

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

***TRAINING EVALUATION AND
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (TEAMS) II
AUDIT, PHASE II
(Fiscal Year 2008/2009)***



Conducted by the

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.
Inspector General

July 8, 2009

**OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
TRAINING EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (TEAMS) II
AUDIT, PHASE II**

PURPOSE

Pursuant to Consent Decree Paragraph 137, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted a Training Evaluation and Management System (TEAMS) II audit. Specifically, Paragraph 137 requires the Inspector General to audit the quality and timeliness of the Los Angeles Police Department's (LAPD or Department) use of TEAMS II and to evaluate the Department's compliance with Consent Decree Paragraph 47, which is the protocol for using TEAMS II. Paragraph 47 contains 13 sub-paragraphs [(a) to (m)], the following four (**a**, **b**, **i** and **m**) which were the focus of this audit:

Paragraph 47(a) – *“The protocol shall require that, on a regular basis, supervisors review and analyze all relevant information in TEAMS II about officers under their supervision to detect any pattern or series of incidents that indicate that an officer, group of officers, or an LAPD unit under his or her supervision may be engaging in at-risk behavior.”*

Paragraph 47(b) – *“The protocol shall provide that when at-risk behavior may be occurring based on a review and analysis described in the preceding subparagraph, appropriate managers and supervisors shall undertake a more intensive review of the officer's performance.”*

Paragraph 47(i) – *“The protocol shall provide that managers' and supervisors' performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol shall be taken into account in their annual personnel performance evaluations.”*

Paragraph 47(m) – *“The protocol shall require that whenever an officer transfers into a new Division or Area, the Commanding officer of such new Division or Area shall promptly cause the transferred officer's TEAMS II record to be reviewed by the transferred officer's watch commander or supervisor.”*

Note: One important provision of the TEAMS II protocol is that managers and supervisors perform the required timely reviews of subordinate officers' TEAMS II reports and work history to identify subordinate officers with potential patterns of at-risk practices needing corrective action. Conversely, these reviews should also identify subordinate officers deserving commendations.

BACKGROUND

This is the fourth TEAMS II audit conducted by the OIG. The first and third TEAMS II audits (both Phase I) primarily focused on threshold-activated Action Items.¹ A threshold-activated Action Item is automatically generated in TEAMS II when an employee has an inordinate number of uses of force, complaints, vehicle pursuits, traffic collisions, or claims/lawsuits in comparison to his/her peer group average. Indeed, the Department's implementation of the threshold-activated Action Items process is the “heart” of the early warning system required by the Consent Decree. It allows Department supervisors and managers to review an employee's

¹ The related audit reports were issued on November 6, 2007 and October 2, 2008, respectively.

activity to evaluate whether the employee is exhibiting any type of potential at-risk behavior that should be addressed or monitored.

The second TEAMS II audit and this audit (both Phase II) primarily focused on Action Items generated for sworn officer transfers and annual performance evaluations, and Action Items created at the discretion of supervisors and managers for follow-up and monitoring purposes. The prior TEAMS II Phase II audit concluded that Action Items were generally not being manually created, as required, for sworn officer transfers and annual performance evaluations. To remedy this problem, TEAMS II Development Bureau implemented major procedural and system changes, whereby Transfer Action Items (TAIs) were to be automatically generated beginning April 16, 2008 for all sworn officer transfers, and Performance Evaluation Report Action Items (PERs) were to be automatically generated beginning May 1, 2008 for all sworn officer annual performance evaluations. Hence, one major objective of this audit was to determine if TAIs and PERs were indeed being automatically generated, as required.

SUMMARY OF AUDIT SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The details of the scope and methodology for each audit objective are provided in the Detailed Results of the Audit section of this report. However, the bulk of the audit testing was performed on samples of Action Items closed in November 2008, the most current month available during the planning phase of the audit. These Action Item samples included 26 Transfer Action Items (TAIs), 22 Performance Evaluation Report Action Items (PERs), and 24 Supervisor Action Items (SAIs).

All TAIs completed from September 1 to November 30 of 2008 were analyzed to determine the number of days it took to complete them. All TAIs and PERs that were still open at December 3, 2008, were analyzed to determine the number of days they remained open.

