

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

June 16, 2015
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL/COMMUNITY LAW ENFORCEMENT
AND RECOVERY SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT (AD No. 15-035)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Gang Enforcement Detail/Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Selection Criteria Audit (GED/CLEAR).
2. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

Audit Division conducted the GED/CLEAR Audit to evaluate compliance with Department's policies and procedures.

If additional information regarding this audit is required, please contact Arif Alikhan, Director, Office of Constitutional Policing and Policy, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

GED/CLEAR SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT

(AD No. 15-035)



Conducted by
AUDIT DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

June 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GED/CLEAR SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT

	PAGE No.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PURPOSE	1
BACKGROUND	1
STATUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS	1
METHODOLOGY	2
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	2
DETAILED FINDINGS	3
Objective No. 1 Completeness of the Selection Package	3
Objective No. 2 Assessment of TEAMS Evaluation Report	4
Objective No. 2(a) Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report	4
Objective No. 2(b) Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TEAMS Evaluation Report	6
Objective No. 2(c) Chronology of Approval for the Selection on the TEAMS Evaluation Report	7
Objective No. 2(d) Use of Canned Language	8
Objective No. 3 Review of Sustained Complaints and Adverse Findings	9
Objective No. 3(a) Documented Review of Sustained Complaints	9
Objective No. 3(b) Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings	11
OTHER RELATED MATTER	12
RECOMMENDATIONS	12
ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL/COMMUNITY LAW ENFORCEMENT AND
RECOVERY SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT

Conducted by
Audit Division
Second Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014/15

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year (FY) 2014/15, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Gang Enforcement Detail/Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Selection (GED/CLEAR) Selection Criteria Audit to evaluate compliance with related Department directives. The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of personnel in GED and CLEAR assignments, while adhering to Department policies and procedures.

BACKGROUND

Audit Division previously conducted an audit of GED units during the fourth quarter, FY 2012/13. The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of personnel in GED assignments while adhering to Department policies and procedures.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The audit was comprised of seven objectives/sub-objectives that were tested. The Department did well with each of the objectives, with the exception of one, whereby canned language was identified as being utilized in narrative sections of the Training and Evaluation Management System (TEAMS) Evaluation Report (TER) that should contain unique language pertaining to each of the respective employees. The table on the following page summarizes the audit results for each objective.

This section intentionally left blank

Summary of Audit Findings

Objective	Description of Audit Objectives	Results	Results
		FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14
1	Completeness of the Selection Package	62/64 ¹ (97%)	90/97 (93%)
2 - Assessment of TEAMS Evaluation Report			
2(a)	Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report	62/63 (98%)	94/95 ² (99%)
2(b)	Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TEAMS Evaluation Report	62/63 (98%)	93/95 (98%)
2(c)	Chronology of Approval for the Selection on the TEAMS Evaluation Report	55/63 (87%)	90/94 ³ (96%)
2(d)	Use of Canned Language - Commanding Officer's Evaluation - Suitability Interview	N/A	38/95 (40%) 39/95 (41%)
3 - Review of Sustained Complaints and Adverse Judicial Findings			
3(a)	Documented Review of Sustained Complaints	3/3 (100%)	N/A ⁴
3(b)	Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings	1/1 (100%)	1/1 (100%)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that Policies and Procedures Division revisit Department Manual Section 3/763.76, Selection Process for Gang Enforcement Details, specifically the portion regarding the Suitability Interview and allow for the information to be documented on the Continuation Form of the GED Selection Checklist *Objective 2(b)*.⁵
2. It is recommended that Policies and Procedures Division update the Checklist of Selection Documentation section of the GED Selection Checklist/New Selection/Loans, to reflect the current Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Application Requirements for a GED position. Currently, the standard is for the two most recent Standards Based Assessments, and that the period covered is over one year. The standard on the GED Selection Checklist is for the two most recent Performance Evaluations covering a two year period.

