

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

***REVIEW OF AUDIT DIVISION'S
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL
SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT
2005/2006***



Conducted by the

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.
Inspector General

October 5, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEW OF AUDIT DIVISION'S GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL SELECTION
CRITERIA AUDIT, FISCAL YEAR 2005/2006

		PAGE No.
<u>PURPOSE</u>		1
<u>BACKGROUND ON AUDIT DIVISION'S AUDIT</u>		1
<u>REVIEW METHODOLOGY</u>		2
<u>REVIEW RESULTS</u>		2
	COMPLETENESS	2
	FINDINGS	3
	QUALITY	4
<u>OTHER RELATED MATTERS</u>		4
<u>CONCLUSION</u>		4

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
REVIEW OF AUDIT DIVISION'S
GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT,
FISCAL YEAR 2005/2006**

PURPOSE

Pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 135, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reviewed Audit Division's Gang Enforcement Detail Selection Criteria Audit (Audit). The Audit was completed in the Fourth Quarter of Fiscal Year 2005/2006 and received by the OIG on July 5, 2006. The OIG assessed the Audit's completeness, findings, and quality.

BACKGROUND ON AUDIT DIVISION'S AUDIT

Audit Division conducted its third Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Selection Criteria Audit and assessed the Los Angeles Police Department's (Department) compliance with Consent Decree Paragraphs 106 (b, c, d), 107 (a, b, c) and 131(b). Those Paragraphs, along with Department policies and procedures, address selecting officers into GED units, limiting their tour assignment, and reevaluating GED officers when certain sustained complaints and/or adverse judicial findings are received during their tour of duty.

Audit Division selected a sample of officers assigned to GED units and Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) units during Deployment Period No. 2, 2006 (February 5th through March 4th), evaluating various GED selection packages.¹ Three different samples were used to evaluate a total of six audit objectives.² The samples were considered sufficient to make a statistically valid Department-wide Consent Decree compliance determination. The table below summarizes the compliance percentages reported by Audit Division.

COMPLIANCE PERCENTAGES REPORTED BY AUDIT DIVISION

Objective No.	Consent Decree ¶	Objective and Consent Decree ¶ Description	Compliance Percentage
1a	106(b)	Minimum Eligibility Requirements – Non Supervisors	100%
1b	106(c)	Minimum Eligibility Requirements – Supervisors	100%
1c	107(a)	Use of TEAMS and Written Consideration of Certain Sustained Complaints, Adverse Judicial Findings, or Discipline Received <u>Before</u> the Officer's Selection	100%
1d	107(b)	Evaluation of Selection Process	45%
2	77	Limited Tour Assignments	97%
3	107(c)	Written Consideration of Certain Sustained Complaints or Adverse Judicial Findings Received <u>During</u> the Officer's GED Tour of Assignment	Determination Withheld ³

¹ GED selection packages generally contain an officer's Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) report, TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER), Performance Evaluation Reports and/or Transfer Applicant Data Sheet.

² Greater detail on Audit Division's methodology and findings can be found in Audit Division's Audit Report.

³ Audit Division indicated that of the 331 officers in its population, 12 received sustained complaints during their GED tour; however, they did not meet the Consent Decree criteria to require written consideration. As such, a determination of compliance for this objective was withheld.

REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The OIG assessed the completeness, findings, and quality of Audit Division’s Audit by reviewing the final Audit Report, Audit Work Plan, Audit workpapers, and a Microsoft Access database used to compile the Audit’s findings.⁴

Audit Division utilized three different samples to evaluate the Department’s compliance with the Consent Decree. The following table depicts the number of GED selection packages evaluated by Audit Division and the number of sub-sample packages evaluated by the OIG.

Objectives	Number of GED Selection Packages Evaluated ⁵	
	Audit Division	OIG
Objective 1 (a-d) – “New Officer Selections”	74	23
Objective 2 – “GED Tour Extensions”	57	21
Objective 3 – “Current Suitability”	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	143	56

On September 22, 2006, the OIG met with Audit Division management to discuss the results of this review. At that time, Audit Division management indicated they are in general agreement with this review’s findings.

