

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

**TRAINING EVALUATION AND
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM II AUDIT**

(Fiscal Year 2009/2010)



Conducted by the

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

DJANGO SIBLEY
Acting Inspector General

April 26, 2010

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
TRAINING EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM II AUDIT
FISCAL YEAR 2009/2010**

PURPOSE

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG), in accordance with the Transition Agreement and pursuant to its Audit and Review Plan, has completed its Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS II) Audit (Audit). A mandate of the Transition Agreement is to review the processing of Action Items for compliance with Special Order No. 28, 2008, entitled “*Duty to Conduct and Document Individual Performance Assessments - Revised*,” dated August 29, 2008. This Special Order describes how TEAMS II is to be used as a risk management system, primarily through the processing of Action Items. Hence, the purpose of this Audit was to determine if these Action Items were appropriately and timely processed.

BACKGROUND

The Transition Agreement requires a review of the TEAMS II system to determine if the Department is utilizing the system “in the manner in which it was intended – an early warning or risk management system.”¹ In part, the Transition Agreement requires a review of Threshold-Activated Action Items “to verify that supervisors are conducting a review of TEAMS II information to detect any pattern or series of incidents that indicate that an officer may be engaging in at-risk behavior.”²

TEAMS II is a system that provides a summary of an officer’s work performance history and allows supervisors to compare an officer’s work performance history to other officers who perform similar work. TEAMS II uses several sources of information to track and compare the performance of officers; some of those sources track crimes and arrests, claims and lawsuits, commendations, collisions, traffic citations, training, vehicle pursuits, pedestrian and vehicle stops, complaints, use of force incidents and risk management information. This information is tracked by TEAMS II and appears on an officer’s TEAMS II report.

To identify officers who may be at risk of committing misconduct, supervisors are required to evaluate TEAMS II reports for officers at four determined junctures: each time an officer transfers to a new assignment, receives an annual performance evaluation, reaches a higher activity level than his/her peers, or when the supervisor chooses to conduct a performance assessment. The evaluation includes an analysis of all relevant information to detect any pattern or series of incidents that may indicate that an officer may be engaging in at-risk behavior.

The method developed to track a supervisor’s review and evaluation of TEAMS II reports is the Action Item. The four types of System-Generated Action Items reviewed in the Audit were Transfer Action Item, Performance Evaluation Report Action Item, Threshold-Activated Action Item and Supervisor Action Item.

The Audit tested each of the four types of System-Generated Action Items in order to assess whether supervisors used the information contained in TEAMS II reports to analyze potential

¹ Transition Agreement, Page 8, Line 16.

² *Id.*, Page 8, Line 25.

patterns and practices of behavior that may lead to officer misconduct as required by the protocols established in Special Order No. 28, 2008.

METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE

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.

The OIG used Special Order No. 28, 2008, as the standard for testing the relevant samples. Details for each objective’s methodology, sample and scope are provided in the Detailed Methodology section of each objective. The following chart depicts a summary of results.

ACTION ITEM CATEGORY AND OBJECTIVE	COMPLIANCE RATE
A. Threshold-Activated Action Items (AIs)	
Objective A1: Determine if AIs were adequately justified, reviewed and documented in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008.	93% (37/40)
Objective A2: Determine if AIs with corrective action disposition(s) were adequately explained and justified in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008. Also determine if these corrective action disposition(s) represented new action taken as a result of the AI review.	39% (14/36)
Objective A3: Determine if AIs were completed within 60 days of creation.	83% (454/550)
B. Transfer Action Items (TAIs)	
Obj. B1: Determine if the TAI and related TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER) forms were completed in accordance with Special Order No. 23, 2003.	100% (26/26)
Obj. B2: Determine if the TAIs and TER forms were completed within 10 days of publication of the related Transfer Order.	92% (24/26)
Obj. B3: Determine if TAIs were generated for all officer transfers.	100% (90/90)
C. Performance Evaluation Report Action Items (PERs)	
Obj. C1: Determine if the PERs and related Standards Based Assessment forms evaluated the supervisor’s performance in accordance with Department Manual Section 3/760.20.	100% (21/21)
Obj. C2: Determine if Performance Evaluation Report Action Items were generated for related annual performance evaluations.	100% (40/40)
Obj. C3: Determine if PERs were completed within 60 days.	69% (1,526/2,201)
D. Supervisor Action Items (SAIs)	
Obj. D1: Determine if SAI dispositions were adequately reviewed and justified in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008.	96% (27/28)
Obj. D2: Determine if there was evidence that corrective action was taken for SAIs with corrective action dispositions.	90% (9/10)

DETAILED RESULTS

A. Threshold-Activated Action Items (Action Items)

Objective AI: Determine if Action Items were adequately justified, reviewed and documented in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008.