¹The selection package for one supervisor from Rampart Area was not completed. Therefore, this selection was removed from all subsequent objectives.

²The TERs and GED Selection Checklists were not completed for one loaned Rampart Area supervisor and one new Hollenbeck Area supervisor. These findings are detailed in Objective No. 1 and were not tested for Objective Nos. 2(a)-(d).

³The Commanding Officer did not sign the TER for one Foothill Area New Supervisor selection. This finding was detailed in Objective 2(a) and not considered for Objective 2(c).

⁴As there were no New Officers, New Supervisors, Loans, or Current Suitability that sustained complaints involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty during this period, this objective was unable to be evaluated.

⁵Based on AD's audit, the following results detail how the Suitability Interview was documented in the Selection Packages: (4) TER only, (29) GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet and TER, (41) GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet only, (18) GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet with referral on TER, and (4) no documentation.

3. It is recommended that Office of Operations and Personnel Division develop protocols to ensure that intradivisional position changes are properly processed and entered into TEAMS accordingly (refer to Other Related Matter: TEAMS II Report-Assignment/Rank History Information).
4. It is recommended that Office of Operations provide training to geographic Area commanding officers and GED supervisors in regard to proper documentation of Suitability Interviews, and documentation of the commanding officer's evaluation of the GED officer's selection; both of which should incorporate insight on uniqueness of such documentation.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Each of the findings were validated with the commanding officers at the respective Areas. Audit Division presented the audit report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations and the Chief of Detectives, whom were both in general agreement with the findings.

GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL/COMMUNITY LAW ENFORCEMENT AND RECOVERY SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT

Conducted by
Audit Division

Second Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014/15

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year (FY) 2014/15, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Selection Criteria Audit to evaluate compliance with related Department directives. The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of personnel in GED and Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) assignments, while adhering to Department policies and procedures.¹

Audit Division conducted this audit under the guidance of generally accepted government auditing standards, specifically pertaining to performing the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. Audit Division has determined that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

BACKGROUND

Audit Division previously conducted an audit of GED units during the fourth quarter, FY 2012/13. The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of personnel in GED assignments while adhering to Department policies and procedures.

STATUS ON RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made in the last audit:

1. *"It is recommended that Planning and Research Division² revisit the TER³ and update the nomenclature of complaint classifications for consistency with Professional Standards Bureau's (PSB) complaint classification titles. Currently, the TER identifies the complaint classifications as follows: Excessive Force, False Arrest and Charge, Improper Search and Seizure, Sexual Harassment, Discrimination, and Dishonesty. Professional Standards Bureau's Complaint Statistical Information, Form 01.19.00, identifies the same complaint classifications as follows: Unauthorized Force, False Imprisonment, Unlawful Search, Sexual Misconduct, Discrimination, and Dishonesty."*

Status on Recommendation No. 1: *In progress.*

2. *"The Assignment/Rank History Information section of a TEAMS II Report should be updated to reflect every change in rank and assignment of an officer's entire LAPD work history. The accuracy and completeness of this information is relied upon by various users within the Department. During the course of assessing the selection packages for the officers assigned*

¹For the purpose of this audit, when referring to GED, AD included personnel assigned to CLEAR.

²Now Policies and Procedures Division.

³Training and Evaluation Management System (TEAMS) Evaluation Report.

to GED units, IAID⁴ reviewed the TEAMS II reports to determine whether the accurate assignment was reflected for each of the 260 officers/supervisors within the specified samples. Of the 260 TEAMS II reports reviewed, a total of nine (five from Operations-South Bureau, two from Operations-Valley Bureau, and two from Central Bureau) contained discrepancies pertaining to their current assignments.”

Status on Recommendation No. 2: *In progress.*

METHODOLOGY

The period selected for this audit was Deployment Period (DP) No. 7, 2014 (June 15 to July 12). In determining the audit population, AD utilized the Deployment Planning System and GED Field Deployment Rosters.