Note: All audit sample sizes, unless otherwise indicated in the Detailed Results of the Audit section of this report, were calculated based on a 95 percent one-tail confidence level, an expected error rate of six percent, and a plus-precision of seven percent.

AUDIT OBJECTIVES

A. Transfers

Objective A1: To determine if Transfer Action Items (TAIs) were being generated for all sworn officer transfers.

Objective A2: To determine if both the TAIs and TEAMS Evaluation Reports (TERs)² were completed within 10 days of publication of the related transfer orders.

² The TER, a manual form, is required to be completed for each transfer and loan. The TER shall document that the reviewer has identified and analyzed the employee's applicable sustained complaints, adverse judicial findings, and uses of force. The TER shall be approved by both the watch commander and commanding officer who receive the transferred officer.

Objective A3: To determine if management approved the TERs, adequately discussed any sustained complaints and uses of force, and used current TEAMS II reports in the evaluations.

B. Annual Performance Evaluations

Objective B1: To determine if Performance Evaluation Report Action Items (PERs) were being generated for all sworn officer annual performance evaluations.

Objective B2: To determine if both the PERs and hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports were completed within 60 days of the annual anniversary date of the employee's current rank, regardless of paygrade.³

Objective B3: To determine if either the PERs or the hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports documented that the manager's or supervisor's performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol was taken into account in their annual performance evaluation.

C. Supervisor Action Items (SAIs)

Objective C: To determine if the disposition assigned for each SAI was consistent with information in the sworn officer's TEAMS II report and if the applicable corrective action was taken.⁴

SUMMARY OF RESULTS FOR EACH AUDIT OBJECTIVE

Objective A1: TAIs were generated for all 97 (100%) of the sworn officer transfers tested.

Objective A2: Of the total 653 TAIs completed from September 1 to November 30 of 2008, 623 (95%) were completed either on time or were less than 31 days late. Also, 180 TAIs were open (pending completion) as of December 3, 2008; and 26 of these 180 (14%) open TAIs were more than 60 days past due.

Objective A3: For all 26 (100%) TAIs in the audit sample tested, the supervisor and commanding officer approved the TER; adequately addressed employee's applicable sustained complaints, adverse judicial findings, and uses of force; and used a timely TEAMS II report in the evaluation.

Objective B1: PERs were generated for all 30 (100%) sworn officers in the audit sample with November anniversary dates.

Objective B2: Of the 22 hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports in the audit sample tested, 10 (45%) were completed on time, 11 (50%) were completed late (averaging 27 days late), and 1

³ For example, if the employee was promoted to his/her current rank of Sergeant on September 16, 2006, the current rank anniversary date for 2008 would be September 16, 2008.

⁴ For example, if the No Action disposition was assigned, there were no recent sustained complaints, out-of-policy uses of force, preventable traffic collisions, etc. that were not already addressed which might have warranted a different disposition.

(5%) was not completed. Also, 2,101 PERs were open (pending completion) as of December 3, 2008; and 11 (0.5%) of these 2,101 open PERs were more than 60 days past due.

Objective B3: For 11 of the 18 (61%) applicable PERs in the audit sample tested, there was evidence that the manager's or supervisor's performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol was taken into account in their annual performance evaluation.

Note: Effective January 2009 (subsequent to audit testing), the Department replaced the hardcopy Performance Evaluation Report form with the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) form, which prompts the evaluator to address the supervisor's or manager's performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol. Hence, the compliance rate should greatly improve in the future.

Objective C: The disposition assigned for each of the 24 SAIs in the audit sample tested was consistent with information in the sworn officer's TEAMS II report.

The Commanding Officer of TEAMS II Development Bureau provided a written response to a draft of this Report and expressed agreement with the Audit's results. The OIG wishes to thank TEAMS II Development Bureau for their cooperation and sharing of their expertise while we were conducting this Audit.

