

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

May 18, 2022
14.2

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: DETECTIVE BUREAU AUDIT (AD NO. 21-008)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Detective Bureau Audit.

DISCUSSION

Audit Division (AD) conducted the Detective Bureau Audit to evaluate the probationary detectives and the competitive selection process for detective bonus positions during the audit period of September 1, 2018, through September 30, 2021.

I have directed Detective Bureau to conduct an inspection of the non-compliant areas within the next six months.

If additional information regarding this audit is required, please contact Trina Unzicker, Audit Division, at (213) 486-8129.

Respectfully,



MICHELL R. MOORE
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

Detective Bureau Audit (AD No. 21-008)



Conducted by
AUDIT DIVISION

MICHEL MOORE
Chief of Police

April 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Detective Bureau Audit
AD No. 21.008

Page
No.

OVERVIEW	1
BACKGROUND	1
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	2
DETAILED FINDINGS	3
Objective No. 1 – Completeness of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist	3
Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Detective’s Bonus Positions Selection Process	4
Objective No. 2(a) – Completeness of Selection Package	4
Objective No. 2(b) – Commanding Officer’s Rationale for Justification of Selection	6
Objective No. 2 (c) – Review of Selected Candidate’s Disciplinary History	7
Objective No. 2 (d) – Completion of the Interview Worksheets	8
Objective No. 2 (e) – Completeness of Non-Selected Applicant Selection Packages	8
Objective No. 2 (f) – Diversity Among the Selected and Non-Selected Candidates (Information Only)	10
Objective No. 2 (g) – Diversity Among the Selection Board Members (Information Only)	11
Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Bonus Pay	11
OTHER RELATED MATTERS	12
RECOMMENDATIONS	12
ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	13
APPENDIX	
ADDENDUM	
➤ Robbery-Homicide Division Response to Detective Bureau Audit	
➤ Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Response to Detective Bureau Audit	
➤ Office of Operations Response to Detective Bureau Audit	
➤ Office of Operations Notice	

DETECTIVE BUREAU AUDIT
Conducted by Audit Division
2021

OVERVIEW

As part of the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) 2021 Annual Audit Plan, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Detective Bureau (DB) Audit. The audit included the evaluation of probationary detectives and the competitive selection process for detective bonus pay positions.¹ Auditors first evaluated the Department's conformance with policies and procedures relative to the six-month probationary detective evaluation process for all geographic Areas. At the end of the six-month evaluation period, Detective Commanding Officers evaluate the employee's ability to hold the rank of detective and record their determination on the Probationary Detective Performance Checklist (Checklist).

Auditors evaluated the competitive selection and record retention process for detective bonus pay positions located in the Detective Bureau's specialized units: Robbery Homicide Division (RHD) and Gang and Narcotics Division (GND). Since the total number of detectives yielded a small population, auditors expanded the scope of the audit outside Detective Bureau to include the Counter Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau (CTSOB) and Emergency Services Division (ESD).

The Department's compliance rates are as follows:

- The Probationary Detective Performance Checklist was completed 50 percent of the time [*Objective No. 1*];
- Selection packages were complete 33 percent of the time [*Objective No. 2(a)*];
- The Commanding Officer's rationale for justification of selection and the review of selected candidate's disciplinary history were present 100 percent of the time [*Objective Nos. 2(b-c)*];
- Interview worksheets were complete 91 percent of the time [*Objective No. 2(d)*];
- Non-selected applicant selection packages were complete 91 percent of the time [*Objective No. 2(e)*];
- Demographic information regarding diversity among the selected and non-selected candidates, as well as diversity among the selection board members, was evaluated for informational purposes [*Objective Nos. 2(f-g)*]; and,
- Detective bonus pay positions pay reconciled with the personnel assigned to those positions 100 percent of the time [*Objective No. 3*].

