

## INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

February 10, 2017  
13.5

**TO:** The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

**FROM:** Chief of Police

**SUBJECT:** EVALUATION OF THE BIASED POLICING COMPLAINT MEDIATION  
PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. That the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE this report.

### DISCUSSION

The attached report provides the Board of Police Commissioners with a summary of the work completed under the Department's Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program and recommends that the program be continued as a permanent alternative to traditional complaint investigations with only minor changes to the current guidelines. The report contains data from January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2016, the pilot program's end date.

If you have any questions, please contact Commander Stuart A. Maislin, Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group, at (213) 996-2978.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK  
Chief of Police

Attachment

## **Evaluation of the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program January 30, 2017**

This report provides the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC) with a summary of the work completed under the Department's Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program (Program) and recommends that the Program be continued as a permanent alternative to traditional complaint investigations with only minor changes to the current guidelines. The report contains data from January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2016, the pilot program's end date.

### **Background**

Since 2009, Internal Affairs Group (IAG) has pursued the concept of mediating select cases of biased policing complaints. It was hoped that mediation would influence the way employees communicate and treat people, as well as give community members a better understanding of law enforcement practices, both of which would strengthen community relations. To determine how such a program might be received, LAPD met with community groups and stakeholders, including the Los Angeles Police Protective League (LAPPL) and members of the BOPC. As the meetings indicated widespread support for such a program, IAG developed the Community - Employee Mediation Pilot Program Implementation Plan (Plan).

Under the Plan, select biased policing and discourtesy complaints would go through mediation instead of the traditional, adversary-oriented investigation procedure. Mediation would be an informal, confidential process in which complainants and accused employees meet face-to-face with impartial mediators to discuss the alleged misconduct. While the goal would be to arrive at a mutually agreeable resolution, participants would not be required to reach a formal agreement. Rather, the Plan defines successful mediation as a process in which the parties have heard, clarified, and understood the issues and each other's point of view, which may result in either an agreement or an agreement to disagree.

The Plan's eligibility guidelines limit mediation to biased policing and discourtesy complaints with no additional allegations of misconduct, or only additional minor allegations of misconduct.<sup>1</sup> The Plan provides that complaints involving the following circumstances should not be mediated, though the Commanding Officer, IAG, makes the final determination of case eligibility:

- Force was used;
- Ethnic remark or other specific discourtesy directed at a class of persons;
- A complainant was arrested;
- An employee was assaulted;
- A lawsuit was filed;
- A person was injured;
- Property was damaged;
- Excessive delay in reporting allegations; and,
- Allegations of criminal misconduct.

---

<sup>1</sup> Initially, only biased policing complaints were mediated when the pilot program began in 2014. In September 2015, the Department expanded the Program to include discourtesy complaints.

Per the guidelines, employee eligibility is also limited. Generally, employees are eligible unless they have had two prior complaints with similar allegations within the last twelve months. However, employee eligibility is ultimately at the discretion of the Commanding Officer, IAG, or designee, who may make exceptions as he/she deems appropriate.

The Plan was presented to the BOPC and accepted on July 30, 2013, allowing the Department to finalize its partnership with the Los Angeles City Attorney’s Office (LACA) to develop training and provide mediation services for the Program. On January 1, 2014, the Department, in conjunction with LACA, launched the Program as a 36-month pilot.

Concurrent with the launch of the Program in 2014, the Department developed an eLearning course designed to give employees a general understanding of the Program so they could make an informed decision if contacted about participation. Sworn employees, detention officers and police service representatives of all levels were required to complete the course.

Shortly after the Program started, a research team from the University of Southern California began a study of the Program’s initial implementation efforts. The study was completed in August 2015 and found that the Program had been implemented successfully, that mediators had been well prepared, and that both officers and complainants were highly satisfied and confident in the process. The study also proposed best practices for increasing officer participation, some of which have been implemented, including devoting full-time staff to the Program, outreach efforts that make use of past participants, and creating a complainant reminder procedure to increase the likelihood that complainants will attend their scheduled mediation sessions.

**Program Statistics During the Pilot Period**

From January 1, 2014, through December 31, 2016, 708 complaints were referred to the Program for mediation, and 363 complaints were determined to be eligible, a 51.3 percent eligibility rate. Of the 363 eligible complaints, 91 complaints closed as Mediated (73 mediations and 18 after complainant “no-shows”).<sup>2</sup> The table below summarizes the Program statistics over the three-year period.

