

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

March 16, 2017
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: STANDARDS BASED ASSESSMENT AND EMPLOYEE EVALUATION
REPORT AUDIT (Audit No. 16-011)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Standards Based Assessment and Employee Evaluation Report Audit.
2. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

Audit Division conducted the Standards Based Assessment and Employee Evaluation Audit to evaluate compliance with Department policies and procedures.

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

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

*STANDARDS BASED ASSESSMENT AND
EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT
AUDIT*

(AD No. 16-011)



Conducted by
AUDIT DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

January 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STANDARDS BASED ASSESSMENT AND EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT AUDIT	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PURPOSE	1
BACKGROUND	1
PRIOR AUDITS	2
PRIOR RECOMMENDATIONS	2
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	2
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	3
DETAILED FINDINGS	3
Objective No. 1 – Existence of Current SBA/EER	3
Objective No. 1(a) – Current SBA in the Division Employee Folder	4
Objective No. 1(b) – Current EER in the Division Employee Folder	4
Objective No. 2 – Timeliness of Personnel Evaluations	5
Objective No. 2(a) – SBA Prepared within the Correct Rating Period	5
Objective No. 2(b) – SBA Served to the Officer within 90 Calendar Days After the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PERAI) was Issued	6
Objective No. 2(c) – EER Rating Period Coincides with the Employee’s Salary Anniversary Date	6
Objective No. 2(d) - EER Signed by the Reviewer within 60 Days of the End of the Rating Period – Performance Assessment Only	7
Objective No. 3 – Quality of SBAs	8
Objective No. 3(a) – SBA Completed Adequately	8
Objective No. 3(b) – SBA Signed and Dated by the Employee	8
Objective No. 4 – Quality of EER	9
Objective No. 4(a) - EER Completed Adequately	9
Objective No. 4(b) – EER Signed and Dated by the Employee	9
OTHER RELATED MATTERS– Calculating Rating Periods for Civilian Employees	10
RECOMMENDATIONS	10
ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE	10

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
STANDARDS BASED ASSESSMENT
AND EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT AUDIT
Conducted by
Audit Division
Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2015/16**

PURPOSE

Pursuant to the Los Angeles Police Department's (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2015/16, Audit Division (AD) has completed a Department-wide Standards Based Assessment (SBA) and Employee Evaluation Report (EER) Audit to assess whether SBAs and EERs were completed in accordance with applicable Department policies and procedures.

PRIOR AUDITS

The methodology utilized in prior audits was similar to this audit, which focused on completeness, timeliness and quality of SBAs and EERs. However, the prior audit included an objective to test SBAs with closed sustained complaints during the rating period.¹ Following numerous conversations with command staff, AD determined it was not practicable to assess an employee with a closed sustained complaint, as the allegations generally resulted from behavior which occurred in a previous rating period. Audit Division made a recommendation to the Department to consider removing this check box from the SBA.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This audit included four objectives and focused on whether an SBA or EER existed; was prepared within the correct rating period; was completed properly; and, was reviewed in a timely manner to ensure a quality assessment was performed.

Based on test work performed, it was evident that overall employee evaluations were available for review and prepared adequately. The SBAs were generally prepared in the correct rating period; however, the EERs were not and improvement is needed. Improvement is also needed as it relates to the completed EER being reviewed by management in a timely manner. See table on the following page for objective results.

¹The SBA requires the rater to assess an employee for complaints received that were sustained with admonishment or higher penalty during the rating period.

Table No. 1 – Summary of Findings

Objective No.	Description	FY 2013/14 Results	FY 2015/16 Results
1	Existence of Current SBA/EER		
1(a)	Current SBA in the Division Employee Folder	54/58 (93%)	51/57 (89%)
1(b)	Current EER in the Division Employee Folder	38/49 (78%)	42/45 (93%)
2	Timeliness of Personnel Evaluations		
2(a)	SBA Prepared within the Correct Rating Period	55/58 (95%)	57/57 (100%)
2(b)	SBA Served to the Officer within 90 Calendar Days After the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item was Issued	45/58 (78%)	47/57 (82%)
2(c)	EER Rating Period Coincides with the Employee's Salary Anniversary Date	25/49 (51%)	27/45 (60%)
2(d)	EER Signed by the Reviewer within 60 Days of the End of the Rating Period – Performance Assessment Only	31/49 (63%)	31/45 (69%)
3	Quality of SBA		
3(a)	SBA Completed Adequately ²	57/58 (98%)	57/57 (100%)
3(b)	SBA Signed and Dated by the Officer	56/58 (97%)	55/57 (96%)
4	Quality of EER		
4(a)	EER Completed Adequately	49/49 (100%)	45/45 (100%)
4(b)	EER Signed and Dated by the Employee	49/49 (100%)	45/45 (100%)