BACKGROUND

Geographic Areas and many specialized units employ detectives in a variety of investigative assignments. When a detective works a hazardous or specialized assignment that is considered to

¹ This audit was conducted in accordance with the U.S. Government Accounting Office, Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, July 2018 Revision.

be a bonus pay position, they shall be compensated with extra pay based on the assignment.² Detectives are selected to the bonus pay positions through a competitive selection process. Bonus pay positions are advertised on the Paygrade Advancement and Transfer Opportunities and the selection process follows the Department’s Employee Selection Guidelines. To compete for a specialized assignment, detectives must demonstrate they are proficient in their job classification and information from their probationary evaluation period may be reviewed.

The Department had 33 detectives assigned to bonus pay positions at the time of the audit. The positions are within RHD, GND, and ESD. Bonus pay positions division, rank classification, and position descriptions are summarized in Table No. 1:

Table No. 1 – Current Bonus Pay Positions by Classification and Position Description

Division	Classification	Bonus Code	Number of Detectives	Position Description
ESD	DET 1	415K	4	FIREARMS & EXPLOSIVES
GND	DET 1	415L	6	NARCOTICS DETECTIVE-ILLCIT LABS
GND	DET 2	425G	2	CANINE (K-9) HANDLER
RHD	DET 2	422J	14	SPECIAL INVESTIGATION SECTION (SIS)
ESD	DET 2	425K	2	FIREARMS & EXPLOSIVES
GND	DET 2	425L	1	NARCOTICS DETECTIVE-ILLCIT LABS
RHD	DET 3	432J	3	SIS DETECTIVE SUPERVISOR
ESD	DET 3	435K	0	FIREARMS & EXPLOSIVES
GND	DET 3	435L	1	NARCOTICS DETECTIVE-ILLCIT LABS
Total: 33				

While this is the first audit conducted by AD that focused primarily on detective bonus pay positions, AD conducted a Personnel Selection Criteria and Process Audit in 2014 and evaluated probationary detectives’ performance during Command Accountability Performance Audits from 2017 through 2020. The results of this Audit may be used to establish a baseline for any future audits.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

For Objective No.1, auditors reviewed Personnel Divisional Rosters and Transfer Orders and identified a population of 10 probationary detectives for the audit period of September 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021. Auditors then collected Checklists from the assigned Areas to test this Objective.

For Objective No. 2, Personnel Division provided AD with a list of detectives assigned to detective bonus pay positions. Because of the small number of detectives assigned to bonus pay positions during the audit period, auditors expanded the scope of the audit to reflect the

² See Memorandum of Understanding No. 24 for Joint Submission to the City Council Regarding Police Officers, Lieutenants and Below Representation Unit, August 14, 2019, Article 5.3, Appendix H, Longevity, Assignment, Special and Hazard Pay.

Department’s three-year divisional record retention policy. The expanded period was from September 1, 2018, through September 30, 2021, and resulted in a population of 13 detectives assigned to bonus pay positions. Of the 13 detective bonus pay positions identified, one position was not applicable for the competitive selection process, resulting in 12 selection packages for review.³

For Objective No. 3, auditors requested payroll information from Fiscal Group (FG) for the 33 detective bonus pay positions identified during the audit period of September 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021. Auditors also obtained a detective bonus position list from Personnel Division and used it to reconcile the Detective Deployment Roster to ensure detective bonus pay was in accordance with their assignment.

Table No. 2 summarizes the overall audit findings:

Table No. 2 – Audit Objectives

Objective No.	Audit Objectives	Number Meeting Standards/ Evaluated	Percent Meeting Standards
1	Completeness of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist	5/10	50%
2	Evaluation of Detective’s Bonus Pay Positions Selection Process		
2(a)	Completeness of Selection Package	4/12	33%
2(b)	Commanding Officer's Rationale for Justification of Selection	11/11	100%
2(c)	Review of Selected Candidate's Disciplinary History	11/11	100%
2(d)	Completion of the Interview Worksheets	10/11	91%
2(e)	Completeness of Non-Selected Applicant Selection Packages	67/74	91%
2(f)	Diversity Among the Selected and Non-Selected Candidates (Information Only)	Info only	
2(g)	Diversity Among the Selection Board Members (Information Only)	Info only	
3	Evaluation of Bonus Pay	13/13	100%

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 – Completeness of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist

Criteria

Department Manual, 1st Quarter 2021, Vol. 3, “Management Rules and Procedures,” Section 760.40, “Probationary Service Rating Reports,” states:

³ Employee Relations Group indicated that the employee was appointed to the position at GND (K-9Unit); therefore, a selection package did not exist.