The population consisted of officers and supervisors, who entered a GED unit from March 25, 2013, to July 12, 2014, and were assigned to a GED unit on July 12, 2014. A total of 324 GED personnel were assigned to GED units on July 12, 2014.

The population was divided into four categories: New Officers, New Supervisors, Loans, and Current Suitability (officers and supervisors).

The categories of New Officers and New Supervisors consisted of personnel who entered GED units during the audit period, and were commencing a 39 DP tour of duty. The population for new selections was 166; 142 officers and 24 supervisors.

Of the 142 officers identified as newly selected, a statistically valid sample of 71 New Officers was generated.⁵

Twenty-two New Supervisors were identified and all were utilized for the audit.⁶

The category of Current Suitability consisted of officers and supervisors who were assigned to a GED unit prior to March 25, 2013, and had been reviewed in the prior audit. The entire population of 156 officers and supervisors identified as Current Suitability was utilized in Objective No. 3(a).

Four employees were identified as being on loan, all of which were evaluated.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The audit was comprised of seven objectives/sub-objectives; a total of eight tests were conducted to satisfy the established objectives. Table No. 1 summarizes the audit findings.

⁴Now Audit Division.

⁵The sample size was obtained utilizing a one-tail test with a 95 percent confidence level and a four percent error rate.

⁶Two supervisor selection packages (Wilshire Area and Newton Area) were excluded as their GED transfer date occurred outside of AD's testing period (there was an incorrect date on TEAMS II report).

Table No. 1 - Summary of Audit Findings

Objective	Description of Audit Objectives	Results	Results
		FY 2012/13	FY 2013/14
1	Completeness of the Selection Package	62/64 ⁷ (97%)	90/97 (93%)
2 - Assessment of TEAMS Evaluation Report			
2(a)	Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report	62/63 (98%)	94/95 ⁸ (99%)
2(b)	Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TEAMS Evaluation Report	62/63 (98%)	93/95 (98%)
2(c)	Chronology of Approval for the Selection on the TEAMS Evaluation Report	55/63 (87%)	90/94 ⁹ (96%)
2(d)	Use of Canned Language - Commanding Officer's Evaluation - Suitability Interview	N/A	38/95 (40%) 39/95 (41%)
3 - Review of Sustained Complaints and Adverse Judicial Findings			
3(a)	Documented Review of Sustained Complaints	3/3 (100%)	N/A ¹⁰
3(b)	Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings	1/1 (100%)	1/1 (100%)

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 – Completeness of the Selection Package

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Gang Enforcement Detail – Qualification and Selection Requirements, states, “*In addition to participating in a formal documented oral interview, sworn personnel applying for assignment to a GED shall submit the following:*

- *Transfer Applicant Data Sheet, Form 15.88.00;*
- *Standards Based Assessment, Form 01.87.00, the last two ratings (annual or transfer) due prior to the start of the selection process. The two most recent ratings reviewed to determine selection to a GED must cover a period over a year;*
- *GED Selection Checklist, New Selection, Form 12.16.00; and,*
- *Training, Evaluation and Management Systems II (TEAMS II) report (promotion/paygrade advancement TEAMS II report only).*

⁷The selection package for one supervisor from Rampart Area was not completed. Therefore, this selection was removed from all subsequent objectives.

⁸The TERs and GED Selection Checklists were not completed for one loaned Rampart Area supervisor and one new Hollenbeck Area supervisor. These findings are detailed in Objective No. 1 and were not tested for Objective Nos. 2(a)-2(d).

⁹The Commanding Officer did not sign the TER for one Foothill Area New Supervisor selection. This finding was detailed in Objective 2(a) and not considered for Objective 2(c).

¹⁰As there were no New Officers, New Supervisors, Loans, or Current Suitability that sustained complaints involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty during this period, this objective was unable to be evaluated.

Note: An employee's Training Evaluation and Management Systems (TEAMS) report, specifically, "Promotion/Paygrade Advancement" shall also be submitted and should not be over 30 days old.