Background

The TEAMS II system used to conduct performance analysis is the Risk Management Information System (RMIS). RMIS assesses a variety of areas, including an officer's uses of force, complaints, claims/lawsuits, preventable traffic collisions and vehicle pursuits. Each area is numerically measured by being compared to stops and arrests per officer known as thresholds. The thresholds are then averaged by peer groups, comprised of all officers who perform similar job functions. RMIS automatically notifies the officer's assigned supervisor via an Action Item if the officer exceeds the average for any threshold, thereby requiring the supervisor to review and analyze the officer's TEAMS II report.

Special Order No. 28, 2008, outlines the requirements for completion of an Action Item. Supervisors must briefly document all Action Item areas and are required to conduct an analysis of the officer's entire work history to determine if a pattern of conduct or at-risk behavior may exist. Neither the criterion for a pattern of conduct nor the definition of at-risk behavior is defined by Special Order No. 28, 2008. In addition, the supervisor is required to document a comparison of the officer's work performance against his/her peer group. In order to assist with that analysis, TEAMS II automatically links the Summary of Employee Activity report to the Action Item. Based on the analysis, the supervisor is then required to determine an appropriate course of action for the officer and provide a written justification for the disposition.³ Finally, the supervisor must have a discussion with the affected officer regarding the disposition and document the discussion in the Action Item narrative.

To promote consistency in documenting reviews of officers work performance, TEAMS II automatically includes the following eight information prompts to address the aforementioned requirements in the Action Item narrative:

- (1) Provide a brief summary of each use of force within the evaluation period.
- (2) Provide a brief summary of each complaint within the evaluation period.
- (3) Provide a brief summary of each vehicle pursuit and preventable traffic collision within the evaluation period.
- (4) Provide a brief summary of each claim/lawsuit within the evaluation period.
- (5) Compare the officer's performance against that of similar officers.
- (6) Conduct an analysis of all the events as a whole and determine if there is a "pattern of conduct."
- (7) Justify the disposition selected.

³ A supervisor may choose one or more from the following dispositions: no action, commendation, informal meeting, training, special evaluation reports, modified field duties, assigned to non-field duties, Risk Management Executive Committee referral, directed Behavioral Science Services referral, comment card, notice to correct deficiencies, and complaint.

- (8) Provide a brief summary of the discussion with the affected officer regarding the supervisor's review and selection of disposition.

Detailed Methodology

To select a current and thereby relevant sample of Action Items, the OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Action Items completed from January 1, 2009, through September 8, 2009. The total population consisted of 1,861 Action Items. The OIG then deselected all corrective action dispositions, as those dispositions were tested in a separate sample for Objective A2.⁴ The OIG then judgmentally selected the period from June 1, 2009, to September 8, 2009, for this objective.

The selected time period contained 653 Action Items. From the 653 Action Items, the OIG selected a random sample of 40 Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and a 6% plus-precision.

Three RMIS reports were reviewed for each Action Item: the Action Item History report, TEAMS II report and Summary of Employee Activity report.⁵ Each Action Item History report contains the documented narrative and comments of the reviewers. Each Action Item was examined to determine if the supervisor and reviewers had adequately documented their review in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008. Further, each Action Item was compared to the TEAMS II report and Summary of Employee Activity report in order to verify the narrative and comments.

The OIG noted that Special Order No. 28, 2008, does not require a specific due date for an Action Item review, but the Order does indicate that "the Risk Management Information System will automatically assign a due date to the AI." TEAMS II RMIS staff assigns a due date 60 days from the creation of the Action Item. The Action Item investigation should be conducted and reviewed within that time period.

The following tests were used to review the sample Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if there was a brief summary of each use of force, complaint, claim/lawsuit, vehicle pursuit, and traffic collision occurring within the evaluation period.

Test 2: Determine if there was an analysis of the events as a whole used to determine if there is a pattern of conduct.