Detectives. The Probationary Detective Performance Checklist, Form 01.87.05, shall be completed for probationary detectives. Detective supervisors shall evaluate performance on an ongoing basis and regularly document the progress on the Checklist. Each probationary detective must complete the training by being signed off as “Competent” in all of the Categories and tasks by the end of the six-month probationary period.

Note: If a probationary period is interrupted for another assignment (e.g., detectives and sergeants), the employee shall complete all Checklist items and his or her six-month period before the probation is deemed complete.

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed each of the 10 probationary detective selection packages for the performance Checklist. The Department met the standard for this Objective if the Checklist was completed and contained all signatures and dates.

Findings

Five of the 10 performance Checklists (50 percent) met the standard for this Objective. The five Checklists that did not meet the standard are detailed in Table No. 3 below. Auditors recommend that, by the end of the employee’s probationary period, they attend Basic Detective School or other similar training courses intended to help improve proficiency and effectiveness (see Recommendation No. 1).

Table No. 3 – Objective No. 1 Findings

Division/Area	Description of Finding
Devonshire	The Checklist was not located.
Foothill	Page 1 of the Checklist lacked completion dates and had an incorrect probation period. Page 15 of the Checklist lacked signatures.
Newton	The Checklist was not located.
North Hollywood	Page 1 of the Checklist had incorrect probation periods and evaluation dates. Page 15 of the Checklist lacked signatures.
Van Nuys	The Checklist was not located.

Objective No. 2 - Evaluation of Detective’s Bonus Pay Positions Selection Process

Objective No. 2(a) – Completeness of Selection Package

Criteria

Office of Administrative Services Notice, April 10, 2017, “Sworn Checklist - Paygrade Advancement and Lateral Transfer Opportunity Competitive Selection Process - Revised,” states:

The attached Sworn Selection Checklist will now accompany all selection packages provided to Department entities conducting competitive selection testing for paygrade advancements and lateral transfer opportunities.

Department Employee Selection Guidelines, January 9, 2013, Section VIII, "Making the Selection," Subsection D, "Post-Interview Documentation," states:

The Sworn/Civilian Selection Checklist will be provided by Employee Selection Section to the hiring entity at the request of the hiring entity for a selection package. The Sworn/Civilian Selection Checklist lists all of the items that must be retained by the hiring entity as documentation for the selection process.

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed each selection package in search of the following documents:

- Raters;
- Selection Matrix;
- Rationale;
- Paygrade Advancement/Lateral Advanced Paygrade Transfer (15.2 to Personnel Division Commanding Officer (CO));
- Transfer and/or Change in Paygrade, Form 1.40;
- Transfer Applicant Data Sheet, Form 15.88.00 (03/09 version only);
- TEAMS Report (Promotion/Paygrade Advancement TEAMS Report, only);
- TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER), Form 01.78.04 or Transfer Action Item (TAI), Form 01.78.20;
- Standards Based Assessment (SBA), Form 01.87.00;
- Task & Competency List;
- Screen-down Material (if applicable);
- Written or Performance Exercise (if applicable);
- Interview Topic Guide (if applicable); and,
- Interview Worksheet OR Package Review Worksheet.

The Department met the standard for this Objective if the selection packages contained all the required documents.

Findings

Twelve employee selection packages were identified for the bonus position selection process. Four of the 12 selection packages (33 percent) met the standard for this Objective. The eight that did not meet the standard are detailed in Table No. 4.