<b>Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Program<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Complaints Referred	289	195	224	708
Not Eligible	118 (40.8%)	108 (55.4%)	119 (53.1%)	345 (48.7%)
Eligible	171 (59.2%)	87 (44.6%)	105 (46.9%)	363 (51.3%)
Mediations Conducted	28	30	15	73
Closed Mediated after Complainant No-Shows	6	4	8	18

<sup>2</sup> A complaint may be closed as Mediated if a complainant, without good cause, does not attend scheduled mediation sessions twice, i.e., “no-shows.” In 2014, eight cases closed using this provision; four in 2015; and six in 2016.

<sup>3</sup> In 2014, only biased policing complaints were eligible for mediation. Discourtesy complaints did not become eligible for mediation until September 9, 2015. As a result, the number of complaints referred to the Program and eligible for mediation in 2016 has increased significantly.

While 51.3 percent of the complaints referred to the program were eligible for mediation, IAG reassigned many of the complaints for investigation because the parties to the complaint were unavailable or unwilling to participate. The table below provides data on the number of eligible complaints reassigned from 2014 and through 2016.

Eligible for Mediation but Reassigned	2016	2015	2014	Total
Eligible	171	87	105	363
Reassigned	130 (76.0%)	61 (70.1%)	72 (68.6%)	263 (72.5%)
Complainant could not be located/contacted	20 (15.4%)	20 (32.8%)	19 (26.4%)	59 (22.4%)
Complainant declined	65 (50.0%)	23 (37.7%)	30 (41.7%)	118 (44.9%)
Officer declined	32 (24.6%)	16 (26.2%)	19 (26.4%)	67 (25.5%)
Inappropriate for mediation	6 (4.6%)	2 (3.3%)	4 (5.6%)	12 (4.6%)
Alternative Complaint Resolution	7 (5.4%)			7 (2.7%)

In 2016, IAG began collecting the reasons complainants and employees gave for declining mediation. The data has been used to determine ways to increase participation in the Program. The table below provides a breakdown of the reasons given by complainants and employees in 2016. Comparison data for 2014 and 2015 is not available.

Eligible for Mediation but Reassigned	2016
Eligible	171
Reassigned	130 (76.0%)
Complainant could not be located/contacted	20 (15.4%)
Complainant declined	65 (50.0%)
Wanted full investigation	16 (24.6%)
Too much bother	13 (20.0%)
Avoid other party	6 (9.2%)
Changed mind/does not wish to pursue	6 (9.2%)
Lack of trust in LAPD	2 (3.1%)
No reason given	22 (33.8%)
Officer declined	32 (24.6%)
Wanted full investigation	15 (46.9%)
Avoid other party	6 (18.8%)
Too much bother	1 (3.1%)
No reason given	10 (31.3%)
Inappropriate for mediation	6 (4.6%)
Alternative Complaint Resolution	7 (5.4%)

For complainants, the primary reasons for reassignment were that complainants could not be located or contacted, they wanted a full investigation, or found the process to be too much trouble. In terms of locating complainants, when telephone or email contact is not possible or successful, the Mediation Coordinator attempts to locate complainants by going to their

residence to explain the benefits of the Program. To make it easier for complainants to participate in mediation, the Department worked with the LACA to identify mediators who are available on weekends and evenings. Initially, mediations were only held downtown on weekdays during business hours. Now mediations can be held during weekends and evenings hours, and at locations more convenient to the complainants, such as the private meeting rooms of local libraries.

For employees, the primary reason for reassignment was that officers wanted a full investigation. To provide employees with additional information on how the mediation process can be beneficial, the Coordinator has asked employees who previously participated in mediation to attend outreach at Department trainings, such as Basic Supervisor Schools, Supervisory Update Schools, and training days at various divisions. In addition, to ensure that officers remain aware of the value of the Program, the Mediation Coordinator has submitted articles about the program for inclusion in the Thin Blue Line, the official publication of the LAPPL.

### Satisfaction Surveys

After mediation, participants are asked to complete satisfaction surveys. Though not all participants responded, surveys were received from 185 participants. Based on those surveys, the following table summarizes the responses to four of the survey questions relating to satisfaction with the mediation process, whether the process was fair, whether mediation increased the participant's understanding of the other party, and whether the participant would recommend mediation to others.

