evidence	(3/3)	(4/4)	100% (7/7)
(g)	All Digital In-Car Video System Recordings Included, if Any	(4/4)	(2/2)	100% (6/6)
2.	ALL ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT APPROPRIATELY ADDRESSED	(23/23)	(34/34)	100% (57/57)
3.	EVALUATION BASED ON SUFFICIENT INFORMATION, APPROPRIATE STANDARDS OF CREDIBILITY AND A PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE	(23/23)	(27/27)	100% (50/50)
4.	DEPARTMENT NOTIFICATION OF RESOLUTION TO COMPLAINANT	(20/20)	(29/29)	100% (49/49)
5.	DEPARTMENT REFERRAL TO CRIMINAL PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITIES OF ALL COMPLAINTS INVOLVING LAPD OFFICERS WITH FACTS INDICATING CRIMINAL CONDUCT	(2/2)	(0/0)	100% (2/2)
6.	COMPLETENESS OF THE INVESTIGATION FILES			
(a)	Availability of Audio/Video Recordings	(22/22)	(16/19)	93% (38/41)
(b)	Completeness of Audio/Video Recordings	(22/22)	(18/18)	100% (40/40)
7.	A COMPARISON OF THE OFFICER, COMPLAINANT, AND WITNESS STATEMENTS			
(a)	Consistency Between Summarized Statement and Audio/Video Recording	(20/21)	(19/19)	98% (39/40)
(b)	Significant Inconsistencies Identified and Reported	(22/22)	(19/19)	100% (41/41)
8.	IDENTIFY AND REPORT TRAINING NEEDS	(3/3)	(3/3)	100% (6/6)
9.	ADEQUACY OF THE INVESTIGATION	(22/23)	(34/34)	98% (56/57)

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 – Conduct of Investigations

Department policy establishes the minimum standards that must be followed when conducting complaint investigations. The audit measured the 57 investigations against these standards and the findings are reported below in Objective No. 1 (a-g).

Objective No. 1(a) – Audio/Video Recording of Interviews

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires that the interviews of all complainants, involved Department employees, and witnesses shall be recorded. Should a non-employee complainant or witness refuse to be recorded, an attempt shall be made to record the refusal on tape or on a signed statement of refusal. Additionally, Department Manual Section 3/816.01, Supervisor's Responsibility, requires the tape-recording of all interviews. If not practical, supervisors shall include a written justification under the summary portion of the Complaint Form, 1.28.00.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine whether the interview of the complainant, witness, and/or accused officer was audio and/or video recorded. Any complainant or witness refusals to be audio or video recorded, were required to be documented in the investigations. Investigations that contained indications that interviews of complainants, witnesses, and involved officers were audio and/or video recorded, met the standards for this objective. Investigations that documented complainant or witness refusals to be recorded, or an explanation of why the interview was not recorded, also met the standards.

Overall Findings

Forty-two investigations were applicable for this objective.² Each (100%) of the 42 investigations contained evidence that interviews of the complainants, witnesses, or involved employees were audio and/or video recorded, or an explanation was documented within the investigation file, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 1(b) – Interviewing of Witnesses/Complainants

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires that identified complainants and witnesses shall be interviewed.

² The remaining 15 investigations were not applicable since no interviews were required.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for evidence that complainants and witnesses were interviewed. Investigations that indicated complainants and witnesses were interviewed, or for which justification was provided for not conducting the interviews, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty-three investigations were applicable for this objective.³ Each (100%) of the 43 investigations contained evidence that complainants and witnesses were interviewed or justification was provided, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 1(c) – Prohibiting Group Interviews

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires that the interviews of all complainants, involved Department employees, and witnesses shall be conducted individually (no group interviews).

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for any indication that group interviews were conducted during the investigation. Investigations that did not indicate that group interviews were conducted, or that provided justification for conducting group interviews, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty-two investigations were applicable for this objective.⁴ Each (100%) of the 42 investigations contained evidence that complainants and witnesses were interviewed independently and no group interviews were conducted, or justification was provided, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 1(d) – Interview of All Involved Supervisors

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires all involved supervisors to be interviewed regarding their conduct at the scene during the incident.

³ The remaining 14 investigations were not applicable since no interviews were required.