DETAILED RESULTS OF THE AUDIT

A. TRANSFERS

Background and References

Consent Decree Paragraph 47(m) – *“The protocol shall require that whenever an officer transfers into a new Division or Area, the Commanding officer of such new Division or Area shall promptly cause the transferred officer's TEAMS II record to be reviewed by the transferred officer's watch commander or supervisor.”*

Special Order No. 23, 2003, “Criteria for Transfers/Loans of Sworn Personnel Established” – This Special Order requires that the commanding officer gaining the transferred officer ensure that the watch commander or officer in charge review the sworn officer's TEAMS II report within ten days of publication of the related transfer order and document this review on the sworn officer's TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER). The TER shall document that the reviewer has identified and analyzed the employee's applicable sustained complaints, adverse judicial findings, and uses of force.

Intradepartmental Correspondence (15.2) dated April 18, 2008 from the Commanding Officer of TEAMS II Development Bureau to all commanding officers – This 15.2 advises that TEAMS II will electronically generate a Transfer Action Item (TAI) for each sworn officer transferring into a command. The officer's supervisor shall complete the TAI by reviewing the officer's TEAMS II report and referencing the TER, and the officer's commanding officer shall approve and complete the TAI and TER within 10 days of publication of the related transfer order.

Audit Objectives

Objective A1: To determine if Transfer Action Items (TAIs) were being generated for all sworn officer transfers.

Objective A2: To determine if both the TAIs and TEAMS Evaluation Reports (TERs)⁵ were completed within 10 days of publication of the related transfer orders.

Objective A3: To determine if management approved the TERs, adequately discussed any sustained complaints and uses of force, and used current TEAMS II reports in the evaluations.

Scope and Methodology

Objective A1: For each of the 39 sworn officer promotions on Transfer Order Nos. 12 and 13 of 2008, it was determined if a corresponding TAI was generated. For each of the 58 judgmentally-selected sworn officer transfers and inter-divisional paygrade changes on Transfer Order Nos. 12 and 13 of 2008, it was determined if a corresponding TAI was generated.⁶

Objectives A2 and A3: From the population of all 135 TAIs closed in November 2008, 26 TAIs were randomly selected for the audit sample. Testing included examination of the corresponding Transfer Orders, TAIs, TERs and TEAMS II reports.

Results

Objective A1: TAIs were generated for all 97 (100%) of the sworn officer transfers tested.

Objective A2 - Timeliness of Completion Tests: Twenty (20) of the 26 (77%) TAIs tested were completed within 10 days of publication of the related transfer order. The remaining 6 TAIs were late anywhere from 2 to 33 days. The OIG expanded the scope to examine all 653 TAIs completed from September 1 to November 30 of 2008, as listed on a report received from TEAMS II Development Bureau. The OIG noted that 464 of the 653 TAIs (71%) were completed on time and that 623 (95%) were completed either on time or less than 31 days late:

>90 days late	61-90 days late	31-60 days late	1-30 days late	on time	total
3	7	20	159	464	653
0.4%	1.1%	3.1%	24.3%	71.1%	100%

⁵ The TER, a manual form, is required to be completed for each transfer and loan. The TER shall document that the reviewer has identified and analyzed the employee's applicable sustained complaints, adverse judicial findings, and uses of force. The TER shall be approved by both the watch commander and commanding officer who receive the transferred officer.

⁶ The sample of 58 consists of all sworn *supervisory* inter-divisional paygrade changes and transfers listed on Transfer Order Nos. 12 and 13 of 2008, and every tenth sworn *non-supervisory* inter-divisional paygrade change or transfer listed on Transfer Order No. 12 of 2008. Note that all the transfers, promotions and inter-divisional paygrade changes on the Transfer Orders involve officers transferring from one division to another, so TAIs are required.

Twenty-three (23) of the 26 (88%) TERs tested were completed within 10 days of publication of the related Transfer Order. The remaining 3 TERs were late anywhere from 2 to 31 days. For 19 of the 26 of the transfers tested, there was a difference between the TAI and TER completion dates, ranging from:

- The TER completion date succeeding the TAI completion date by 34 days, to
- The TAI completion date succeeding the TER completion date by 37 days.

The net average result for all 26 transfers was that the TAI completion date succeeded the TER completion date by 2.7 days.

Objective A2 – Aging of Open (Pending Completion) TAIs: One hundred and eighty (180) TAIs were open (pending completion) as of December 3, 2008; and 26 of these 180 (15%) open TAIs were more than 60 days past due.