In general, participants indicated satisfaction with the mediation process, believed it to be fair, reported an increased understanding of the other party, and were likely to recommend the Program to others.

- Satisfaction with the process: Of the 185 survey responses, 155 participants (83.8%) were either "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the mediation process. Officers were more likely to be satisfied (88.9%) than complainants (76.6%).
- Fairness of the process: In total, 169 participants (91.4%) thought the outcome of the mediation process was either "completely fair" or "somewhat fair." In this category, officers were also more likely to believe the process to be fair (97.2%) than complainants (83.1%).
- Understanding of the Other Party: A total of 125 participants (67.6%) indicated their understanding of the other party increased after mediation. Complainants (70.1%) were more likely than officers (65.7%) to report their understanding had increased.
- Likelihood of Recommending to Others: Out of 185 participants, 160 (86.5%) indicated they were either "very likely" or "somewhat likely" to recommend the mediation process to others. Officers (88.9%) were slightly more likely to recommend the process than complainants (83.1%).

Evaluation of the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program

SATISFACTION SURVEYS		Total Over Three Years						2016		2015		2014	
		Combined		Complainants		Officers							
Total number of responses		185		77		108		70		71		44	
Category	Rating	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Satisfaction with Mediation Process	Very Satisfied	94	50.8%	42	54.5%	52	48.1%	35	50.0%	32	45.1%	27	61.4%
	Somewhat Satisfied	61	33.0%	17	22.1%	44	40.7%	23	32.9%	26	36.6%	12	27.3%
	Somewhat Dissatisfied	17	9.2%	8	10.4%	9	8.3%	6	8.6%	9	12.7%	2	4.5%
	Not Satisfied at All	11	5.9%	8	10.4%	3	2.8%	4	5.7%	4	5.6%	3	6.8%
	Did Not Answer	2	1.1%	2	2.6%			2	2.9%				
Fairness of Mediation Process	Completely Fair	129	69.7%	50	64.9%	79	73.1%	46	65.7%	50	70.4%	33	75.0%
	Somewhat Fair	40	21.6%	14	18.2%	26	24.1%	17	24.3%	15	21.1%	8	18.2%
	Not Very Fair	7	3.8%	6	7.8%	1	0.9%	2	2.9%	4	5.6%	1	2.3%
	Not Fair at All	5	2.7%	3	3.9%	2	1.9%	2	2.9%	1	1.4%	2	4.5%
	Did Not Answer	4	2.2%	4	5.2%			3	4.3%	1	1.4%		
Increase in Understanding	Increased a Great Deal	35	18.9%	17	22.1%	18	16.7%	11	15.7%	14	19.7%	10	22.7%
	Increased Somewhat	55	29.7%	20	26.0%	35	32.4%	17	24.3%	23	32.4%	15	34.1%
	Increased a Little	35	18.9%	17	22.1%	18	16.7%	16	22.9%	9	12.7%	10	22.7%
	Did Not Increase	54	29.2%	19	24.7%	35	32.4%	23	32.9%	23	32.4%	8	18.2%
	Did Not Answer	6	3.2%	4	5.2%	2	1.9%	3	4.3%	2	2.8%	1	2.3%
Likelihood of Recommending	Very Likely	114	61.6%	46	59.7%	68	63.0%	43	61.4%	42	59.2%	29	65.9%
	Somewhat Likely	46	24.9%	18	23.4%	28	25.9%	16	22.9%	18	25.4%	12	27.3%
	Not Very Likely	14	7.6%	6	7.8%	8	7.4%	5	7.1%	8	11.3%	1	2.3%
	Not Likely at All	6	3.2%	3	3.9%	3	2.8%	4	5.7%			2	4.5%
	Did Not Answer	5	2.7%	4	5.2%	1	0.9%	2	2.9%	3	4.2%		

**Cost Analysis - Mediation Compared to Investigation and Adjudication**

To determine how mediation of biased policing complaints compares to the investigation and adjudication of biased policing complaints, data regarding the time and salary costs associated with each were gathered. Only biased policing complaints that would have been eligible for mediation were included to ensure that the cost data for the investigation and adjudication process would be similar to complaints that are mediated. Further, since biased policing complaints are eligible for mediation only if there are no additional allegations or only additional minor allegations of misconduct, the cost analysis was limited to complaints with only one or two accused employees, with one biased policing allegation against each employee, and no more than one additional allegation of minor misconduct.