In addition, the TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER), Form 01.78.04, was evaluated for this objective. Section I of the TER states, *"Only Promotion/Paygrade Advancement TEAMS shall be used for selections to FTO, GED, CLEAR, FID, PSB, NED, and GND, Narco Section. All other transfers shall use the Final Selection Process TEAMS filter."*

Audit Procedures

A total of 97 Selection Packages were examined for completeness with this objective. A package was defined as complete if all items were present and in accordance with Department policy.

Findings

Ninety (93%) of 97 Selection Packages (67 officers, 20 supervisors and three loans) met the standards for this objective. The seven Selection Packages that did not meet the standards are identified in Table No. 2.

Table No. 2 - Completeness of the Selection Package

Area/Division	Finding Description
Rampart Area	The Selection Package for a Loaned Supervisor did not include a TER, a GED Selection Checklist, or a TEAMS II Report (promotion/paygrade advancement version).
Newton Area	The Selection Package for a New Supervisor did not include SBAs covering a period of over a year.
Rampart Area (3)	The Selection Packages for New Officers included an incorrect version of the TEAMS II Report (promotion/paygrade advancement version).
77 th Street Area	The Selection Package for a New Officer included a TEAMS II Report that was missing the first page, therefore, AD was unable to determine the version.
Hollenbeck Area	The Selection Package was not completed for one New Supervisor selection.

Objective No. 2 – Assessment of TEAMS Evaluation Report

Objective No. 2(a) – Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report

Criteria

Department Manual Section 1/668.04, Types of TEAMS II Reports, states, *"TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, Used for personnel transferring into or loaned to Professional*

Standards Bureau (PSB), Force Investigation Division (FID), Gang Enforcement Detail (GED), Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Program, Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED), Gang and Narcotics Division (GND), Narco Section, or the position of Field Training Officer (FTO). The Department has established specific criteria for selecting sworn personnel to specialized or sensitive assignments. This information is to be used to ensure that all mandated selection criteria for these assignments are appropriately addressed."

Audit Procedures

The TERs were examined for the following documentation:

- Division Employee Folder field completed;
- Department Personnel Package field completed;
- Adverse Judicial Findings field completed;
- Watch Commander/Supervisor Completing Review field completed; and,
- Commanding Officer Approving field completed.

A total of 95 TERs were evaluated for this objective. The Department met the standard if all of the above items were completed.

Findings

Ninety-four (99%) of the 95 TERs (71 officers, 20 supervisors and three loans) met the standards for this objective. The Selection Package that did not meet the standards is identified in Table No. 3.

Table No. 3 - Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report

Area/Division	Finding Description
Foothill Area	The Commanding Officer Approving field was blank for a New Supervisor selection. ¹¹

Additional Information

During the review of the TERs, it was noted that the Date of Transfer was often incomplete. Of the 95 TERs reviewed, 81 (85%) completed the Date of Transfer field.¹² Although this did not appear to affect the monitoring pertaining to the tour of duty periods, the dates should be entered for completeness of the TER.

¹¹However, the TER was signed by the Bureau Commanding Officer in the Bureau Commanding Officer field.

¹²For loans, Date of Loan was used instead of Date of Transfer to test for this objective.

Objective No. 2(b) – Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TEAMS Evaluation Report

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.76, Selection for Gang Enforcement Details, states, “*In addition to meeting all application requirements established in Manual Section 3/763.75, these applicants shall participate in an oral interview with the commanding officer and/or his/her designee. The Suitability Interview is not intended to mirror the oral interview process for advanced paygrade assignments. It is a vehicle used to confirm a selectee’s suitability for assignment to a GED.*”

The commanding officer and/or his/her designee conducting the Suitability Interview shall ensure that the following information is documented on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, after the interview:

- *Name of interviewer;*
- *Date of interview; and,*
- *Summary of discussion detailing suitability for GED assignment, emphasizing traits that indicate the selectee has demonstrated proficiency in a variety of law enforcement activities, necessary interpersonal and administrative skills, cultural and community sensitivity, and a commitment to police integrity.”*

Audit Procedures

A total of 95 TERs and GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheets were examined for this objective. The TER and GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet were examined to determine if documentation existed in either document, indicating that a Suitability Interview occurred. The Selection Package met the standard if a Suitability Interview was properly documented on the TER or GED Selection Checklist.