REVIEW RESULTS

COMPLETENESS

To assess the Audit’s completeness, the OIG reviewed Audit Division’s Audit Report and supporting workpapers to ensure applicable Consent Decree mandates were assessed and the sampled GED selection packages were selected from a complete population.

Per the Department’s Annual Audit Plan (Fiscal Year 2005/2006), the Audit was to assess the Department’s compliance with Consent Decree Paragraphs 106 (b, c, and d) and 107 (a, b, and c), while addressing the applicable audit mandates of Consent Decree Paragraph 131(b). The OIG determined that the Audit sufficiently assessed those mandates. Additionally, based on the OIG’s review of Audit Division’s sampling documentation, it appears Audit Division selected from a complete population of GED officers.

FINDINGS

⁴ The OIG’s review of supporting workpapers was based on a randomly selected one-tail sample size calculation with a 95 percent confidence level, an expected error rate of six percent, and a plus precision of seven percent.

⁵ Not all GED selection packages were applicable to each objective.

To assess the Audit's findings, the OIG reviewed Audit Division's supporting work papers to ensure the findings were adequately supported and reviewed the Audit Report to ensure the findings were properly presented.

Based on the OIG's review of sampled GED selection packages, Audit Division's findings were well supported. However, the OIG noted a few additional concerns regarding the documentation of suitability interviews.

Specifically, for 12 GED selection packages, the TER and/or checklist, did not document any details of the suitability interview.⁶ A suitability interview is a discussion that occurs between the GED candidate and the evaluating supervisor where the supervisor evaluates the GED candidate's proficiency for the GED assignment. Although the TER and/or checklist indicated that a suitability interview took place, there was nothing documented to determine what areas were evaluated during the suitability interview. Department policy (Special Order #7, 2004) states that the commanding officer and/or designee conducting the suitability interview shall ensure that the TER includes the name of the interviewer, date of interview and a summary of discussion detailing suitability for the GED assignment, emphasizing traits that indicate the candidate 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 Division indicated that their Audit focused on whether the suitability interview took place, not to ensure whether there was documentation of what was discussed during the suitability interview; however, Audit Division plans to evaluate this area in its next audit. Additionally, for one GED selection package, there was no date documented as to when the suitability interview occurred.⁷

Since Audit Division reported a 45% compliance percentage for this objective (Evaluation of the Selection Process), these additional concerns would not significantly impact the reported compliance percentage.

⁶ Control Nos. 00OSBSPSEL1, 00OSBSEL2, 5HARBSEL3, 3SOWSEL1, 3SOWSEL3, 15NHDSPSEL1, 13NEWTSEL4, 4HBKSEL2, 4HBKSEL4, 4HBKSEL6, 16FTHLSEL2, and 10WVALSPSEL1.

⁷ Control No. 3SOWSEL1.

QUALITY

To assess the Audit's quality, the OIG evaluated the quality of both the Audit and the Audit Report.

Based on the OIG's review, the Audit was properly supervised and planned, in that the Audit's methodology allowed for proper assessments of Consent Decree mandates. Additionally, the Audit Report properly delineated the Audit's objectives, scope, methodology, and the status of prior audit recommendations. Finally, the Audit Report was issued in a timely manner (within a year of Audit Division's last audit), used a fair and unbiased tone, and was found to be convincing, clear, and concise.

OTHER RELATED MATTERS

During the OIG's review there was one instance where an officer received a sustained allegation for submitting a Daily Field Activities Report (DFAR) that contained inaccurate information. The allegation was classified as Neglect of Duty.⁸ However, in reading the complaint investigation, it appears that the inaccuracy on the DFAR was to omit information related to an incident relevant to the complaint investigation. To the Department's credit, this complaint investigation was reviewed and considered by the Area Commanding Officer prior to the officer's selection into the GED. Nevertheless, this raises a question of whether a complaint of this nature should be classified as Neglect of Duty versus Dishonesty. While one example certainly does not portend any larger negative trend, the OIG will review this area in more detail and see if indeed any true issues exist in this regard.

CONCLUSION

Overall, based on the OIG's review of Audit Division's GED Selection Criteria Audit, it appears the Audit was complete, performed in a quality manner, and the findings were well supported.

⁸ Control No. 13NEWTSUD2