Time and Cost Investigating and Adjudicating Biased Policing Complaints

Biased policing complaints are investigated by IAG sergeants and detectives. Data on time spent investigating biased policing complaints came from 56 closed complaints that had been eligible

Evaluation of the Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program

for mediation but had to be reassigned for investigation because either the employee or the complainant declined to participate in the Program. The complaints were reviewed to determine the date reported and the date closed, the rank of the investigators, their hourly salary, and the hours spent on investigation. The total investigation hours and the total salary cost associated with the 56 complaints were averaged to determine the estimated time and cost associated with investigating a biased policing complaint.

After investigation, complaints are sent to the accused employee's commanding officer for adjudication, and then to the bureau commanding officer for a second level review. The time and cost data associated with adjudicating biased policing complaints by the employee's chain-of-command was obtained through a survey of the complaint coordinators at the Areas and divisions. The coordinators were asked to estimate the time spent on each step of the adjudication process based on a hypothetical complaint with only one or two employees accused of biased policing. The resulting data from the 11 patrol and three traffic divisions that responded were averaged to arrive at the time and cost associated with the first level review of a biased policing complaint. Similarly, to obtain data on time spent by the bureaus reviewing the complaints and recommended adjudications, the four geographical bureaus were surveyed, and the data averaged to arrive at the time and cost associated with the second level review of a biased policing complaint.

Finally, since complaints are returned to IAG for review and closeout, data on the time and salary cost associated with IAG reviews were also included. On average, as shown in the table below, the investigation and adjudication of a biased policing complaint takes about 27 hours and costs approximately \$1,580 in terms of salary. Additionally, it took an average of 277 days for a biased policing complaint to go through the entire investigation and adjudication process.

<b>COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION AND ADJUDICATION PROCESS</b>	<b>Avg. Hrs.</b>	<b>Avg. Cost</b>
<b>Investigation of Complaint</b>		
<b>By Internal Affairs Group (IAG) investigators (Sergeant/Detective)</b>	<b>15.51</b>	<b>\$880.19</b>
<b>Adjudication of Complaint</b>		
<b>By Area/Division, which includes the following steps:</b>	<b>5.33</b>	<b>\$322.02</b>
Administrative tasks (e.g. project assignment, tracking) (Secretary/Police Officer/Sergeant) Review of IAG investigation (Sergeant/Lieutenant) Draft Letter of Transmittal (LOT) (Sergeant/Lieutenant) Presentation of investigation and LOT to commanding officer (Sergeant/Lieutenant) Commanding officer review of investigation and LOT (Captain) Meet with accused employee (depending on circumstances, Sergeant/Lieutenant/Captain)		
<b>By Bureau, which includes the following steps:</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>\$229.48</b>
Administrative tasks (e.g. project assignment, tracking) (Secretary/Police Officer) Review of investigation and LOT submitted by Area/Division (Sergeant) Presentation of investigation and LOT to commanding officer (Sergeant) Assistant commanding officer review of investigation and LOT (Commander)		
<b>IAG Review</b>		
<b>By IAG Review and Evaluation Section (Sergeant and Detective Officer-in-Charge)</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>\$88.31</b>
<b>By IAG Commanding Officer (Sergeant and Commander)</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>\$51.80</b>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>26.94</b>	<b>\$1,581.79</b>
<b>Average number of days to close:</b>		<b>277.2 days</b>

It should be noted that because of the time it takes for a complaint to go through the investigation and adjudication process, the closed complaints reviewed for this analysis were initiated in 2014 or the first half of 2015. As a result, the time and cost estimates are based mostly on incidents that occurred before Digital In-Car Video (DICV) and Body-Worn Video (BWV) were widely deployed. Some of the Areas surveyed pointed out that with the addition of DICV and BWV, the time spent on reviewing and adjudicating a complaint would increase simply because of the time it takes to review video recordings.

Time and Cost Mediating Biased Policing Complaints

The Department staffs the Program with one full-time Sergeant II and one full-time Police Officer III. They track complaints referred to the Program, review them for eligibility, locate and contact the complainants and officers to explain about participation in the Program, and coordinate with the LACA to schedule the participants for mediation. There are no costs associated with the investigation or adjudication of mediated complaints as they are closed out after mediation. While the Mediation Coordinator occasionally attends mediation sessions as an observer, it is not done on a regular basis so its time and cost have not been included in this analysis. Also not included are costs associated with the LACA’s effort to coordinate with the volunteer mediators who conduct the mediation, since this analysis focuses solely on the time and cost to the Department.