Table No. 4 – Objective No. 2(a) Findings

Area/Division	Number of Packages	Description
Robbery Homicide Division	7	Missing Selection Matrix, Task and Competency List, TEAMS report. ⁴
Emergency Services Division	1	No package; position was not advertised. ⁵

Auditors recommend that the Employee Selection Section update the Office of Administrative Services Notice dated April 10, 2017, that instructs the Test Coordinator regarding what information is required to complete the Sworn Selection Package Checklist and where the Checklist should be maintained. Auditors noted that, on occasion, the Sworn Selection Package Checklists were not included in the selection package or were located among other divisional records. When these materials are kept separate, they risk being misplaced or lost and may not be included in the selection package when it is forwarded for record retention (see Recommendation No. 2).

Objective No. 2(b) – Commanding Officer's Rationale for Justification of Selection

Criteria

Operations Notice No. 9, November 10, 2006, “Deficiencies Identified During Recent Sworn Paygrade Selection Processes,” states:

Written rationale shall contain ample insight and justification to support the final selection.

Department Employee Selection Guidelines, January 9, 2013, Section VIII, “Making the Selection,” Subsection B, “Selection,” states:

For all selections, the commanding officer or officer in charge must ensure that a written rationale for selecting the candidate(s) above all others is prepared. Detailed comments, as to the specific job-related factors setting this candidate apart, shall be included. Depending on individual Office, Bureau, or Group policy, this document is often in the form of a 15.2, Intradepartmental Correspondence, from the commanding officer to the bureau head or other manager responsible for final approval of the selection. In the absence of an Office, Bureau, or Group policy, the minimum requirement is that a memorandum "to file" be prepared and signed by the commanding officer. In any case, the document should be retained with the final selection package (see Section VIII. D).

⁴ The seven selection packages were missing one or more of the required documents.

⁵ Emergency Services Division addressed the finding in their response to AD.

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed each of the 11 selection packages and evaluated the Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00 (Form 15.02), to determine if the CO's rationale was included in the package and if it contained insight and justification to support the final selection.⁶

The Department met the standard for this Objective if the selection package contained a written rationale with insight and justification to support the final selection.

Findings

Each of the 11 selection packages (100 percent) met the standard for this Objective.

Objective No. 2(c) – Review of Selected Candidate's Disciplinary History

Criteria

Human Resources Bureau Notice, March 29, 2001, “Paygrade Advancement and Lateral Advanced Paygrade Transfer Procedures,” states:

The Intradepartmental Correspondence shall indicate that the commanding officer has reviewed and completed an analysis of the selected employee's TEAMS report, with particular emphasis on the employee's disciplinary history. This information is provided in the new TEAMS classification screen entitled, “Final Selection by C/O; Transfer...”

Commanding officers shall indicate that they have contacted Internal Affairs Group regarding pending personnel complaints that may not have been included on the TEAMS report and shall indicate that they have addressed all issues regarding personnel complaints. Commanding officers shall also explain the reason(s) why the employee was selected should there be issues, such as discipline, on the TEAMS report.

Audit Procedures

Auditors evaluated the Form 15.02 to determine whether a review and analysis of the employee's disciplinary history was completed. The Department met the standard for this Objective if the selection package contained a completed form by the CO.

Findings

Each of the 11 selection packages (100 percent) met the standard for this Objective.

⁶ As noted previously, one selection package was missing, resulting in only 11 selection packages to review.

Objective No. 2(d) – Completion of the Interview Worksheets

Criteria

Office of Administrative Services Notice, April 10, 2017, “Sworn Checklist - Paygrade Advancement and Lateral Transfer Opportunity Competitive Selection Process - Revised,” states:

The attached revised Sworn Selection Checklist (Checklist) will now accompany all selection packages provided to Department entities conducting competitive selection testing for paygrade advancements and lateral transfer opportunities.

The Sworn Selection Checklist helps ensure that all the following information is retained for each candidate:

- Worksheets with the candidate and rater name, serial number, signature, and rank;
- A tentative and final rating that are computed accurately;
- Checks in evaluation boxes to indicate rating in each category;
- The checks in the evaluation boxes, comments written, tentative ratings, and final ratings all correspond to each other, there are no inconsistencies;
- Comments in each category to justify the rating in that category; and,
- Comments in the "Additional Comments" section justify any change in rating if the tentative and final ratings are different.