Test 3: Determine if there was a documented comparison of the officer's performance against officers in the same peer group, organization or similar job assignment and explain any significant differences between the affected officer's performance and that of similar officers.

⁴ Corrective action dispositions include training, modified field duties, assigned to non-field duties, Risk Management Executive Committee referral, directed Behavioral Science Services referral, notice to correct deficiencies, special evaluation reports and complaint.

⁵ An Action Item History report is the documentation of an Action Item investigation.

Test 4: Determine if there was justification for the disposition selected.

Test 5: Determine if there is a brief summary of the discussion with the affected officer regarding the supervisor's review and disposition selection.

Testing Results

The Department was 93% compliant with this objective. Thirty-seven of the 40 Action Items tested contained the required summary. All three exceptions were found as a result of Test 1; each of those three Action Item narratives did not contain the required event information which was available in the affected officer's TEAMS II report. Details for those exceptions are as follows:

The supervisor completing the first Action Item addressed the event that initially triggered the Action Item but did not discuss the officer's complaints, uses of force, pursuits, or claims/lawsuits.⁶ The supervisor completing the second Action Item did not document two prior use of force incidents.⁷ The supervisor completing the third Action Item incorrectly reported that no preventable traffic collisions occurred during the evaluation period.⁸

Objective A2: Determine if Action Items with corrective action disposition(s) were adequately explained and justified in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008. Also determine if these corrective action disposition(s) represented new action taken as a result of the Action Item review.

Background

According to Special Order No. 28, 2008, supervisors must provide justification for the disposition selected for an Action Item. A supervisor may choose one or more of the following dispositions: no action, commendation, informal meeting, training, special evaluation reports, modified field duties, assigned to non-field duties, risk management executive committee referral, directed Behavioral Science Services referral, comment card, notice to correct deficiencies, and complaint.

Special Order No. 28, 2008, uses the following definitions for the reason each disposition should be selected:

No Action - used when no pattern of behavior posing potential risk was identified in the Action Item investigation or when corrective action was taken prior to the Action Item and no new action is required.

⁶ AI No. 528393 (Complaint Form Nos. 09-002430, 09-002345 and UOF Case Nos. 2008378, 2008341, 2008203)

⁷ AI No. 527853 (Use of Force Case Nos. 2008279, 2008839)

⁸ AI No. 526552 (Traffic Collision No. 081037373)

1.0

Commendation - used when the Action Item investigation reveals that the work history of an officer is above average and should be commended.

Informal Meeting- used when a supervisor meets with the officer and conducts an informal counseling session that does not result in any further action as a result of the Action Item investigation.

Training - used when the Action Item investigation identified a need for formal training.

Special Evaluation Reports - used when the Action Item investigation determined an officer needs further monitoring.

Modified Field Duties - used when the Action Item investigation identifies a need for modification within an officer's work duties.

Assigned to Non-Field Duties - used when the Action Item investigation determined that an officer should be removed from the field and placed in a non-field duty assignment.

Risk Management Executive Committee (RMEC) Referral - used when the Action Item investigation revealed that an officer should be referred to RMEC for special monitoring.⁹

Directed Behavioral Science Services (BSS) Referral - used when the Action Item investigation revealed that an officer should be referred to BSS for mental health services.

Comment Card - used when the Action Item investigation requires that a supervisor complete a comment card.¹⁰

Notice to Correct Deficiencies (NTCD) - used when the Action Item investigation determines that a NTCD is necessary.¹¹

Complaint - used when misconduct is identified through the Action Item investigation and a personnel complaint should be initiated due to the newly discovered misconduct.

⁹ RMEC reviews officer performance to assess liability and also directs non-punitive corrective actions to address performance and/or behavior. RMEC also makes recommendations to the Chief of Police to issue, renew, or rescind Long or Short-term duty (L/STDR) restriction letters. Both letters restrict an officer to non-field duties with no public contact, arrests, or court testimony. LTDR letters are reviewed annually and STDR are reviewed semi annually.

¹⁰ Comment cards are used to document one of the following: an incident or behavior that was notably good or bad; a procedure, policy, or expectation was explained; specific training presented for a particular purpose; or that a particular act which was against policy and/or procedure was unacceptable.