Findings

Ninety-three (98%) of 95 Selection Packages (69 officers, 21 supervisors and three loans) met the standards for this objective. The two Selection Packages that did not meet the standards are identified in Table No. 4.

Table No. 4 - Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TEAMS Evaluation Report

Area/Division	Finding Description
Harbor Area and Hollywood Area	There was no documentation that a suitability interview had occurred for the New Officers.

Additional Information

It should be noted that 84 (90%) of the 93 selection packages documented the Suitability Interview on a continuation sheet of the GED Selection Checklist – New Selection, Form 12.16.00, whereas four (4%) documented the interview on a TER only (refer to Recommendation No. 1).

Objective No. 2(c) – Chronology of Approval for the Selection on the TEAMS Evaluation Report

Criteria

Department Manual Section 1/668.04, Types of TEAMS II Reports, states, *“TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, Used for personnel transferring into or loaned to Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), Force Investigation Division (FID), Gang Enforcement Detail (GED), Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Program, Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED), Gang and Narcotics Division (GND), Narco Section, or the position of Field Training Officer (FTO). The Department has established specific criteria for selecting sworn personnel to specialized or sensitive assignments. This information is to be used to ensure that all mandated selection criteria for these assignments are appropriately addressed.”*

Audit Procedures

Approval of the TER by the required supervisor and command staff *should not* occur until the entire review process has been completed. The Department met the standard when the respective “watch commander/supervisor completing review” and “commanding officer” approved and signed the TER subsequent to all appropriate reviews had been conducted. A total of 94 TERs were examined for this objective.¹³

Findings

Ninety (96%) of 94 TERs (67 officers, 20 supervisors and three loans) met the standard for this objective. The four Selection Packages that did not meet the standards are identified in Table No. 5.

¹³The Commanding Officer did not sign the TER for one Foothill Area New Supervisor selection. This finding was detailed in Objective 2(a) and not considered for Objective 2(c).

Table No. 5 - Chronology of Approval for the Selection on the TEAMS Evaluation Report

Area/Division	Finding Description
Devonshire Area and Hollywood Area	The watch commander/supervisor completing review signed the TER for a New Officer before all the appropriate reviews had been conducted.
Olympic Area	The commanding officer signed the TER for a New Officer before all the appropriate reviews had been conducted.
Pacific Area	The commanding officer and the watch commander/supervisor completing reviews signed the TER for a New Officer before all the appropriate reviews had been conducted.

Objective No. 2(d) – Use of Canned Language

Criteria

Audit Division considers the examination for “canned” language a best practice and incorporates such review into its respective audits. Although templates may prove useful under certain circumstances, in this particular case, Selection Packages should be unique and individualized in documenting the officers’ specific personal traits and experiences, as well as responses that were provided during the Suitability Interviews.

Audit Procedures

The Selection Packages were examined to determine if the use of “canned” language was present. Specifically, the areas of focus were the documentation of the Suitability Interview and the Commanding Officer’s “brief, positive evaluation of [the] GED selectee” (Department Manual Section 3/763.76). The Selection Package met the standard if there was no indication of “canned” language. A total of 95 Selection Packages were examined for this objective.

Findings

Thirty-eight (40%) of 95 Selection Packages (23 officers, 13 supervisors and two loans) examined for the commanding officer’s evaluation, met the standards for this objective.