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed each selection package to determine if the interview worksheets were completed with all the required elements listed above. The Department met the standard for this Objective if the Interview Worksheets were completed with each of the required elements.

Finding

Ten of the 11 Interview Worksheets (91 percent) met the standard for this Objective. One Interview Worksheet from Robbery Homicide Division that did not meet the standard left the tentative, final, and final average scores blank.

Objective No. 2(e) - Completeness of Non-Selected Applicant Selection Packages

Criteria

Office of Administrative Services Notice, April 10, 2017, “Sworn Checklist - Paygrade Advancement and Lateral Transfer Opportunity Competitive Selection Process – Revised,” states:

The attached revised Sworn Selection Checklist will now accompany all selection packages provided to Department entities conducting competitive selection testing for paygrade advancements and lateral transfer opportunities.

Department Employee Selection Guidelines, January 9, 2013, Section VIII, “Making the Selection,” Subsection D, “Post-Interview Documentation,” states:

The Sworn/Civilian Selection Checklist will be provided by Employee Selection Section to the hiring entity at the request of the hiring entity for a selection package. The Sworn/Civilian Selection Checklist lists all of the items that must be retained by the hiring entity as documentation for the selection process.

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed the Transfer and/or Change in Paygrade, Form 01.40.00, from the selection packages for the detective bonus pay positions. A total of 74 applicants were documented as non-selected for the bonus pay positions based on these forms.⁷

Auditors reviewed the packages of the 74 non-selected applicants for the same period of September 1, 2018, through September 30, 2021, to determine whether their corresponding divisions complied with the Administrative Services Notice and the Employee Selection Guidelines and included the following documents:

- Transfer and/or Change in Paygrade Form 1.40.00;
- Transfer Application Data Sheet Form 15.88.00 (03/09 version);
- TEAMS Report (Promotion/Paygrade Advancement TEAMS Report only);
- Standards Based Assessment (SBA), Form 01.87.00; and,
- Interview Worksheet OR Package Review Worksheet.

The Department met the standard for this Objective if each of the above items was included in the packages.

Findings

Sixty-seven of the 74 non-selected selection packages (91 percent) met the standard for this Objective. The seven that did not are listed in Table No. 5 below. For Objectives 2(a-e), auditors recommend that Employee Selection Section (ESS) review Employee Selection Guidelines and ensure they conform with information contained in the Office of Administrative Services Notice, April 10, 2017 (see Recommendation No. 3).

⁷ The original total of applicants was 88, however, 14 applicants withdrew their applications and, therefore, 74 applicants were applicable for review.

Table No. 5 - Objective No. 2(e) Findings

Area/Division	Documents Missing	Number of Findings
Robbery Homicide Division	Transfer Application Data Sheet	1
	Interview Worksheet or Package Review Worksheet	6

Objective No. 2(f) - Diversity Among the Selected and Non-Selected Candidates (Information Only)

Criteria

Auditors found no applicable criteria in Employee Selection Guidelines or Administrative Orders to apply, however, AD used methodology from the 2010 Hunter-La Ley Decree Inspection and the 2014 Personnel Selection Criteria and Process Audit to assess diversity among both selected and non-selected candidates during the audit period of September 1, 2018, through September 30, 2021. Although the Hunter-La Ley Decree expired in March 2010, the Department pledged to continue the core mandate of the Decree to help ensure that the employee selection process is fair, open, based on merit, and does not discriminate⁸.

Los Angeles Police Department Hunter-La Ley Transition Plan — Auditing, states,

"5) The Department shall continue to audit paygrade advancements and coveted assignments for the ranks of Police Officer III and above and provide statistics by sex, race, and ethnicity"

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed the demographic information for the detective bonus pay positions from the 13 selected and 74 non-selected candidate position packages.⁹ Auditors also reviewed the Selection Matrix and Transfer and/or Change in Paygrade, Form 01.40.00, for diversity patterns. The Department's Deployment Rosters were used to verify the information regarding gender and ethnicity of each of the selected and non-selected candidates. The results are shown in Table Nos. 6 and 7:

Table No. 6 – Selected Candidate Gender and Ethnicity

Gender		Ethnicity			
Male	Female	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian
13/13	0	3/13	1/13	3/13	6/13
100%	0%	23%	8%	23%	46%

⁸ See Los Angeles Police Department Hunter-La Ley Transition Plan, page 16.