⁴ The remaining 15 investigations were not applicable because there were no recordings and/or interviews in the investigations.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine if all on-scene supervisors were interviewed regarding their conduct at the scene. Investigations that indicated all on-scene supervisors were interviewed or provided reasonable justification for the supervisor not being interviewed, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Fourteen investigations were applicable for this objective.⁵ Each (100%) of the 14 investigations contained evidence that all on-scene supervisors were interviewed regarding their conduct at scene, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 1(e) – Canvassing the Scene to Locate Witnesses

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires canvassing the scene to locate possible witnesses, if appropriate.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for indications that the scene was canvassed to locate witnesses, with the burden for locating witnesses falling on the Department, and not on the complainant. Investigations that indicated that the scene was canvassed to locate witnesses, or a reasonable justification was provided as to why canvassing was not conducted, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Thirty-one investigations were applicable for this objective.⁶ Eighteen investigations were applicable to PSB and 13 investigations were applicable to COC investigations. Each (100%) of the 18 PSB investigations and 12 (92%) of the 13 COC investigations contained evidence that the scene was canvassed to locate witnesses, or documented enough information to determine the scene was canvassed, or justification was provided as to why canvassing was not conducted, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

The remaining investigation is detailed below.

COC 04 (CF No. 11-003772) – The investigation revealed that the Investigating Officer (I/O) documented that the scene was not canvassed and no explanation was provided.

⁵ The remaining 43 investigations were not applicable since none involved an on-scene supervisor at the time of the alleged misconduct.

⁶ The remaining 26 investigations were not applicable because canvassing was not necessary due to the nature of the complaint.

Objective No. 1(f) – Collection and Preservation of Evidence

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires that all appropriate evidence shall be collected and preserved.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for indications that all appropriate evidence (excluding interview recordings) was located, preserved, and that the burden for such collection rested with the Department, and not on the complainant.⁷ Investigations that indicated all appropriate evidence was located, preserved, and that the burden for collection rested with the Department, or justification was provided, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Seven investigations were applicable for this objective.⁸ Each (100%) of the seven investigations indicated that all appropriate evidence was collected, preserved, and that the burden for collection rested with the Department, or justification was provided. Therefore, all seven investigations met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 1(g) – All Digital In-Car Video System Recordings Included, if Any

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/579.13, Digital In-Car Video System (DICVS) Use and Deployment, requires officers to activate DICVS during the initiation of all vehicle stops, Code-3 responses/pursuits, suspect transports, pedestrian stops (when practical), and other occasions, when, in the officer's judgment, it would be beneficial to do so.

Audit Procedures

Currently, only Operations - South Bureau (OSB) has vehicles equipped with DICVS; therefore, this objective was not applicable to all complaint investigations. If a complaint investigation involved an incident that occurred in OSB and involved a police vehicle, efforts were made to determine if the alleged incident could have been captured on a DICVS recording and if so, whether the I/O included the evidence in the investigation. Investigations that contained the relevant DICVS recordings required to thoroughly evaluate the investigation, met the standards for this objective.

⁷ "Preserved" was defined as the ability to produce appropriate evidence when required.

⁸ The remaining 50 investigations were not applicable because none involved any related evidence to collect and preserve for purposes of the complaint adjudication.

Overall Findings

Six investigations were applicable for this objective.⁹ Each (100%) of the six investigations indicated that a DICVS video was properly located and included in the investigation file.

Objective No. 2 – All Allegations of Misconduct Appropriately Addressed

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/811, Accepting Complaints, indicates that all allegations of misconduct whether alleged by the complainant or identified by the I/O during the investigation shall be addressed as a framed allegation within the complaint investigation or the I/O shall initiate a new complaint investigation, as appropriate.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for indications that all allegations of misconduct made by the complainant or identified during the investigation were framed and addressed by the investigation. Investigations that indicated the I/O framed and addressed each allegation or that the I/O initiated a separate complaint investigation, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Each (100%) of the 57 investigations contained evidence that all allegations of misconduct were properly framed or a separate complaint investigation was initiated, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 3 – Evaluation Based on Sufficient Information, Appropriate Standards of Credibility and a Preponderance of Evidence

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/825.20, Evaluating Witness Credibility, requires that Department managers (the rank of captain or above) are responsible for assessing the believability and credibility of witnesses in accordance with the established standards. Additionally, Department Manual Section 3/825.20, requires that no automatic judgment that insufficient information exists to make a credibility determination when the primary evidence amounts to conflicting statements of the accused employee and the complainant. Lastly, the Department's *Management Guide to Discipline* states that upon reviewing a complaint investigation, managers must first determine whether misconduct occurred based on a preponderance of evidence. This determination of misconduct precludes the consideration of mitigating factors.