¹¹ A NTCD is used to warn or admonish an officer of deficient performance or that a particular act was a violation of a rule, policy, procedure, or expectation, and that continuing the deficient performance or repeating the particular act (or acts like it) will result in at least a set of particular adverse consequences.

Additionally, Special Order No. 28, 2008, specifically states that the disposition of an Action Item should reflect a new action being taken as a result of the Action Item investigation and should be supported by the Action Item narrative. Further, any action taken prior to the creation of the Action Item for the investigated event(s), not requiring further action, should be closed using the disposition of no action.

The OIG determined the corrective action dispositions employed in the sample of Action Items reviewed to be: assigned to non-field duties, directed BSS referral, modified field duties, special evaluation reports, training, complaint, RMEC referral, and NTCD. Based on definition, the OIG further determined that there were corrective actions which should be considered a higher risk. The higher risk corrective action dispositions included complaint, RMEC referral and NTCD.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Action Items completed from January 1, 2009, through September 8, 2009. The total population consisted of 1,861 Action Items. The OIG sorted the listing by officer serial number and disposition type. The OIG then eliminated all non-corrective dispositions which were previously tested in objective A1.¹² The OIG further separated all Action Items with the dispositions of complaint, RMEC referral, and NTCD in order to test all high risk corrective action dispositions separately for this objective.

The OIG used the entire population of 56 Action Items with corrective action dispositions to obtain a random sample of 30 Action Items using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and a 6% plus-precision. The OIG also identified six Action Items with high risk corrective action dispositions. Thus, the OIG reviewed a total of 36 Action Items for this objective.

Three RMIS reports were reviewed for each Action Item: the Action Item History report, the TEAMS II report and the Summary of Employee Activity report.¹³ Each Action Item History report contains the documented narrative and comments of the reviewers. There are several levels of review for each Action Item investigation, the employee's supervisor(s), the commanding officer and the commander/civilian equivalent. Therefore, each report was examined to determine if the supervisor and reviewers had adequately documented their review in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008. Further, each Action Item was compared to the TEAMS II report and Summary of Employee Activity report in order to verify the narrative and comments.

The following tests were used to review the sample Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if the corrective action disposition was adequately explained and justified in the Action Item narrative in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008. Additionally,

¹² Non-corrective action dispositions include: no action, commendation, and informal meeting.

¹³ An Action Item History report is the documentation of an Action Item investigation.

determine if the disposition adequately supported the information in the Summary of Employee Activity and TEAMS II reports.

Test 2: Determine if corrective action dispositions represented new action taken as a result of the Action Item investigation.

Testing Results

The Department was 39% compliant with this objective. Fourteen of the 36 Action Items tested contained the required information. All 22 exceptions were found as a result of Test 2. Each of those Action Item narratives did not represent a new action taken as a result of the Action Item tested. Details for those exceptions are as follows:

Nine Action Items with the disposition of “assigned to non-field duties” referenced actions that had been imposed prior to the generation of the Action Item, rather than taken as a result of the Action Item investigation.¹⁴ As the Action Items did not require any new action, the proper disposition was “no action.”

Four Action Items with the disposition of “complaint” referenced the complaint which generated the Action Item.¹⁵ According to Special Order No. 28, 2008, the complaint disposition is used in the event new misconduct is identified during review of the Action Item and a personnel complaint is required. As the Action Items did not require any new action, the proper disposition was “no action.”

Five Action Items had the disposition of “training” assigned as a result of categorical use of force investigations.¹⁶ This action was not the result of a new action, but rather, the result of a finding made by the Board of Police Commissioners. As the Action Items did not require any new action, the proper disposition was “no action.”

Three Action Items had the disposition of “training” for an officer who had already received training in a prior Action Item.¹⁷ As the Action Items did not require any new action, the proper disposition was “no action.”

Objective A3: Determine if Action Items were completed within 60 days of creation.

Background

The OIG noted that Special Order No. 28, 2008, does not require a specific due date for an Action Item investigation. The Order only indicates that “the Risk Management Information

¹⁴ AI Nos. 520704, 523521, 514074, 515950, 521248, 513977, 512556, 516732, 522872

¹⁵ AI Nos. 517482, 511471, 528416, 515502

¹⁶ AI Nos. 517023, 526495, 526490, 526493, 529589

¹⁷ AI Nos. 524392, 528636, 520807

System will automatically assign a due date to the AI.” TEAMS II staff advised the OIG that RMIS assigns a due date 60 days from the creation of the Action Item.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all the Action Items completed from November 7, 2009, to February 7, 2010. The report consisted of 550 Action Items, which were all used by the OIG to conduct the following test.