⁹ The total number of detectives for Objective No. 2(f) is 13 because 11 were selected through a selection process and two were not. The details appear in Footnotes 2 and 5.

Table No. 7 – Non-Selected Candidate Gender and Ethnicity

Gender		Ethnicity			
Male	Female	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian
74/74	0	14/74	9/74	27/74	24/74
100%	0%	19%	12%	37%	32%

Objective No. 2(g) – Diversity Among the Selection Board Members (Informational Only)

Criteria

Department Employee Selection Guidelines, January 9, 2013, Section VII, “Conducting the Interviews,” Subsection A, “Interview/Package Review Panel Member Selection,” states:

There should be a minimum of two (2) panel members for all formal interview or package review selection processes. Every effort should be made to create a panel representative of the ethnic and gender diversity of the Department.

Audit Procedures

Auditors reviewed the Interview Worksheets from the 11 selection packages to identify the diversity of the selection board members from Objective No. 2. The Department's Deployment Rosters were used to verify demographic information of the selection board members.

Table No. 8 – Interview Board Member Gender and Ethnicity

Interview Boards	Board Member Gender		Board Member Ethnicity			
	Male	Female	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Caucasian
4 Panel interview board	3	1	1			3
3 Panel interview board	2	1				3
3 Panel interview board	2	1				3
3 Panel interview board	2	1				3
2 Panel interview board	1	1				2
Totals	10	5	1	0	0	14

Objective No. 3 – Evaluation of Bonus Pay

Criteria

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) No. 24 for Joint Submission to the City Council Regarding Police Officers, Lieutenant and Below Representation Unit, August 14, 2019, Appendix H, “Longevity, Assignment, Special and Hazard Pay,” states:

Employees shall receive an additional increment of salary while so assigned in the amount set forth below. Such additional increment of salary shall be special pay or hazard pay over and above the compensation attached to the class and pay grade and shall be paid only while an employee is so assigned...

Audit Procedures

Auditors selected all 33 detectives working in a bonus position as reported by payroll information from FG and Personnel Division. Auditors then reconciled the payroll information with Deployment Rosters to ensure that the bonus pay was aligned with the current assignment. The Department met the standard if detective bonus pay positions pay reconciled with personnel assigned to those positions.

Findings

Each of the 33 bonus pay positions (100 percent) met the standard for this Objective.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

Auditors reviewed the TEAMS reports for all 10 probationary detectives (Objective No. 1) with a focus on the employee's specialized detective training history. Auditors determined that 8 of the 10 (80 percent) detectives attended Basic Detective School either prior to becoming a detective or after being assigned. While there is no mandate for employees to complete Basic Detective School, the instruction familiarizes them with investigative tools and provides resources that support patrol operations.

Auditors noted that 19 of the 74 applicant files contained an outdated version of their SBA, Form 01.87.00; (9/11), instead of the current SBA, Form 01.87.00; (5/18). The current SBA form includes a Risk Management-General Section (G) that includes boxes to evaluate an employee's risk management practices [Objective No. 2 (e)].

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Office of Operations should create an instructional plan for Detective Supervisors on how to complete the Probationary Detective Performance Checklist, Form 01.87.05, evaluate performance on an ongoing basis, regularly document the progress on the Checklist, and sign off as required [Objective No.1].
2. The Employee Selection Section should update the Office of Administrative Services Notice dated April 10, 2017, that instructs the Test Coordinator regarding what information is required to complete the Sworn Selection Package Checklist to also include where the checklist should be maintained [Objective 2 (a)].

3. The Employee Selection Section should review Employee Selection Guidelines and ensure they conform with information contained in the Office of Administrative Services Notice, April 10, 2017 [Objective Nos. 2 (a-e)].