>90 days past due	61-90 days past due	31-60 days past due	1-30 days past due	not past due	total
21	5	21	24	109	180
12%	3%	12%	13%	61%	100%

Objective A3 – Testing for Proper Approval and Completion of TERs: For all 26 (100%) TAIs in the audit sample tested, the supervisor and commanding officer approved the TER; adequately addressed employee’s applicable sustained complaints, adverse judicial findings, and uses of force; and used a timely TEAMS II report in the evaluation.

B. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

Background and References

Consent Decree Paragraph 47(i) – *“The protocol shall provide that managers' and supervisors' performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol shall be taken into account in their annual personnel performance evaluations.”*

Intradepartmental Correspondence (15.2) dated April 18, 2008 from the Commanding Officer, of TEAMS II Development Bureau to all commanding officers – This 15.2 advises that TEAMS II will electronically generate a Performance Evaluation Report Action Item (PER) for each sworn officer 30 days before their annual anniversary of their current rank. This PER and the related hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports shall be completed within 60 days of the officer’s anniversary date.

Audit Objectives

Objective B1: To determine if PERs were being generated for all sworn officer annual performance evaluations due.

Objective B2: To determine if both the PERs and hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports were completed within 60 days of the annual anniversary date of the employee's current rank, regardless of paygrade.⁷

Objective B3: To determine if either the PERs or the hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports documented that the manager's or supervisor's performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol was taken into account in their annual performance evaluation.

Scope and Methodology

Objective B1: From the population of all 666 sworn officers with November anniversary dates, 30 officers were randomly selected for the audit sample. For each officer, it was determined if a corresponding PER was generated.

Objectives B2 and B3: From the population of all 80 PERs for sworn supervisory and managerial officers closed in November 2008, 22 PERs were randomly selected for the audit sample.⁸ Testing included examination of the PERs and hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports.

Results

Objective B1: PERs were generated for all 30 (100%) sworn officers in the audit sample with November anniversary dates.

Objective B2 - Timeliness of Completion Tests: Of the 22 hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports in the audit sample tested, 10 (45%) were completed on time, 11 (50%) were completed late (averaging 27 days late), and 1 (5%) was not completed. Also, 2,101 PERs were open (pending completion) as of December 3, 2008; and 11 (0.5%) of these 2,101 open PERs were more than 60 days past due.

According to TEAMS II Development Bureau, timeliness of completion should be determined based on the date that the evaluated officer signs the hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports (hardcopy date), not the completion date recorded on the related PER (electronic date). While these dates may differ, what is important is that the employee is served timely.

- For 13 PERs, the hardcopy date succeeded the electronic date, ranging from 1 to 105 days.
- For 7 PERs, the electronic date succeeded the hardcopy date, ranging from 4 to 131 days.
- For 1 PER, the hardcopy and electronic dates were the same.

The net average result for the 21 completed PERs was that the hardcopy date succeeded the electronic date by 10 days.

⁷ For example, if the employee was promoted to his/her current rank of sergeant on September 16, 2006, the current rank anniversary date for 2008 would be September 16, 2008.

⁸ The random sample of 22 included 21 supervisors (19 sergeants and 2 lieutenants) and 1 manager (captain).

Objective B2 – Aging of Open (Pending Completion) PERs: Of the 2,101 PERs open as of December 3, 2008, 392 (19%) were past due. Note that only 11 of the 2,101 (0.5%) open PERs were more than 60 days past due. See schedule below.

>90 days past due	61-90 days past due	31-60 days past due	1-30 days past due	not past due	Total
0	11	132	249	1,709	2,101
0%	0.5%	6.3%	11.9%	81.3%	100%

Objective B3 – Testing for Compliance with ¶47(i): For 11 of the 18 (61%) applicable PERs tested in the audit sample tested,⁹ there was evidence that the manager’s or supervisor’s performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol was taken into account in their annual performance evaluation.¹⁰

Note: Effective January 2009, the Department replaced the hardcopy Performance Evaluation Report form with the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) form. The SBA form’s Development of Subordinates section contains the following boxes to be checked if the officer either *meets or sometimes exceeds standards* (1☐),¹¹ or *needs improvement* (2☐):
1☐ “Regularly reviews various RMIS¹² reports, audits, Action Items using the TEAMS II system. Completes TEAMS II transfer reviews on time.”
2☐ “Seldom or never reviews various RMIS reports, audits, Action Items using the TEAMS II system. Does not complete the TEAMS II transfer reviews on time.”