Test 1: Determine if all Action Items were completed within 60 days of the creation date.

Testing Results

The Department was 83% compliant with this objective. Four hundred and fifty-four of the 550 Action Items tested were completed within 60 days.

B. Transfer Action Items

Objective B1: Determine if both the Transfer Action Item and related TEAMS Evaluation Report forms were completed in accordance with Special Order No. 23, 2003.

Background

When an officer is promoted or transferred to a new assignment, the information is tracked by Personnel Division which subsequently publishes a Transfer Order. Once the Transfer Order is published, RMIS automatically creates a Transfer Action Item for each affected officer. The Transfer Action Item then generates a tracking number for a TEAMS Evaluation Report. A TEAMS Evaluation Report form documents the review of an officer's TEAMS II report and specifically requires that the supervisor record such items as sustained administrative investigations, adverse judicial findings, and instances of discipline for excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Transfer Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The OIG then sorted the Transfer Action Items by completion date and judgmentally selected the time period of November 8, 2009, through December 5, 2009, for this objective.

The time period selected contained a total of 62 Transfer Action Items. From the 62 Transfer Action Items, the OIG selected a random sample of 26 Transfer Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and 6% plus-precision.

For each of the 26 Transfer Action Items tested, the related TEAMS Evaluation Report was requested from the respective commanding officer.

The following test was used to review the sample of Transfer Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if the Transfer Action Items and related TEAMS Evaluation Report forms were completed appropriately in accordance with Special Order No. 23, 2003.

Testing Results

The Department was 100% compliant with this objective. All 26 Transfer Action Items and the related TEAMS Evaluation Report forms contained all the required information as set forth in Special Order No. 23, 2003.

Objective B2: Determine if the Transfer Action Items and TEAMS Evaluation Report forms were completed within 10 days of publication of the related Transfer Order.

Background

According to Special Order No. 23, 2003, entitled “Criteria for Transfer/Loans of Sworn Personnel,” when an officer is transferred/loaned, the commanding officer must ensure that the officer’s TEAMS II report is reviewed within 10 working days from publication of the Transfer Order and/or notification of the loan.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Transfer Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The OIG then sorted the Transfer Action Items by completion date and judgmentally selected the time period of November 8, 2009, through December 5, 2009, for this objective.

The time period selected contained 62 Transfer Action Items. From the 62 Transfer Action Items, the OIG selected a random sample of 26 Transfer Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and 6% plus-precision.

For each of the 26 Transfer Action Items tested, the related TEAMS Evaluation Report was requested from the respective commanding officer.

The following tests were used to review the sample of Transfer Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if the Transfer Action Items were completed within 10 days.

Test 2: Determine if the TEAMS Evaluation Report forms were completed within 10 days.

Testing Results

The Department was 92% compliant with this objective. Twenty-four of the 26 Transfer Action Items were completed within the required 10-day deadline. Details for those exceptions are as follows:

One officer's Transfer Action Item was completed after the 10-day deadline; however, the corresponding TEAMS Evaluation Report form was completed on time.¹⁸

One officer's TEAMS Evaluation Report was not signed by the Commanding Officer within the 10 day deadline; however, the Transfer Action Item was closed in TEAMS II on time.¹⁹

Objective B3: Determine if Transfer Action Items were generated for all officer transfers.

Background

In addition to the previously mentioned information regarding Transfer Action Items, the OIG noted that Special Order No. 23, 2003, excludes "probationary police officers who are transferring from Training Division."

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Transfer Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The Transfer Action Items were then sorted according to date.

The OIG also obtained the Transfer Order for October 11, 2009, through November 7, 2009, (Deployment Period 11). The total number of transfers for that time period, excluding probationary officers, civilians, reserve officers and the return-to-work program officers, was 90. The Transfer Order for Deployment Period 11 was compared to the TEAMS II RMIS staff report to conduct the following test:

Test 1: Determine if Transfer Action Items were generated for all officer transfers.

Testing Results

The Department was 100% complaint with this objective. All 90 transfers had the required corresponding Transfer Action Items.