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

The Office of Operations Inspection Unit (OOIU) stated that they are in general agreement with the findings for Objective 1. Their Form 15.02 is attached to this report. The OOIU provided the following response:

- Special Order No. 19 Probationary Service Ratings Reports-Revised; and, Probationary Detective Performance Checklist-Activated, dated October 8, 2015, will be dispersed to the Area detectives to ensure that the policy and its revisions are addressed.
- The OOIU will collaborate with Area detective officers-in-charge regarding the review of ratings for probationary detectives prior to submission to their respective bureaus.
- The OOIU will provide the 2021 Detective Bureau Audit results to the Bureau Inspection Teams who will then discuss the results with their respective chains of command to help improve completion of the Probationary Detective Performance Checklists.

The Counter Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau is in general agreement with the audit report findings, Objective No. 2(a). Their response, Form 15.02, is attached to this report.

The Detective Bureau is in general agreement with the audit report findings, Objective Nos. 2(a), 2(d), and 2(e). Their response, Form 15.02, is attached to this report.

The Robbery Homicide Division created a Candidate Selection Package Checklist that addresses missing/incomplete documents and requires a final review and signature of the officer-in-charge of the interview board. The Commanding Officer will have final review of the selection process documents to help ensure compliance. The results of the audit were shared with the personnel coordinator for additional assurance.

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

January 11, 2022
1.15

TO: Commanding Officer, Audit Division

FROM: Commanding Officer, Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO DETECTIVE BUREAU/BONUS POSITION SELECTION
AUDIT

On January 6, 2022, Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau (CTSOB) received correspondence from Audit Division regarding the results of an audit of compliance with the selection process and bonus pay for detective positions. CTSOB has reviewed the results and, as directed, is responding with compelling and reasonable explanations for the noted deficiency.

The audit included a review of selection processes for Detective positions within Emergency Services Division. Specifically, it was noted the selection of a detective, to a position within the Bomb Squad appeared not to conform to the approved selection process. Specifically, it was completed without a position advertisement or the completion of properly documented selection package.

Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau conducted a review of this instance and determined the detective was assigned to the Bomb Squad in March 2018 (appeared on Transfer Order, DP 4-2018). This assignment and transfer occurred at the specific direction of then Chief of Police, Charlie Beck, who ordered the traditional selection process be bypassed. At the time of occurrence, neither CTSOB nor ESD were granted the opportunity to provide input or influence in this determination.

If you have questions regarding this matter, please contact Commander Shannon K. Paulson, Assistant Commanding Officer, Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau, at (213) 486-8780.



DAVID J. KOWALSKI, Deputy Chief
Commanding Officer
Counter-Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau

INTRADPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

January 6, 2022
11.2

TO: Commanding Officer, Audit Division

FROM: Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations

SUBJECT: 2021 DETECTIVE BUREAU AUDIT RESPONSE

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for Fiscal Year 2021, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Detective Bureau Audit to evaluate conformance with the Department's policies and procedures relative to the probationary detective summary of performance, selection process for detective bonus positions, and the record retention process for detective bonus positions.

After review of the audit draft report, it was determined that the Office of Operations Inspections Unit was able to validate and address the findings in Objective 1(a) related to the Office of Operations' geographic Areas. The other findings will be reviewed and validated by Detective Bureau.

Auditors identified and selected the entire population of 10 probationary detectives from March 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021. Within the audit report, Table No. 2 outlines the "Audit Objectives." Table No. 2 summarizes the findings for Objective 1(a) – Completeness of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist.

Table No. 2 – Audit Objectives (Excerpt from 2021 Detective Bureau Audit Report)

Objective No.	Description of Objectives	Number Meeting Standards / Evaluated	Percent Meeting Standards
1	Evaluation of Probationary Detective Performance		
1(a)	Completeness of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist	5/10	50%

Objective No. 1(a) – Completeness of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist:

Audit Division noted that Auditors reviewed the Probationary Detective Performance Checklist for each probationary detective to determine if the checklist was complete and if the detective supervisor evaluated performance by signing off as "competent" in all categories by the end of the six-month period. If the checklist was complete in its entirety and the detective supervisor signed off as "competent," the Department met the standard for Objective 1(a).