⁹ The remaining 51 investigations were not applicable.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for indications that Department managers used appropriate standards when evaluating witness credibility. Additionally, the investigations were reviewed for indications that no automatic judgments were made when determining credibility. Lastly, the investigations were reviewed for indications that Letters of Transmittal (LOT) documented a preponderance of the evidence standard for adjudications of each investigation.

Overall Findings

Fifty investigations were applicable for this objective.¹⁰ Each (100%) of the 50 investigations indicated that credibility determinations were made pursuant to Department policy, that investigations did not contain evidence that automatic judgments were made to make credibility determinations, and that LOTs documented a preponderance of evidence standard to adjudicate the allegations, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 4 – Department Notification of Resolution to Complainant

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/825.30, Notification of Investigation Results to Complainant, requires that commanding officers adjudicating complaint investigations shall prepare a resolution letter on Department letterhead addressed to the complainant.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine whether a resolution letter was sent to the complainant, advising him/her of the complaint resolution, including significant dates, general allegations and disposition. The review included determining whether the name of the complainant, address, and nature of the complaint were accurate according to the Complaint Form, 1.28.00.

The Department requires notification to complainants and does not require notification for Department-initiated complaints. Investigations in which proper notifications were sent to complainants met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty-nine investigations were applicable for this objective.¹¹ Each (100%) of the 49 investigations indicated the applicable complainants were sent a notification letter containing the resolution of their complaint, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

¹⁰ The remaining seven investigations were not applicable because they were resolved utilizing the Alternative Complaint Resolution process.

¹¹ The remaining eight investigations were not applicable. Three were Department-initiated complaints, four were filed by anonymous complainants and one complainant refused to provide personal information.

Objective No. 5 – Department Referral to Criminal Prosecutorial Authorities of All Complaints Involving LAPD Officers with Facts Indicating Criminal Conduct

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/837.30, Scope of the Investigation, requires that Department entities completing complaint investigations which establish prima facie evidence of the commission of a criminal offense within the City of Los Angeles by Department employees, shall submit the completed investigation to IAG for presentation to a prosecuting agency.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine whether possible criminal conduct was referred to prosecutorial authorities. Investigations for which possible criminal conduct was referred to the appropriate prosecutorial authority, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Two investigations were applicable for this objective. Both investigations indicated possible criminal conduct, and were referred to prosecutorial authorities, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 6 – Completeness of the Investigation Files

Objective No. 6 (a-b) measured whether the Department maintained all required audio and/or video recordings, ensured all audio and/or video recordings were complete, and that investigations contained all appropriate investigation sections.

Objective No. 6(a) – Availability of Audio/Video Recordings

Criteria

This audit assessed the completeness of the investigation file based on the availability of audio and/or video recordings by applying the standards set forth in Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine whether the investigation files included the required audio and/or video recordings for the associated interviews. Investigations that contained the required audio and/or video recordings met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty-one investigations were applicable for this objective.¹² Twenty-two investigations were applicable to PSB and 19 investigations were applicable to COC investigations.

Each (100%) of the 22 PSB investigations and 16 (84%) of the 19 COC investigations included the required audio and/or video recordings for the associated interviews, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

The remaining three investigations for which the Department was unable to provide required recordings are indicated below.

COC 05 (CF No. 11-003939), COC 08 (CF No.12-000121 and COC 21 (CF No. 12-001853).

Objective No. 6(b) – Completeness of Audio/Video Recordings

Criteria

This audit assessed the completeness of the audio and/or video recordings by applying the standards set forth in Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed to determine whether the audio/video recordings provided in the investigation were complete. Investigations that contained evidence that audio and/or video recordings were complete met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty investigations were applicable for this objective.¹³ Each (100%) of the 40 investigations contained evidence that audio and/or video recordings were complete, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 7 – A Comparison of the Officer, Complainant, and Witness Statements

Objective No. 7 (a-b) measured whether the I/O's summaries were consistent with complainant, officer, and witness recorded statements and did not omit pertinent information. Significant inconsistencies in complainant, officer, and witness interview statements, if any, should also be identified and documented within the investigation file.

¹² The remaining 16 investigations were not applicable because interviews were either not required or there were no associated recordings.