C. Performance Evaluation Report Action Items

Objective C1: Determine if the Performance Evaluation Report Action Items and related Standards Based Assessment forms evaluated the supervisor's performance in accordance with Department Manual Section 3/760.20.

Background

A Performance Evaluation Report Action Item notifies a commanding officer that a subordinate officer's annual performance evaluation is due for completion. This type of Action Item ensures that the officer's TEAMS II report is reviewed at the time of the officer's performance

¹⁸ TAI No. 534519

¹⁹ TAI No. 537808

evaluation. Department Manual Section 3/760.20 defines, in part, that a Standards Based Assessment form is used to evaluate officers at the rank of lieutenant and below on an annual basis. Additionally, Department Manual Section 1/668.01 specifies that for subordinate officer evaluations, supervisors are required to review the officer's Summary of Employee Activity report and TEAMS II report.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Performance Evaluation Report Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The OIG sorted the Performance Evaluation Report Action Items and selected only those items in which commanding officers had completed annual performance evaluations for sergeants and lieutenants assigned to field duties. The OIG then further sorted the selected Performance Evaluation Report Action Items by completion date and judgmentally selected the time period of November 8, 2009, through December 5, 2009, for this objective.

The time period selected contained 38 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items. The OIG selected a random sample of 21 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and 6% plus-precision.

For each of the 21 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items tested, the supervisor's related Standards Based Assessment form was requested from the respective commanding officer. In addition to the review of the Standards Based Assessment form, the supervisor's TEAMS II report and Summary of Employee Activity report were reviewed.

The following test was used to review the sample of Performance Evaluation Report Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if the affected commanding officer checked one of the following boxes in completing his/her sergeant's/lieutenant's annual performance evaluation.

1 "Regularly reviews various RMIS reports, audits, Action Items using the TEAMS II. Completes TEAMS II transfer reviews on time."

2 "Seldom or never reviews various RMIS reports, audits, Action Items using the TEAMS II. Does not complete the TEAMS II transfer reviews on time."

Testing Results

The Department was 100% complaint with this objective. All 21 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items reviewed had the appropriate box checked.

Objective C2: Determine if Performance Evaluation Report Action Items were generated for related annual performance evaluations.

Background

On April 18, 2008, TEAMS II Development Bureau issued an Intradepartmental Correspondence outlining the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item process. According to the memorandum, TEAMS II automatically generates a Performance Evaluation Report Action Item for each officer 30 days prior to their annual anniversary date.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained two reports in order to test this objective. First, the OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Performance Evaluation Report Action Items created from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009.

Second, the OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all officers with anniversary dates from November 8, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The time period selected contained 670 related Performance Evaluation Report Action Items. From the 670 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items, the OIG selected a random sample of 40 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and 6% plus-precision.

The following test was used to review the sample of Performance Evaluation Report Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if there was a Performance Evaluation Report Action Item created for each officer in the sample.

Test Results

The Department was 100% complaint with this objective. All 40 officers in the sample had a Performance Evaluation Report Action Item created.

Objective C3: Determine if Performance Evaluation Report Action Items were completed within 60 days.

Background

On April 18, 2008, TEAMS II Development Bureau issued an Intradepartmental Correspondence outlining the Performance Evaluation Report Action Item process. According to the memorandum, an officer's Performance Evaluation Report Action Item and the related Standards Based Assessment form are required to be completed within 60 days following the officer's anniversary date.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Performance Evaluation Report Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The total population consisted of 2,201 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items. The OIG used the total population to conduct the following test.

Test 1: Determine if all Performance Evaluation Report Action Items were completed within 60 days following an officer's anniversary date.

Testing Results

The Department was 69% compliant with this objective. One thousand five hundred and twenty-six of the 2,201 performance Action Items tested were completed within 60 days. The 675 exceptions ranged from one to 109 days past due. All of the exceptions are based on the Action Item closure date and not the signed date of the related Standards Based Assessment forms.

D. Supervisor Action Items

Objective D1: Determine if Supervisor Action Item dispositions were adequately reviewed and justified in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008.

Background

Supervisor Action Items allow supervisors and commanding officers to monitor a subordinate's work performance. A Supervisor Action Item is manually generated by an officer's supervisor using RMIS. The information required to complete each Supervisor Action Item is contained on the affected officer's TEAMS II report.