Thirty-nine (41%) of 95 Selection Packages (22 officers, 16 supervisors and one loan) examined for the Suitability Interview met the standards for this objective. The 71 Selection Packages that did not meet the standards are identified in Table No. 6.

Forty-two Selection Packages contained “canned” language in both the commanding officer’s evaluation and the Suitability Interview. Fifteen Selection Packages contained “canned” language in the commanding officer’s evaluation (in addition to 42 Selection Packages that contained it in both, for a total of 57). Fourteen Selection Packages contained “canned” language in the Suitability Interview (in addition to 42 packages that contained it in both, for a total of 56). The total number of Selection Packages with “canned” language was 71

(commanding officer's evaluation only – 15; Suitability Interview only – 14, both – 42). Table No. 6 provides a summary of the findings.

As stated in the Criteria section of this objective, having unique supervisory documentation of the officer interviews, and insight from the commanding officer in regard to the officers being selected as it relates to their personal traits and experiences, is pertinent to the value of the overall selection process of GED officers.

Table No. 6 – Use of Canned Language

Area/Division	Commanding Officer's Evaluation Only	Suitability Interview Only	Commanding Officer's Evaluation and Suitability Interview	Total Findings per Area/Division
Central Area	0	0	3	3
Hollenbeck Area	0	2	2	4
Northeast Area	0	0	4	4
Newton Area	0	5	2	7
Rampart Area	2	0	0	2
77th Street Area	3	0	4	7
Harbor Area	2	0	2	4
Southeast Area	0	0	7	7
Southwest Area	3	0	2	5
Topanga Area	0	0	3	3
Devonshire Area	0	2	0	2
Mission Area	2	0	0	2
West Valley Area	2	0	0	2
Hollywood Area	1	0	4	5
Olympic Area	0	0	3	3
Pacific Area	0	1	3	4
Wilshire Area	0	2	3	5
West Los Angeles Area	0	2	0	2
TOTAL	15	14	42	71

Objective No. 3 – Review of Sustained Complaints and Adverse Judicial Findings

Objective No. 3(a) – Documented Review of Sustained Complaints

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.77, Review of Selected Candidate's Work History and Evaluation of Findings, states, "Supervisors must document in writing on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, their consideration of any sustained complaint, adverse judicial finding, or discipline against an officer for each of the following:

- *Excessive force;*
- *False arrest or charge;*
- *Improper search/seizure;*
- *Sexual harassment;*
- *Discrimination; or,*
- *Dishonesty.*

Supervisors and managers may decide to select or retain (i.e., extension of assignment) an officer with a sustained complaint or adverse judicial finding in one or more of these categories. However, that decision must be justified in writing on a TEAMS II Evaluation Report and retained in the interview/selection package.”

Audit Procedures

All 97 Selection Packages were examined for this objective. The TEAMS II Reports of the New Officers, New Supervisors and Loans categories were reviewed for sustained complaints involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, and dishonesty.

The TEAMS II Reports of all 156 personnel in the Current Suitability category were reviewed for sustained complaints involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, and dishonesty, from March 25, 2013, to July 12, 2014.

If an officer/sergeant had a sustained complaint for any of the aforementioned complaint categories, the Department met the standards if there was appropriate documentation in the TER of the supervisor's consideration of the sustained complaint and justification for the selection or retention of the officer/sergeant into the GED.

Findings

The review found none (0%) of 97 new officers/supervisors or loans had sustained complaints involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty.

In the Current Suitability category, the review found none (0%) of the 156 officers/supervisors had a pending complaint involving excessive force, false arrest, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty.

As there were no New Officers, New Supervisors, Loans, or Current Suitability that had sustained complaints involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty during this time period, this objective was unable to be evaluated.