To determine the Department’s time and salary cost associated with mediating biased policing complaints, the Mediation Coordinator estimated the time spent on each activity when processing a biased policing complaint for mediation, from initial receipt of the referral through the final close out. To determine the amount of time it takes for biased policing complaints to go through the mediation process, 57 mediated biased policing complaints were reviewed to determine the date reported and the date of the mediation.

As shown in the table below, on average, it took about six hours and costs approximately \$335 in terms of salary for the Department to resolve a biased policing complaint through the mediation process. On average, it took about 69 days for a biased policing complaint to go through the entire mediation process.

<b>MEDIATION PROCESS</b>	<b>Avg. Hrs.</b>	<b>Avg. Cost.</b>
Tracking and entry in various databases (Police Officer III)	0.50	\$22.78
Eligibility determination (Police Officer III)	0.50	\$22.78
Locate/contact complainant (Sergeant II)	1.50	\$86.70
Contact officer (Sergeant II)	1.00	\$57.80
Referral to LACA/coordinate/schedule mediation (Sergeant II)	0.50	\$28.90
Review of surveys (LAPD) (Sergeant II)	1.00	\$57.80
Close-out activities (Sergeant II)	1.00	\$57.80
<b>Total:</b>	<b>6.00</b>	<b>\$334.56</b>
<b>Average number of days to close:</b>	<b>68.5 days</b>	

Comparing the cost of mediation to the cost of investigating and adjudicating a biased policing complaint, the average cost of \$335 to mediate is 21.2 percent of the average cost of \$1,580 to investigate and adjudicate a biased policing complaint. In terms of days, it takes an average of 69 days for a complaint to go through the mediation process. This is about 24.9 percent of the 277 days, on average, it takes to investigate and adjudicate a biased policing complaint.



### **Program Goal: Strengthen Community Relations and Trust**

It is hoped that this Program will help the Department strengthen its relationship with the communities it serves. Though change is incremental, all reports indicate progression toward this goal. Communication is a first step. When people talk face-to-face with the guidance of neutral mediators, they can begin to see viewpoints and perceptions different from their own.

Mediation participants on both sides have expressed the merit of the face-to-face interaction. For complainants, merely having a chance to communicate their concerns directly to the officers has been invaluable. Likewise, officers have appreciated the opportunity to explain their actions and, on occasion, have acknowledged that they could have acted differently. Some have even apologized for how their actions made the complainant feel.

While an account of the following mediation was included in a prior update report, it bears repeating as it demonstrates the power of mediation. It involved a Latino college student from East Los Angeles who had been stopped and cited for a Vehicle Code violation. Prior to the mediation, he viewed law enforcement officers as oppressors who unfairly targeted Latino males. The complainant said mediation completely changed his perspective because he gained an understanding of police stops and tactics. For him, it was a liberating experience and his feeling of being constantly targeted was lifted. He believes this transformation helped improve his performance during final exams and offered to share his story with others to promote the Program.

Another mediation story previously reported is reiterated as it illustrates the Program's potential to restore trust. The complaint involved a woman who misinterpreted an officer's signals at a traffic collision. During mediation, she said the officer was harsh and abrupt, which was intimidating and diminished her view of police officers. Moreover, the complainant believed the officer treated her that way because she is a woman. In response, the officer apologized and became emotional when he said she reminded him of his mother, whom he would never have addressed in that manner. The officer assured the complainant he would be more careful with his tone in the future and asked her to look beyond the incident. The complainant's husband, who accompanied her as a support person, offered their forgiveness and said a heavy burden had been eliminated from their home.<sup>4</sup> He added that they would now feel safe calling the police for assistance.

Mediation gives both sides the opportunity to resolve a complaint through dialogue and attempt to see the other's perspective. The constructive exchanges that result are encouraging.

### **Current Efforts to Improve the Program**

The Department and LACA are in the process of developing a screening instrument for matching mediators with participants. Its purpose is to maximize the likelihood of successfully resolving complaints by tailoring the mediators to the participants when possible. Attributes for each participant would be assessed and assigned scores. The overall score would then be translated to its corresponding mediation style.