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that Application Development and Support Division consider developing a program to automatically generate a Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PERAI) that provides for a monthly alert to supervisors, indicating an EER is due for a civilian employee. The proposed PERAI for EERs would mirror the PERAI for SBAs that is currently in place.
2. It is recommended that Policies Procedures Division incorporate the guidelines for calculating the rating period for civilian employees currently documented on a Desk Note published by the Personnel Records Section, onto the Department's LAN as an Order or in the Department Manual.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

1. The findings were validated with the Commanding Officer from each Area/division.
2. The audit report was provided to the Director, Office of Operations, Commanding Officer, Administrative Services Bureau, who expressed general agreement with the audit findings.

²Prior audit utilized three sub-objectives to test this attribute. The prior audit's compliance rates reflect an average of the three sub-objectives.

**STANDARDS BASED ASSESSMENT
AND EMPLOYEE EVALUATION REPORT AUDIT**
Audit Division
Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2015/16

PURPOSE

Pursuant to the Los Angeles Police Department's (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2015/16, Audit Division (AD) has completed a Department-wide Standards Based Assessment (SBA) and Employee Evaluation Report (EER) Audit to assess whether SBAs and EERs were completed in accordance with applicable Department policies and procedures.

Audit Division conducted this audit under the guidance of Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards.¹ These standards require that the audit is adequately planned, performed and supervised. It also requires that sufficient and appropriate evidence is obtained by performing audit procedures that provide a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions.

BACKGROUND

An evaluation process is important in providing a valuable opportunity for supervisors to focus on an employee's work activities and goals, to identify strengths, correct problems, and to encourage better performance, thus enhancing the performance of the whole Department. As such, the Department recognizes that a fair and unbiased assessment process of timely and accurately evaluating employees is important to offer feedback on performance, track training taken, recommend additional training, encourage optimal performance and to identify and promote the most qualified personnel to positions of increased responsibility.

Standard Based Assessment-Lieutenant and Below, Form 01.87.00, is the report used to evaluate the performance of *sworn* employees at the rank of lieutenant and below. The SBA requires the rater to provide a description of the duties of their current assignment. The SBA also requires the rater to evaluate six performance measures including: Skills Required to Perform Current Assignment, Initiative and Productivity, Communication, Personal Interactions, Integrity, and Acceptance of Responsibility.

Employee Evaluation Report, Form PDAS-28E (EER-E), is the report used to evaluate non-supervisory *civilian* employees. The EER-E includes details of the employee's assignment and comments regarding the employee's performance during the rating period, as well as suggestions for the employee's development. It rates the employee on eight factors: Quantity of Work, Quality of Work, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Work Habits, Personal Relations, Adaptability, and Other (anything the supervisor deems pertinent to address). The Employee Evaluation Report, Form PDAS-28S (EER-S), is the report used to evaluate supervisory civilian employees. The EER-S includes information contained within the EER-E and utilizes the same eight factors to rate the employee. However, it also includes an additional nine factors to evaluate the employee's supervisory abilities including: Planning and Assigning Work, Training, Ability to Get the Work Out, Evaluating Performance, Leadership, Making Decisions, Approachability, Fairness and Impartiality, and Disciplinary Control.

¹U.S. Government Accountability Office, Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, December 2011 Revision.

PRIOR AUDITS

The methodology utilized in prior audits was similar to this audit, which focused on completeness, timeliness and quality of SBAs and EERs. However, the prior audit included an objective to test SBAs with closed sustained complaints during the rating period.² Following numerous conversations with command staff, AD determined it was not practicable to assess an employee with a closed sustained complaint, as the allegations generally resulted from behavior which occurred in a previous rating period. Audit Division made a recommendation to the Department to consider removing this check box from the SBA.

PRIOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendation was made in the prior audit:

It is recommended the Department consider the practicality and removal of the box on the SBA, Section F, which requires indication of an adjudicated complaint during the rating period, and incorporate a check box onto the Standards Based Assessment Project Completion Checklist, Form 01.87.01, that indicates, "Disciplinary History Reviewed."