Five of the ten checklists (50%) met the standard for this objective. The following provides detailed information of the five checklists that did not meet the standard:

- Three were due to the auditors being unable to locate the Department Form 01.87.05 Probationary Detective Performance Checklist.

The Office of Operations Inspections Unit made attempts to locate the missing checklists by attempting to contact the named detectives, geographic Areas, and Personnel Division. The Office of Operations Inspections Unit was unable to locate any additional source documentation.

- One checklist did not meet the standard due to incorrect completion dates of less than six months and missing signatures.
- One was due to incorrect completion dates of less than six months, missing dates in other portions of the checklist, and missing signatures.

The table provides additional information regarding the deficiencies for Objective 1(a):

Division/Area	Description of Finding
Devonshire	Probationary Detective Performance Checklist (Form 01.87.05) was not located by auditors.
Foothill	Page 1 of the Checklist did not contain completion dates and the probation date was incorrect - less than 6 months. Page 15 of the Checklist did not contain signatures confirming successful demonstration by actual performance of the duties and responsibilities of a police detective.
Newton	Probationary Detective Performance Checklist (Form 01.87.05) was not located by auditors.
North Hollywood	Page 1 of the checklist had an incorrect probation date of 1 year vs. 6 months. Summary of Performance (A) date did not match the detail. (B - F) details did not include dates. Page 15 of the checklist did not contain signatures confirming successful demonstration by actual performance of the duties and responsibilities of a police detective.
Van Nuys	Probationary Detective Performance Checklist (Form 01.87.05) was not located by auditors.

The Office of Operations Inspections Unit is in general agreement with the findings and will address the deficiencies as follows:

- Special Order No. 19 *Probationary Service Rating Reports — Revised; And, Probationary Detective Performance Checklist — Activated*, dated October 8, 2015, will be recirculated to the Area detectives to ensure that the policy and its revision are readdressed.
- The Office of Operations will collaborate with Area detective officers-in-charge (OIC) regarding the review of ratings for probationary detectives prior to submission to their respective bureaus.

Office of Operations

Page 3

11.2

- The Office of Operations Inspections Unit will provide the 2021 Detective Bureau Audit results to the Bureau Inspection Teams, who will then discuss the results with their respective Chain of Command to help drive improvement regarding the proper completion of Probationary Detective Performance Checklist.

If you have any questions, please contact Police Performance Auditor IV Yadira Huerta, Office of Operations, at (213) 486-6960.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Scott Harrelson', written in a cursive style.

T. SCOTT HARRELSON, Commander
Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT



A note from...

JONATHAN L. TIPPET

Commanding Officer
Robbery-Homicide Division
100 W. 1st Street, 5th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012

(213) 486-6850
FAX (213) 486-6888

February 11, 2022

Ernest Eskridge, Commander
Assistant Commanding Officer
Detective Bureau

**SUBJECT: ADDITIONAL FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE TO DETECTIVE BUREAU AUDIT -
SELECTION PROCESS FOR DETECTIVE BONUS POSITIONS**

Commander,

Audit Division conducted the Detective Bureau (DB) Audit to evaluate conformance with the Department's policies and procedures relative to the selection process for detective bonus positions and the record retention process for detective bonus positions. The audit of the selection process for detective bonus positions covered the period between September 1, 2018 and September 3, 2021. The audit of the records retention process for detective bonus positions covered the period between September 1, 2016 and September 30, 2021. The target section within Robbery-Homicide Division (RHD) for this audit was Special Investigation Section (SIS). On January 18, 2022, RHD submitted a response via Detective Bureau (DB) to the audit.

On February 4, 2022, RHD received Audit Division's response to the 15.2 submitted by DB. See the attached 15.2 for RHD's final response to the Audit.

Should you have any questions, I am available at your convenience.

JT

Attachments