¹³ The remaining 17 investigations were not applicable because there were no recordings in the investigations.

Objective No. 7(a) – Consistency between Summarized Statement and Audio/Video Recording

Criteria

This audit measured whether the I/O's summarization of statements were consistent with complainant, officer, and witness tape-recorded interviews and did not omit pertinent information that could have substantially impacted the investigation.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed and the complainant, officer, and witness tape-recorded statements were compared with the investigators' summarization of the interviews to determine whether there were any instances in which the summaries were factually inaccurate or omitted pertinent information that could have substantially impacted the investigation. Investigations in which investigator's summaries were consistent with complainant, officer, and witness tape-recorded statements and did not omit information that could have substantially impacted the investigation met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty investigations were applicable for this objective.¹⁴ Twenty-one investigations were applicable to PSB and 19 investigations were applicable to COC investigations. Twenty (95%) of the 21 PSB investigations and each (100%) of the 19 COC investigations contained evidence that the investigator's summaries were consistent with complainant, officer, and witness recorded statements, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

The remaining investigation is detailed below.

PSB 22 (CF No. 12-000359) – The initial audio intake interview revealed a significant inconsistency between the complainant's recorded audio statement and the written paraphrase summary of the audio interview.

Objective No. 7(b) – Significant Inconsistencies Identified and Reported

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines, requires that inconsistencies in officer and witness interview statements shall be identified and documented.

¹⁴ The remaining 17 investigations were not applicable because interviews were either not required or there were no associated recordings.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for any indication that statements and the respective audio recordings contained inconsistencies between officer and witness statements. If there were no significant inconsistencies, or if significant inconsistencies in statements were noted within the investigation, the investigation met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Forty-one investigations were applicable for this objective.¹⁵ Each (100%) of the 41 investigations indicated there were no significant inconsistencies, or the significant inconsistencies in statements were noted, and therefore, met the standards for the objective.

Objective No. 8 – Identify and Report Training Needs

Criteria

Department Manual Section 1/670, Training, requires that the Department has an obligation to provide a professional standard of law enforcement service to the community. In fulfilling that responsibility, it is essential that Department personnel be properly trained. This is true not only at the entrance level where officers must receive basic training prior to their assumption of police responsibilities, but it is a continuous process throughout their careers. Training is provided to accommodate Department needs and to actualize the interest and concern which the Department has for the self-improvement and personal development of its employees.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were reviewed for instances in which underlying problems or training needs were identified, and whether the commanding officer addressed those issues. Investigations that identified training needs and that indicated the commanding officer conducted an evaluation and implemented appropriate actions and recommendations met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Six investigations were applicable for this objective.¹⁶ Each (100%) of the six investigations documented that underlying problems or training needs were identified and addressed, and therefore, met the standards for this objective.

¹⁵ The remaining 16 investigations were not applicable because interviews were either not required or there were no associated recordings.

¹⁶ The remaining 51 investigations were not applicable because there were no underlying problems or training needs identified.

Objective No. 9 – Adequacy of the Investigation

Criteria

This audit assessed the adequacy of the investigation, including the application of the standards set forth in Department Manual Section 3/815.01, General Investigation Guidelines.

Audit Procedures

The 57 investigations were assessed to determine whether there were any other significant concerns not reportable in other audit objectives that had an effect on the overall adequacy of the investigation. Investigations that did not reveal any significant concerns not reportable in other audit objectives affecting the overall adequacy of the investigations, met the standards for this objective.

Overall Findings

Fifty-six (98%) of the 57 investigations did not reveal any significant concerns not reportable in other audit objectives affecting the overall adequacy of the investigations, met the standards for this objective.

The one remaining investigation is detailed below.

PSB 22 (CF12-000359) – The complainant had concerns involving the search of her residence during an official police investigation. The complainant's concerns are not addressed in the investigation.

CONCLUSION

The Department met a 95 percent or higher percentage standard in 16 of 17 objectives. The following one objective reflected a less than 95 percent performance standard:

- Availability of Audio/Video Recordings (94%)

A continued emphasis of improvement in this specific area will assist in providing commanding officers with the necessary information to thoroughly evaluate and appropriately adjudicate complaint investigations.

MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Internal Audits and Inspections Division provided a draft copy of the audit to the Commanding Officer of Internal Affairs Group. Internal Affairs Group expressed general agreement with the audit findings and conclusions.