Special Order No. 28, 2008, states, in relevant part, when generating a Supervisor Action Item a supervisor "should document the extent of their review and justify any corrective action necessary."²⁰

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Supervisor Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The OIG then sorted the Supervisor Action Items by the completion date and judgmentally selected the time period of November 8, 2009, through December 5, 2009, for this objective.

²⁰ Corrective actions a supervisor may choose include: cancel, no action, commendation, informal meeting, training, special evaluation reports, modified field duties, assigned to non-field duties, Risk Management Executive Committee referral, directed Behavioral Science Services referral, comment card, notice to correct deficiencies, and complaint.

The time period selected contained 74 Supervisor Action Items. From the 74 Supervisor Action Items, the OIG selected a random sample of 28 Supervisor Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and 6% plus-precision.

Each Supervisor Action Item was examined to determine if the supervisor and reviewers had adequately documented their investigation in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008. Further, each Supervisor Action Item was compared to the officer's TEAMS II report and Summary of Employee Activity report in order to verify the narrative and comments.

The following tests were used to review the sample of Supervisor Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if there was a reason stated for the creation of the Supervisor Action Item in the narrative.

Test 2: Determine if adequate justification was provided for the selected disposition in accordance with Special Order No. 28, 2008.

Test 3: Determine if the TEAMS II report was adequately reviewed for each Supervisor Action Item.

Test Results

The Department was 96% compliant with this objective. Twenty-seven of the 28 Supervisor Action Items tested contained the required aforementioned information. The exception was found as a result of Test 3; the Supervisor Action Item narrative did not consider information which was available in the affected officer's TEAMS II report. Details for the one exception are as follows:

In one Supervisor Action Item, the officer involved received a disposition of "comment card" as a corrective action in respect to a personnel complaint.²¹ The officer's TEAMS II report however, reflected two prior personnel complaints for similar types of actions.²² According to the commanding officer as it was related to the OIG, the affected officer's TEAMS II report had not been adequately reviewed for this Supervisor Action Item. Had adequate review of the Officer's TEAMS II report been conducted, it would have led to a different corrective action.

Objective D2: Determine if there was evidence that corrective action was taken for Supervisor Action Items with corrective action dispositions.

Background

Following a supervisor's review of the officer's TEAMS II report, the supervisor may determine that a corrective action is warranted. The corrective actions available to the supervisor include: training, special evaluation reports, modified field duties, assigned to non-field duties, risk

²¹ SAI No. 537790

²² CF Nos. 07-000806, 06-4604

management executive committee, directed Behavioral Science Services referral, comment card, notice to correct deficiencies, and complaint.

Detailed Methodology

The OIG obtained a report from TEAMS II RMIS staff of all Supervisor Action Items completed from September 1, 2009, through December 5, 2009. The OIG then sorted the listing by the completion date and judgmentally selected the time period of November 8, 2009, through December 5, 2009, for this objective.

The time period selected contained 74 Supervisor Action Items. From the 74 Supervisor Action Items, the OIG selected a random sample of 28 Supervisor Action Items by using a 95% one-tail confidence level, with a 6% expected error rate, and 6% plus-precision. The sample of 28 Supervisor Action Items was then sorted by corrective action dispositions. Ten of the 28 corrective action dispositions were comment card. To test for this objective, the OIG requested the related comment cards from the respective commanding officers. The OIG used the total population of 10 comment cards to test the Supervisor Action Items.

The following test was used to review the Supervisor Action Items:

Test 1: Determine if there was evidence that corrective actions were taken for the selected Supervisor Action Items.

Test Results

The Department was 90% compliant with this objective. Nine of the 10 Supervisor Action Items tested contained documentation indicating the corrective action had been taken. The exception was a result of one area command being unable to locate the requested comment card. Details for the one exception are as follows:

One Supervisor Action Item did not have proof of the corrective action due to the affected officer's comment card not being located.²³

RECOMMENDATIONS

The supervisor's analysis of an Action Item, according to Special Order No. 28, 2008, requires justification of the corrective action disposition and that the corrective action taken is a direct result of the Action Item review. Corrective action imposed by a supervisor and taken prior to the creation of the Action Item, and which requires no additional action, is properly closed with the disposition of "no action." The objective testing this requirement, A2, revealed a compliance rate of 39%. Although this objective is procedural and without impact on the supervisor's ultimate determination of an officer's potential to engage in at-risk behavior, adherence to the protocol is valuable in ensuring the effectiveness of the TEAMS II system. Based on the compliance rate, it appears that the requirements of this objective are broadly misunderstood. As such, the OIG recommends that the Department provide department-wide training relating to the relevant protocols established by Special Order No. 28, 2008.

