

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM DATA VERIFICATION AUDIT



Conducted by the

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

DJANGO SIBLEY
Acting Inspector General

September 29, 2011

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

COMPLAINT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM DATA VERIFICATION AUDIT

PURPOSE

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) has completed a Complaint Management System (CMS) Data Verification Audit. The primary purpose of the Audit was to evaluate the accuracy and reliability of data in CMS for closed complaints.

BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD or Department) processed approximately 4,200 complaints of personnel misconduct against its sworn and civilian employees during 2010. A complaint originates with a supervisor completing the face page of the Complaint Form which contains basic data regarding the involved parties, witnesses, and details of the alleged misconduct. The Complaint Form contains information that will later become part of the complaint investigation. Additionally, data is recorded that tracks the progress of an investigation and ultimately provides the details of the complaint's outcome.

Throughout an employee's career, the details of a personnel complaint may be reviewed by Department managers when making decisions such as transfers or promotions, and when evaluating an employee's overall performance. As such, the accuracy of data regarding personnel complaint information is crucial.

The data collected from a personnel complaint is stored in CMS, which is one of 14 data systems that make up the data base contained within the Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS II). The data found in CMS includes Complaint Form data, investigation data, adjudication findings, and case status. In turn, the data base is queried to create the CMS portion of each employee's TEAMS II report which includes such key data elements as the complaint number, report date, case status (pending or closed), allegations, dispositions, and disciplinary action.

Complaint data is currently entered into CMS at the intake, classification, and closure stages of the complaint process. The intake data contained on the Complaint Form may be entered by personnel at Area police stations, Internal Affairs Group (IAG), or the OIG. The Complaint Form is forwarded to the IAG Complaint Classifications Unit, which determines the appropriate investigating entity (IAG or Division) and may update critical information. At the conclusion of the investigative process, the IAG Support Section enters such data as the final allegation types and dispositions, penalty types, and imposed discipline.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The OIG compared key data elements contained within the hard copy of an employee's personnel complaint investigation against the complaint data contained in that employee's CMS and TEAMS II reports to determine the reporting system's accuracy and reliability. In its comparison, the OIG tested for erroneous data entries as well as data omissions.

Complaint Management System Data Verification Audit

Page 2 of 4

1.0

The OIG selected the test population from all complaint investigations that closed from August 1, 2010, through September 30, 2010, and had at least one allegation disposition of Sustained or Guilty.¹ The total number of complaints in the population was 44.² The OIG selected the entire population as the sample.

The 44 complaints selected for review involved 49 accused employees and resulted in 124 allegations with a disposition of Sustained (113) or Guilty (11). The CMS data entries and related employee TEAMS II records were compared against complaint investigations using the 15 data elements listed in the table below. Data elements Nos. 1 to 5 relate to the complaint in general, while Nos. 6 to 13 were associated with the accused employees, and Nos. 14 and 15 were associated with the allegations. Given the potential influence on assignment and promotion decisions, data element Nos. 12 to 15 (Penalty Type, Penalty Suspension Days, Allegation Type, and Allegation Disposition) were considered most critical.

No.	Associated with	Data Element
1	Entire Complaint	Complaint Number
2	"	Complainant Name
3	"	Source of Complaint
4	"	Date Complaint Reported
5	"	Investigating Entity
6	Accused Employee	Employee Name
7	"	Serial Number
8	"	Organization at Time of Incident ³
9	"	Current Organization ⁴
10	"	Employee Arrested
11	"	Arresting Agency
12	"	Penalty Type
13	"	Penalty Suspension Days
14	Allegations	Allegation Type
15	"	Allegation Disposition

The OIG conducted this Audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. These standards require that the Audit is adequately planned, performed, and supervised and that sufficient, appropriate evidence is obtained by applying review procedures which assess whether a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusion were contained herein.

¹ The OIG included all 33 allegation types listed in the Department's 2010 Annual Complaint Report except for the following three considered to be lower risk: Discourtesy, Failure to Qualify, and Failure to Appear.

² Sustained and Guilty dispositions were selected due to the potential adverse employee impact and higher risk to the Department if the key complaint data is erroneous or omitted.

³ The *Organization at Time of Incident* refers to the accused employee's division of assignment at the time of the alleged misconduct.

⁴ The *Current Organization* refers to the accused employee's division of assignment at the time the complaint was initiated.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Thirteen data elements had a compliance rate of 100%. These included the highest-risk elements: Penalty Type, Penalty Suspension Days, Allegation Type, and Allegation Disposition. Two data elements had a compliance rate of 78%: Employee Arrested and Arresting Agency. The following tables detail the results.

Table 1 – Closed Complaints

No.	Data Element Name	A No. of Applicable Complaints	B Complaints with Entry Errors	C Complaints with Entry Omissions	(A-B-C)/A Compliance Rate
1	Complaint Number	44	0	0	100%
2	Complainant Name	26 ⁵	0	0	100%
3	Source of Complaint	44	0	0	100%
4	Date Complaint Reported	44	0	0	100%
5	Investigating Entity	44	0	0	100%

Table 2 – Accused Employees

No.	Data Element Name	A No. of Applicable Accused Employees	B Accused Employees with Entry Errors	C Accused Employees with Entry Omissions	(A-B-C)/A Compliance Rate
6	Employee Name	49	0	0	100%
7	Serial Number	49	0	0	100%
8	Organization at Time of Incident	49	0	0	100%
9	Current Organization	49	0	0	100%
10	Employee Arrested	9 ⁶	0	2	78%
11	Arresting Agency	9 ⁴	0	2	78%
12	Penalty Type	49 ⁷	0	0	100%
13	Penalty Suspension Days	11 ⁸	0	0	100%

Table 3 – Allegations with a Sustained or Guilty Disposition

No.	Data Element Name	A No. of Applicable Allegations	B Allegations with Entry Errors	C Allegations with Entry Omissions	(A-B-C)/A Compliance Rate
14	Allegation Type	124	0	0	100%
15	Allegation Disposition	124	0	0	100%

⁵ Not applicable when the Department is the complainant.

⁶ Applicable when the accused employee is arrested.

⁷ Eight of the accused employees were terminated from the Department as a result of misconduct. Of the eight employees, four were sworn officers and four were civilians.

⁸ Applicable when the accused employee is suspended.

DETAILED FINDINGS

Employee Arrested/Arresting Agency

Background

The Complaint Form requires the recording of information such as the date, time, and location of the incident, intake supervisor, preliminary investigator, complainant, involved persons, accused employee(s), and initial allegation(s), along with a summary of the incident. Within the section pertaining to accused employee(s), the required information includes whether or not the employee was arrested and if so by which law enforcement agency. The supervisor initially completing the Complaint Form is responsible for recording the arrest information, if applicable.

A total of 49 employees were accused of misconduct in the 44 complaints reviewed for the Audit. Nine of the employees were arrested in connection with their alleged misconduct. In two cases, the fact that the employees were arrested and the names of the arresting agencies were omitted from the Complaint Forms resulting in information being omitted from CMS. The two related arrest reports were appropriately included as documentation in the investigative files for the two closed complaints for which the data was omitted from CMS.

Results and Corrective Action Taken

Internal Affairs Group verified the omissions regarding the arrest information and updated CMS with the accurate arrest information. The OIG verified the update.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

On August 2, 2011, the Commanding Officer of Internal Affairs Group indicated that he was in general agreement with the OIG's Audit findings.

On August 22, 2011, the Commanding Officer of Information Technology Bureau indicated that she was in general agreement with the OIG's Audit findings.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the OIG found CMS data to be accurate and reliable based on its testing of 44 complaints for 15 key data elements.