Status on Recommendation: In Progress. Policies and Procedures Division (PPD) has initiated a project which includes removal of the check box on the SBA, Section F, requiring the rater to indicate whether the employee received an adjudicated complaint during the rating period, and addition of a check box on the SBA Project Completion Checklist, Form 01.87.01, indicating, "Disciplinary History Reviewed." Once PPD has made these changes, the forms will be forwarded to the appropriate command staff for their review and approval.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The audit focused on populations of sworn employees of the rank of lieutenant and below and all civilian employees employed in Deployment Period No. 10, 2015 (October 1, 2015, through November 30, 2015) with rank/anniversary dates in September 2015.³ Employee selection was limited to divisions with ten or more sworn and civilian employees and excluded Probationary and Reserve Police Officers. Based on AD's selection criteria, the sworn population was 786 and the civilian population was 166.

Audit Division randomly selected 57 of 786 sworn employees and 45 of 166 civilian employees.⁴ Audit Division examined Division Employee Folders (Form 01.01.00), and (Training Evaluation and Management System) TEAMS II reports to determine if the objectives included in Table No. 1 were met.

²The SBA requires the rater to assess an employee for complaints received that were sustained with admonishment or higher penalty during the rating period.

³The rank anniversary date is the date used to indicate that an annual employee evaluation should be completed. Deployment Period No. 10, 2015 had 9,277 sworn (lieutenant and below) and 2,792 civilians.

⁴Sampling method was based on a one tail-test calculation with a 95 percent confidence level, and six percent error rate.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This audit included ten objectives/sub-objectives and focused on whether an SBA or EER existed, was prepared within the correct rating period, was completed properly, and was reviewed in a timely manner to ensure a quality assessment was performed.

Based on test work performed, it was evident that overall employee evaluations were available for review and prepared adequately. The SBAs were generally prepared in the correct rating period; however, the EERs were not and improvement is needed. Improvement is also needed as it relates to the completed EER being reviewed by management in a timely manner. See Table No. 1 for a summary of the findings.

Table No. 1 – Summary of Findings

Objective No.	Description	FY 2013/14 Results	FY 2015/16 Results
1	Existence of Current SBA/EER		
1(a)	Current SBA in the Division Employee Folder	54/58 (93%)	51/57 (89%)
1(b)	Current EER in the Division Employee Folder	38/49 (78%)	42/45 (93%)
2	Timeliness of Personnel Evaluations		
2(a)	SBA Prepared within the Correct Rating Period	55/58 (95%)	57/57 (100%)
2(b)	SBA Served to the Officer within 90 Calendar Days After the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item was Issued	45/58 (78%)	47/57 (82%)
2(c)	EER Rating Period Coincides with the Employee’s Salary Anniversary Date	25/49 (51%)	27/45 (60%)
2(d)	EER Signed by the Reviewer within 60 Days of the End of the Rating Period – Performance Assessment Only	31/49 (63%)	31/45 (69%)
3	Quality of SBA		
3(a)	SBA Completed Adequately ⁵	57/58 (98%)	57/57 (100%)
3(b)	SBA Signed and Dated by the Officer	56/58 (97%)	55/57 (96%)
4	Quality of EER		
4(a)	EER Completed Adequately	49/49 (100%)	45/45 (100%)
4(b)	EER Signed and Dated by the Employee	49/49 (100%)	45/45 (100%)

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 – Existence of Current SBA/EER

This objective focused on whether the current SBA or EER was present in the selected Division Employee Folders.

⁵Prior audit utilized three sub-objectives to test this attribute. The prior audit’s compliance rates reflect an average of the three sub-objectives.

Objective No. 1(a) – Current SBA in the Division Employee Folder

Criteria

Department Manual section 3/760.20, Standards Based Assessment – Lieutenant and Below, states, *“The reports shall be completed on an annual basis.”*

Department Manual Section 3/760.90, Department Personnel Records, states, *“Commanding officers shall establish and maintain a Division Employee Folder, Form 01.01.00, for each employee under their command.”*

Audit Procedure

The Division Employee Folders were examined to determine if a current SBA was present. If not, AD deselected them and randomly selected replacements so the remaining objectives could be tested.

The Department met the standard if there was a current SBA in the Division Employee Folder.