²³ SAI No. 537794

Special Order No. 28, 2008, as well as the Transition Agreement, requires that a supervisor, in response to an Action Item, analyze all relevant TEAMS II information to detect any pattern or series of incidents that indicate that an officer may be engaging in at-risk behavior. Neither document, however, provides guidance to assist the supervisor in making the determination as to whether an officer's behavior denotes a "pattern" or should be considered "at-risk." Absent Department guidance as to the meaning of these terms, it is unrealistic to expect supervisors to administer a consistent interpretation of the behavior in question. Quality and consistency of supervisory oversight is promoted through the understanding and adherence to defined standards. As such, to provide a consistent quality of supervisory oversight, the OIG recommends that the Department develop guidance for supervisors to use in determining "patterns" and "at-risk behavior." Additionally, the OIG recommends that the Department design a system to implement the use of the guidance in the analysis of Action Items and, subsequently, that the Department audit compliance with the appropriate application of this system.

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Information Technology Bureau's Audit response has been attached as an addendum.

CONCLUSION

The OIG has completed the TEAMS II Audit which reviewed Action Items, Transfer Action Items, Performance Evaluation Report Action Items and Supervisor Action Items. In general, it appears that supervisors are utilizing the TEAMS II system to assess potential patterns and practices of behavior that may lead to officer misconduct. The OIG noted that compliance rates for most Audit objectives are significantly higher than in past audits.

ADDENDUM

**TEAMS II DIVISION RESPONSE TO THE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTION GENERAL’S
AUDIT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009/2010**

- 69% Compliance Rate on PER Completion within 60 Days (page 14)

This audit determined compliance based on the electronic PER completion date, rather than the date the evaluated employee signed the hardcopy form, which has been the basis used in previous audits. In the past, auditors have acknowledged that the hardcopy should be given more weight because there is a lag between the time the hardcopy is signed by the employee and the time the electronic PER is closed out in the system.

- Recommendation #1 (page 16)

TEAMS II Division will provide update training to all Bureau TEAMS II Coordinators on the proper use of Action Item dispositions. The training will provide guidance on the use of the various AI dispositions and remind users that dispositions selected are actions that will be taken as a result of the AI review. This training will also be included in TEAMS II Coordinator meetings, Command Staff Development training and supervisor school.

TEAMS II Division will also be sending out a notice department-wide, delineating the information provided in this training.

- Improvements in compliance rates from the last audit are as follows:

The OIG audit conducted in July 2009 focused on TAIs and PERs. Numbers in bold shows marked improvement from the last audit.

	2009	2010
a) TAI and TER completed appropriately	100%	100%
b) TAI and TER completed within 10 days	*	92%
c) TAIs generated for all transfers	100%	100%
d) PERAI and SBA evaluated the supervisor’s performance	61%	100%
e) PERAI generated for all annual evaluations due	100%	100%
f) PERAI completed within 60 days	45%	69%

* methodology used in 2009 was different therefore compliance rates are not comparable

1.0

- Several improvements have been made to the system, and a variety of update training continues to be provided to users.
 1. The Investigative Narrative guidelines implemented in February 2009 added eight preset questions to assist supervisors in responding to Action Items. This helped in providing for a more comprehensive and quality review of officer performance.
 2. The creation of the Transfer Action Item Form, which replaced the TEAMS Evaluation Report, eliminated confusion experienced by users with the old form and facilitated the completion of the TAI.
 3. The incorporation of the Transfer Action Item form into the electronic TAI provided for a more seamless and efficient process for the completion of TAIs.
 4. TEAMS II Division continues to conduct quarterly TEAMS II Coordinator meetings to provide continuous training and obtain feedback from users. Implementation of minor enhancements to the system from these meetings has brought about improvements in response times.
 5. TEAMS II Division continues to conduct regular classroom training for new TEAMS II Coordinators, Supervisor School, Command Staff Development and TEAMS II Refresher Courses.