---

<sup>4</sup> While mediation is limited to the parties involved, depending on the circumstances and with the agreement of all parties, a support person may be present at mediation but must sign a confidentiality agreement and may not participate in the mediation itself.

Prior to scheduling a mediation, participants would be evaluated in terms of how receptive they are to mediation, personal communication style, previous experience with the complaint process, years living and/or working in the Los Angeles area, and education. Using this information along with the participants' demographic makeup, the participants would be matched with mediators, who had been characterized by mediation style in advance.

For example, a community member who articulates her concerns and is eager to have a face-to-face dialogue along with an accused officer who is open to mediation and well aware of what to expect would be matched with a mediator who employs active listening and gentle guidance rather than one who engages with probative questions and encourages conversation.

Now that the 36-month pilot period has ended, the Department is looking at the lessons learned through mediation and developing ways to implement those lessons to prevent future complaints. Officers have realized they could have handled some situations differently and possibly avoided a personnel complaint. One example is recognizing when it is time to "switch gears" or de-escalate tone and body language during a traffic stop, and take an approach focused on community education rather than enforcement. Another example is acknowledging when exhaustion or unexpected overtime has gotten the best of us and gaining self-control. These types of lessons could be integrated into roll-call briefings or in-service training. Outside agencies that have maintained successful mediation programs are also being surveyed regarding their use of information learned through mediation.

### **Modifications to the Program Guidelines**

The Biased Policing Complaint Mediation Pilot Program was conducted to learn whether mediating a select group of complaints was a viable and worthwhile option for the Department. Though the pilot period has shown there are some minor modifications to be made to the Program's guidelines, the overall experience, as highlighted above, is without question beneficial and aligned with the Department's goals.

#### Failure to Appear for Mediation

The Plan stipulated that a complaint may be closed as Mediated if a complainant, without good cause, does not attend two scheduled mediation sessions. The Department proposes an additional provision for closing a case as Mediated without conducting the mediation. If a complainant fails to appear for a scheduled mediation without good cause and there is no subsequent contact from the complainant in response to multiple attempts by the Department to reach him or her to reschedule, the complaint may be closed as Mediated. This provision would only be permissible under the condition that the Department has exercised and documented all possible due diligence efforts, i.e., multiple phone calls, written correspondence, and a follow-up to the complainant's residence.

Additionally, in connection with a forthcoming audit, the Office of the Inspector General has identified that complainants should be notified in writing that the complaint may be closed as Mediated under the above specified "no-show" conditions. Currently complainants receive this information verbally or by email after the first time they fail to attend a scheduled mediation.

The undue inconvenience placed on the volunteer mediators and the needless deployment of employees to mediation sessions that do not materialize are of no benefit to anyone. Moreover,

these complainants are no more likely to appear for investigator interviews if the complaint were to be reassigned for investigation.

Finally, to increase transparency, the Department proposes the use of an additional mediation disposition to identify allegations closed under the permissible complainant no-show conditions.

### **Recommendations**

The Program has been well received since its inception in January 2014. A high percentage of participants (83.8%) report being satisfied with the mediation process, and an equally high percentage of participants (86.5%) would recommend it to others. Further, as a way of resolving some of the biased policing and discourtesy complaints received by the Department, mediation takes much less time and costs the Department much less than the traditional investigation procedure. Finally, by allowing complainants and officers to meet and discuss the issues in person, the mediation process also helps strengthen community relations by building a better understanding between the Department and the communities it serves.

The Department's recommendations are:

- Make the Program a permanent part of the Department's complaint resolution process;
- Change the Program's name to the Community - Police Unification Program to reflect its expanded scope and goals as proposed by the LACA;
- Modify the guidelines to allow another provision for closing a complaint as Mediated without conducting the mediation, specifically, if a complainant fails to appear for a scheduled mediation without good cause and there is no subsequent contact from the complainant in response to multiple attempts by the Department to reach him or her to reschedule when all possible due diligence has been exercised and documented;
- Provide written notification of the specified "no-show" policy to complainants; and,
- Modify the Complaint Management System to differentiate between Mediated and Mediated-Complainant No Show dispositions.

If consent to continue the Program permanently is granted, a Special Order to amend the disciplinary process will be drafted, submitted to Policy and Procedures Division, and ultimately submitted to the Los Angeles Police Protective League to provide notice and an opportunity to meet and confer. In the interim, IAG is requesting approval to continue the Program until the details are finalized.