Findings

Fifty-one (89%) of the 57 SBAs met the standard for this objective. The SBAs for six officers which were not present in the Division Employee Folders were from the following divisions:

- (1) Central Area
- (1) Foothill Area
- (1) Hollywood Area
- (1) Internal Affairs Group - Administrative Investigation Division
- (1) Topanga Area
- (1) Training Area

Objective No. 1(b) – Current EER in the Division Employee Folder

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/760.70; Service Rating Reports – Civilian Employees, states, *“Service ratings shall be made annually on all civilian employees on an Employee Evaluation Report, Form PDAS 28.”*

Department Manual Section 3/760.90, Department Personnel Records, states, *“Commanding officers shall establish and maintain a Division Employee folder, Form 01.01.00, for each employee under their command.”*

Audit Procedure

The Division Employee Folders were reviewed to determine if a current EER was present. If not, AD deselected them and randomly selected replacements so the remaining objectives could be tested.

The Department met the standard if there was a current EER in the Division Employee Folder.

Findings

Forty-two (93%) of the 45 EERs met the standard for this objective. The three EERs which were not present in the Division Employee Folders were from the following divisions:

- (1) Communications Division
- (2) Records and Identification Division

Objective No. 2 – Timeliness of Personnel Evaluations

This objective focused on whether the SBAs and EERs were prepared in a timely manner, presented to the employee, and reviewed by management.

Objective No. 2(a) – SBA Prepared within the Correct Rating Period

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/760.20, Standard Based Assessment-Lieutenant and Below, states, *“All sworn employees at the rank of lieutenant and below will be rated during the month that they were appointed to their current rank, regardless of their pay grade. For example, the month of a police officer’s date of hire remains his/her rating month until he/she is promoted to detective or sergeant, then the month of promotion becomes the new rating month for the employee.”*

Audit Procedures

The officers’ TEAMS II reports were reviewed to determine the date they were appointed to their current rank. This was compared to the date of their SBA rating period.

The Department met the standard if the date the officer was appointed to their current rank was the same as the beginning date of their SBA rating period.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 57 SBAs met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 2(b) – SBA Served to the Officer within 90 Calendar Days After the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PERAI) was Issued

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/760.20, Standard Based Assessment-Lieutenant and Below, states, “Supervisors who receive a PERAI shall:”

“Serve the employee with the final paper copy of the SBA, and complete the PERAI no later than 90-calendar days after the date it was issued.”⁶

Audit Procedures

The TEAMS II reports were reviewed to determine the date the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PERAI) was issued for their annual performance review. The date the PERAI was issued was compared to the date the officer signed the SBA.

The Department met the standard if the officer signed the SBA within 90 days of the PERAI issue date.

Findings

Forty-seven (82%) of the 57 SBAs met the standard for this objective. The ten SBAs that were signed more than 90 days after the PERAI was issued are summarized in Table No. 2.

Table No. 2 – SBAs Not Served Timely

Divisions	Number of SBAs	Number Days Overdue
Northeast Area, Force Investigation, Metropolitan, and Training Division	4	1 - 30
Detective Support and Vice Division, Hollenbeck, and Newton Areas	3	31 – 60
Topanga Area	1	61 – 90
West Los Angeles, and North Hollywood Areas	2	> 90

Objective No. 2(c) – EER Rating Period Coincides with the Employee’s Salary Anniversary Date

Criteria

Personnel Records Section Desk Note, dated August 8, 2011, states, “Evaluation due dates are calculated one year from probationary ending date (Salary/Anniversary date).” “The rating period will change as the employee promotes and has a new probationary ending date.”

⁶The SBA is served to employee only after it has been reviewed and signed by the commanding officer.

Audit Procedure

The TEAMS II reports were reviewed to determine the employee's hire date. The salary anniversary date was calculated one year from the probation period end date which is six months after the date of hire and every year thereafter. If the employee promoted, the probation end date was based on the date the employee was promoted, i.e., six months after the employee promoted. The salary anniversary date for Police Service Representatives (PSRs) is calculated differently. The probation period begins after one year of training, i.e., one year after their date of hire.

The Department met the standard if the salary anniversary date was the same as the beginning of their EER rating period.

Findings

Twenty-seven (60%) of the 45 EERs met the standard for this objective. The beginning dates of the rating periods for the 18 EERs did not coincide with the salary anniversary date. Table No. 3 summarizes the results.

Table No. 3 – EER Rating Period Incorrect

Divisions	Number of EERs
Communications Division	11
Forensic Services Division	2
Custody Services Division	1
Office of Chief of Staff	1
Legal Affairs Division	1
Devonshire Area	1
Training Division	1

Objective No. 2(d) - EER Signed by the Reviewer within 60 Days of the End of the Rating Period – Performance Assessment Only

Criteria

Although not a policy requirement, AD established a 60-day timeline for management's review of EERs to ensure command staff is apprised of employees' performance on a timely basis. A similar policy standard exists for SBAs and was used as the basis for this objective.