Hence, presuming that the reviewers check boxes 1☐ or 2☐ as required, compliance with Consent Decree Paragraph 47(i) should improve in the future.

C. SUPERVISOR ACTION ITEMS (SAIs)

Background and References

Consent Decree Paragraph 47(a) – “The protocol shall require that, on a regular basis, supervisors review and analyze all relevant information in TEAMS II about officers under their supervision to detect any pattern or series of incidents that indicate that an officer, group of officers, or an LAPD unit under his or her supervision may be engaging in at-risk behavior.”

Consent Decree Paragraph 47(b) – “The protocol shall provide that when at-risk behavior may be occurring based on a review and analysis described in the preceding subparagraph, appropriate managers and supervisors shall undertake a more intensive review of the officer's performance.”

⁹ Some of the officers included in the sample with a supervisory rank (e.g., an Internal Affairs Group sergeant investigating complaints) did not actually supervise officers. Hence, most of the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol, including reviewing Action Items, were not applicable.

¹⁰ The Federal Monitor reported 53% compliance with CD¶ 47(i) in its quarterly report issued November 17, 2008, pertaining to its audit testing of PERs completed in Deployment Periods Nos. 7 and 8 of 2008.

¹¹ If the officer *greatly exceeds standards*, box 1☐ should be checked, with a supplemental narrative to explain why, as there is no comparable box in the *greatly exceeds standards* performance level.

¹² Risk Management Information System (RMIS) is an application within TEAMS II.

Special Order No. 28, 2008, dated August 29, 2008 – This Special Order states that TEAMS II allows supervisors and managers to manually create a SAI to review a subordinate's performance and to document reviews for periodic monitoring. The supervisor should document the extent of their review and justify any corrective action necessary. Also, an SAI can be created if the result of a subordinate's annual performance evaluation warrants further action.

Audit Objective C

To determine if the disposition assigned for each SAI was consistent with information in the sworn officer's TEAMS II report and if the applicable corrective action was taken.¹³

Scope and Methodology

From the population of all 94 SAIs closed in November 2008,¹⁴ 24 SAIs were randomly selected for the audit sample. For each SAI, the officer's TEAMS II and Summary of Employee Activity reports¹⁵ were generated and examined.

Results

The disposition assigned for each of the 24 SAIs in the audit sample tested was consistent with information in the sworn officer's TEAMS II report. Testing for evidence of corrective action was not applicable for any of the 24 SAIs, as none of the 24 SAIs had dispositions indicating that corrective action was needed.

CONCLUSION

TAIs were generated as required for all sworn officer transfers tested, and PERs were generated as required for all sworn officers with November 2008 rank anniversary dates tested. This was a major improvement since the last audit, which found that action items were not created [manually] for the vast majority of sworn officer transfers and annual performance evaluations.

The TEAMS Evaluation Reports (TERs) pertaining to the TAIs tested were completed accurately and reasonably timely. The hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports pertaining to the PERs were also generally completed reasonably timely.

¹³ For example, if the No Action disposition was assigned, there were no recent sustained complaints, out-of-policy uses of force, preventable traffic collisions, etc. that were not already addressed which might have warranted a different disposition.

¹⁴ The population of 94 SAIs excluded those SAIs with the dispositions of Cancel and No Action – Note for Annual Review Only.

¹⁵ The Summary of Employee Activity Report (R02) compares the employee's activity numbers (of arrests, citations, claims and lawsuits, collisions, complaints, etc.) to the averages within their unit and two other comparable units.

Sixty-one percent of the sworn supervisor or manager annual evaluations tested included evidence on either the PER or hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports that the supervisor's or manager's performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol was taken into account in their annual personnel performance evaluation, as required by Consent Decree Paragraph 47(i). Effective January 2009 (subsequent to audit testing), the Department replaced the hardcopy Performance Evaluation Reports with the Standards Based Assessment (SBA) form. Since this new SBA form prompts the evaluator to address the supervisor's or manager's performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol, compliance with Consent Decree Paragraph 47(i) should improve in the future.