Objective No. 3(b) – Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.77, Review of Selected Candidate's Work History and Evaluation of Findings, states, "*Supervisors must document in writing on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, their consideration of any sustained complaint, adverse judicial finding, or discipline against an officer for each of the following:*

- *Excessive force;*
- *False arrest or charge;*
- *Improper search/seizure;*
- *Sexual harassment;*
- *Discrimination; or,*
- *Dishonesty.*

Supervisors and managers may decide to select or retain (i.e., extension of assignment) an officer with a sustained complaint or adverse judicial finding in one or more of these categories. However, that decision must be justified in writing on a TEAMS II Evaluation Report and retained in the interview/selection package."

Audit Procedures

All 97 Selection Packages were examined for this objective. The TEAMS II Reports of the New Officers, New Supervisors and Loan categories were reviewed for adverse judicial findings involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, and dishonesty.

The TEAMS II reports of all 156 personnel in the Current Suitability category were reviewed for their work history of adverse judicial findings involving excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, and dishonesty, from March 25, 2013, to July 12, 2014.

If an officer/sergeant had an adverse judicial finding for any of the aforementioned categories, the Department met the standards if there was appropriate documentation in the TER of the supervisor's consideration of the adverse judicial findings and justification for the selection or retention of the officer/sergeant in the GED. During the review of the 253 selection packages, one package was found to have an adverse judicial finding. Therefore, only one selection package was assessed for this objective.

Findings

The one (100%) Selection Package met the standard for this objective.

OTHER RELATED MATTER

TEAMS II Report (Assignment/Rank History Information)

During the course of the audit, it was determined that 25 out of 324 personnel assignments were not reflected on the employees' TEAMS II Report in the "Assignment/Rank History Information" section. According to Personnel Division, Position Control Section, TEAMS II is updated for *interdivision* position changes once the Transfer Order is published, while *intradivision* position changes are updated when Position Control Section receives a Transfer and/or Change in Paygrade, Form 01.40.00, from the concerned Division. Many entities within the Department rely on the accuracy of the TEAMS II system. The current assignments of the 25 employees on Table No. 7 were incorrect in TEAMS II (refer to Recommendation No. 3).

Table No. 7 - TEAMS II Report (Assignment/Rank History Information)

Area/Division	No. of Employees	Inter/Intradivision
Foothill Area	3	Intradivision
Harbor Area	3	Intradivision
Mission Area	4	Intradivision
Olympic Area	1	Intradivision
Southeast Area	11	Intradivision
Southwest Area	1	Intradivision
Topanga Area	1	Intradivision
West Valley Area	1	Intradivision
TOTAL	25	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that Policies and Procedures Division revisit Department Manual Section 3/763.76, Selection Process for Gang Enforcement Details, specifically the portion regarding the Suitability Interview and allow for the information to be documented on the Continuation Form of the GED Selection Checklist *Objective 2(b)*.¹⁴
2. It is recommended that Policies and Procedures Division update the Checklist of Selection Documentation section of the GED Selection Checklist/New Selection/Loans, to reflect the current Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Application Requirements for a GED position. Currently, the standard is for the two most recent Standards Based Assessments, and that the period covered is over one year. The standard on the GED Selection Checklist is for the two most recent Performance Evaluations covering a two year period.
3. It is recommended that Office of Operations and Personnel Division develop protocols to ensure that intradivisional position changes are properly processed and entered into

¹⁴Based on AD's audit, the following results detail how the Suitability Interview was documented in the Selection Packages: (4) TER only, (29) GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet and TER, (41) GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet only, (18) GED Selection Checklist Continuation Sheet with referral on TER, and (4) no documentation.

TEAMS II accordingly (refer to ADDITIONAL: TEAMS II Report-Assignment/Rank History Information).

4. It is recommended that Office of Operations provide training to geographic Area commanding officers and GED supervisors in regard to proper documentation of Suitability Interviews, and documentation of the commanding officer's evaluation of the GED officer's selection; both of which should incorporate insight on uniqueness of such documentation.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

Each of the findings were validated with the commanding officers at the respective Areas. Audit Division presented the audit report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations and the Chief of Detectives, whom were both in general agreement with the findings.