Audit Procedure

The EERs were reviewed to determine if they were signed by the Reviewer within 60 days from the end of the rating period.

Conclusion

Thirty-one (69%) of the 45 EERs were signed by the Reviewer within the 60-day time frame. The 14 EERs that were not signed by the Reviewer within the 60-day time frame are summarized in Table No. 4.

Table No. 4 – EERs Not Signed as Reviewed Timely

Divisions	Number of EERs	Number Days Overdue
Communications (2), Records and Identification Divisions	3	1 - 30
Communications Division	5	31 – 60
Communications, Custody Services, Legal Affairs Divisions	3	61 – 90
Records Identification, Forensic Services, Custody Services Divisions	3	> 90

Objective No. 3 – Quality of SBAs

This objective focused on whether all sections of the SBA were completed adequately and it was signed and dated by the officer.

Objective No. 3(a) – SBA Completed Adequately

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/760.20, Standards Based Assessment–Lieutenant and Below, states, “*The reports shall be completed on an annual basis.*”

Audit Procedure

The SBAs were reviewed to determine whether the rater included a description of the duties of the current assignment. The SBAs were also reviewed to determine whether the rater evaluated all six performance measures: Skills Required to Perform Current Assignment, Initiative and Productivity, Communication, Personal Interactions, Integrity, and Acceptance of Responsibility. Furthermore, the SBAs were reviewed to evaluate whether the rater assessed the training completed by the officer during the evaluation period.

The Department met the standard if all sections of the SBA were completed properly.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 57 SBAs met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 3(b) – SBA Signed and Dated by the Employee

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/760.20, Standards Based Assessment–Lieutenant and Below, states, “*Supervisors who receive a PERAI shall: Serve the employee with the final paper copy of the SBA, and complete the PERAI no later than 90 calendar days after the date it was issued.*”

Audit Procedure

The SBAs were reviewed to determine if the officer signed and dated the evaluation.

The Department met the standard if the officer's signature and date were on the SBA.

Findings

Fifty-five (96%) of the 57 SBAs met the standard for this objective. Two (Hollenbeck and Topanga Areas) SBAs were signed by the officer, but not dated.

Objective No. 4 – Quality of EER

This objective focused on whether all sections of the EER were completed adequately and it was signed and dated by the employee.

Objective No. 4(a) - EER Completed Adequately

Criteria

Guidelines for Appraising Employee Performance, Employee Development Section, Personnel Department, revised September 2009, states, "*Each section of the Employee Evaluation Report (PDAS-28E and PDAS-28S) that applies to the employee being rated should be completed by the supervisor.*"

Audit Procedure

The EERs were reviewed to determine whether the rater adequately described the employee's current assignment, provided comments regarding the employee's performance during the rating period, and made suggestions for the employee's development. Audit Division also reviewed the EERs to determine if each performance factor was evaluated by checking if the rating boxes were marked.

The Department met the standard if all sections of the EER were completed adequately.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 45 EERs met the standard for this objective.

Objective No. 4(b) – EER Signed and Dated by the Employee

Criteria

The Guidelines for Appraising Employee Performance, Employee Development Section, Personnel Department, revised September 2009, states, "*At the conclusion of the meeting, the employee should sign the Evaluation Form.*"

Audit Procedure

The EERs were reviewed to determine if the employee signed and dated the evaluation.

The Department met the standard if the employee signed and dated the EER.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 45 EERs met the standard for this objective.

Other Related Matters – Calculating Rating Periods for Civilian Employees

The guidelines for calculating the rating period for civilian employees are documented on a Desk Note that was issued on August 8, 2011 by the Personnel Records Section. These guidelines are not available on the Department's local area network (LAN). As Department supervisors are responsible for completing civilian ratings in accordance with these guidelines, they should be published in a more readily available and official format such as a Department Order or in the Department Manual.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that Application Development and Support Division consider developing a program to automatically generate a Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PERAI) that provides for a monthly alert to supervisors, indicating an EER is due for a civilian employee. The proposed PERAI for EERs would mirror the PERAI for SBAs that is currently in place.
2. It is recommended that Policies and Procedures Division incorporate the guidelines for calculating the rating period for civilian employees currently documented on a Desk Note published by the Personnel Records Section, onto the Department's LAN as an Order or in the Department Manual.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

1. The findings were validated with the CO from each Area/division.
2. The audit report was provided to the Director, Office of Operations, Commanding Officer, Administrative Services Bureau, who expressed general agreement with the audit findings.