

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

***REVIEW OF AUDIT DIVISION'S
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
WORK PRODUCT ASSESSMENT
SUMMARY***



Conducted by

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.
Inspector General

December 28, 2005

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
REVIEW OF AUDIT DIVISION'S GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
WORK PRODUCT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2005/2006**

PURPOSE

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) performed an “executive level” review of Audit Division’s Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Work Product Assessment Summary Report (Report). Audit Division performed the assessment to meet the audit mandates of Consent Decree paragraph 131 (f) and (g). Those mandates require Audit Division to examine the relationships of GED officers working together under particular supervisors to determine whether additional investigation is needed to identify “at-risk” practices. Also, the mandates require Audit Division to draw a conclusion regarding the GED’s adherence to the law, the Los Angeles Police Department’s (Department) policies and procedures, and the Consent Decree; and recommend a course of action to correct any identified deficiencies. Because the assessment only provided a summary of the results from five Consent Decree audits¹ and four Command Accountability Performance Audits (CAPAs)² and drew no conclusions, the OIG performed an “executive level” review of the Report, instead of a more detailed review.

Audit Division’s Report identified/summarized the number of GED officers and supervisors with multiple instances of non-compliance with Consent Decree paragraphs.³ The Report further stated that an additional and more detailed analysis of certain work products is essential to draw conclusions regarding possible patterns of “at risk” practices that may exist within any of the GEDs.

SCOPE

The “executive level” review entailed tracing the various figures in the Report to Audit Division’s supporting work paper schedules, and reviewing the Report for clarity and presentation.

RESULTS

Tracing of the Figures in the Report

Overall, the figures in Audit Division’s Report were accurate, in that they agreed with Audit Division’s supporting work paper schedules. A few minor errors were noted in the Report’s figures for the recurrences and patterns, and the OIG communicated those errors to Audit Division.

¹ The five Consent Decree audits were the Arrest, Booking and Charging Reports Audit; Confidential Informant Control Package Audit; Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stops Data Collection Audit; Non-Categorical Use of Force Reports Audit; and Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits Audit.

² The four CAPAs included the Areas of Newton, Wilshire, West Los Angeles, and Hollywood.

³ The commanding officers of the various Areas were previously notified of the officers and supervisors with instances of non-compliance in the various Consent Decree audits and CAPAs, so the commanding officers were not again communicated this same information after Audit Division’s assessment.

Review of the Report for Clarity and Presentation

Overall, the OIG found Audit Division's Report to be clear and well presented; however, the following clarity and presentation issues were noted:

- The OIG would have preferred that the Report indicate that one Area's CAPA results can not be precisely compared to another Area's CAPA results, because the audit programs, scopes, and test months could be somewhat different. Furthermore, the Areas' operations and predominant types of crimes may vary considerably.
- The OIG would have preferred that the Report indicate the tentative time frame for completing the CAPAs for the remaining 15 Areas.
- Table Nos. 2, 3 and 4 could have more clearly presented the results for Newton, Wilshire, West Los Angeles, and Hollywood, since these four Areas had instances of non-compliance for both the Consent Decree audits and CAPAs. In contrast, the other Areas/Divisions had instances of non-compliance only for the Consent Decree audits, since their CAPAs had not yet been performed. To present the results more clearly, the OIG would have preferred that these Tables include separate columns for the Consent Decree audit "number of instances" and the CAPA "number of instances." Additionally, the total number of work products reviewed for each Area/Division could have been indicated.⁴ This information would help put the total number of instances of non-compliance for each Area/Division in perspective.
- The OIG would have preferred that the Report elaborate as to what the "more detailed analysis of work product" would involve and the tentative time frame for completing this analysis. As some GED officers and supervisors were identified as authorizing or approving work products with multiple instances of Consent Decree non-compliance, there may be a "sense of urgency" for completing this analysis to determine if a pattern of conduct exists.⁵

CONCLUSION

The Report clearly stated that Audit Division's work involved an assessment summary, not an audit, and that more work in the future was necessary to analyze GED officers and supervisors with multiple instances of Consent Decree non-compliance. Therefore, the OIG withholds a determination as to whether Audit Division met the mandates of Consent Decree paragraph 131 (f) and (g). Overall, the figures in the Report were accurate and the Report was clear and well presented.

⁴ For example, the total number of arrest packages for each CAPA could have been indicated. This would have given the Report reader an overall sense of each audit's scope.

⁵ Audit Division advised that they are currently developing a database and related methodology to identify and analyze the officers and supervisors with high-risk non-compliance recurrences, but they had not yet set a time frame for completing this more detailed analysis.