

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

June 27, 2011
14.1

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Chief of Police

SUBJECT: GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL/COMMUNITY LAW ENFORCEMENT
AND RECOVERY PROGRAM – SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT
(IAID NO. 11-021)

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

1. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) / Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Program (CLEAR) - Selection Criteria Audit.
2. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

DISCUSSION

Internal Audits and Inspections Division conducted the GED/CLEAR - Selection Criteria Audit to evaluate compliance with related Department directives. The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of officers and supervisors in GED/CLEAR assignments while adhering to Department policies and procedures.

If additional information regarding this inspection is required, please contact Gerald L. Chaleff, Special Assistant for Constitutional Policing, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Attachment

**GANG ENFORCEMENT DETAIL/COMMUNITY LAW ENFORCEMENT AND RECOVERY
PROGRAM – SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Conducted by
Internal Audits and Inspections Division**

Fourth Quarter, FY 2010/11

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year (FY) 2010/11 Department Audit and Inspection Plan, Internal Audits and Inspections Division (LAID) conducted the Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Program (CLEAR) – Selection Criteria Audit to evaluate compliance with related Department directives. The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of officers and supervisors in GED/CLEAR assignments while adhering to Department policies and procedures. The audit addresses a portion of the Transition Agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice by testing the current management of gang units as it relates to the selection and suitability of gang sworn personnel, while serving as an internal tool for the Department.

The table below provides an overall summary of the finding as they relate to each objective.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Objective	Description of Audit Objectives	Results ¹
		FY 2010/11
1	Eligibility Requirements Met	74/74 (100%)
2	Completeness of the Selection Package	54/91 (59%)
3(a)	Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER)	84/91 (92%)
3(b)	Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TER	36/74 (49%)
3(c)	Timely Supervisor Approval of the Selection on the TER	79/91 (87%)
4	Completion of Confidential Financial Disclosure (CFD)	113/113 (100%) ²
5(a)	Documented Review of Sustained Complaints	118/118 (100%)
5(b)	Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings	117/118 (99%)
6	Adherence to Limited Tour Assignment Guidelines	90/91 (99%)

¹ The methodology and population used in the FY 2009/10 audit varies significantly from the present audit, as a result, findings are not comparable.

² Five packages were not reviewed for CFD. Of the five packages, 1 Extension officer and 2 Current Suitability officers were loaned out to Van Nuys Division Patrol from Van Nuys Area GED. One New Officer at Pacific Area was loaned out to Operations-West Bureau Task Force. All four of the mentioned officers are no longer assigned to GED. The remaining New Officer was assigned to Southeast Area GED Admin. As of DP 6, the New Officer is assigned to regular GED duties and has completed the CFD.

RECOMMENDATION

None.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

1. The findings in this audit were shared at a Bureau Gang Coordinator/GIT meeting on June 16, 2011.
2. The GED/CLEAR-Selection Criteria Audit was forwarded to the Assistant Director of the Office of Operations. The Area Commanding Officers and Gang Impact Team (GIT) Officers in Charge will be directed to share this audit with all GED/CLEAR supervisors.

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
GED/CLEAR - SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT
(IAID NO. 11-021)



CONDUCTED BY

INTERNAL AUDITS & INSPECTIONS DIVISION

CHARLIE BECK
Chief of Police

Fourth Quarter, FY 2010/11

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GED/CLEAR – SELECTION CRITERIA AUDIT (IAID NO. 11-021)

Page
No.

<u>PURPOSE</u>	1
<u>PRIOR AUDIT</u>	1
<u>METHODOLOGY</u>	1
<u>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS</u>	3
<u>DETAILED FINDINGS</u>	3
<i>Objective No. 1 - Eligibility Requirements Met</i>	3
<i>Objective No. 2 - Completeness of the Selection Package</i>	4
<i>Objective No. 3(a) - Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report</i>	5
<i>Objective No. 3(b) - Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TER</i>	6
<i>Objective No. 3(c) - Timely Supervisor Approval of the Selection on the TER</i>	7
<i>Objective No. 4 - Completion of Financial Disclosure</i>	8
<i>Objective No. 5(a) - Documented Review of Sustained Complaints</i>	9
<i>Objective No. 5(b) - Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings</i>	10
<i>Objective No. 6 - Adherence to Limited Tour Assignment Guidelines</i>	10
<u>RECOMMENDATION</u>	11
<u>ACTIONS TAKEN / MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE</u>	11

INTERNAL AUDITS AND INSPECTIONS DIVISION
Gang Enforcement Detail/Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Program
Selection Criteria Audit
Fourth Quarter, FY 2010/11

PURPOSE

In accordance with the Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year (FY) 2010/11 Department Audit and Inspection Plan, Internal Audits and Inspections Division (IAID) conducted the Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Program (CLEAR) – Selection Criteria Audit to evaluate compliance with related Department directives.¹ The audit included a review of the processes pertaining to the selection and suitability of officers and supervisors in GED/CLEAR assignments while adhering to Department policies and procedures. The audit addresses a portion of the Transition Agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice by testing the current management of gang units as it relates to the selection and suitability of gang personnel, while serving as an internal tool for the Department.

Internal Audits and Inspections Division conducted the audit under the guidance of generally accepted government auditing standards. These standards guided the methodology of the audit supporting the capture of sufficient, appropriate evidence in order to ascertain a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions. As such, IAID has determined the evidence captured for the audit provides a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions generated satisfying this audit's objectives.

PRIOR AUDIT

The previous GED/CLEAR-Selection Criteria Audit was conducted during the Fourth Quarter, FY 2009/10. Internal Audits and Inspections Division reviewed the processes and procedures for selection and suitability of personnel into GED/CLEAR assignments. Officers and supervisors in GED/CLEAR assignments from January 4, 2009 to April 6, 2010, were evaluated for compliance with selection and suitability as provided for by Department policy and procedure. In each of the six objectives the Department had an adherence rate of 90 percent or better; there were no recommendations.

METHODOLOGY

Time Period and Population

The audit time period selected for this audit was Deployment Period (DP) No. 4, 2011. In consideration of policy changes, the Deployment Planning System rosters for April 11, 2011, were used, thereby, providing an adequate time for adherence to the financial disclosure requirements.²

The population consisted of officers and supervisors, who entered a GED/CLEAR unit from January 4, 2009 through April 11, 2011, and were assigned to GED/CLEAR units on April 11, 2011.³ A total of 205 GED/CLEAR personnel were assigned to GED/CLEAR units on April 11, 2011.

¹ The selection process for both GED and CLEAR units is the same.

² Per the Department Manual, Volume 3, Section 381, "Incumbent personnel of the rank of lieutenant and below assigned to GIT, GED, CLEAR, ND, or NED positions, will be required to complete the Confidential Financial Disclosure Face Sheet and a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, within ten calendar days after their two-year exemption period has expired from the effective date [March 29, 2009], if they wish to remain in their current assignment."

³ Criminal Gang and Homicide Division and Northeast Area were not operating GED/CLEAR units during the time period selected for this audit.

The audit population was sectioned into five categories of GED/CLEAR personnel. These five categories are defined as New Officers, New Supervisors, Loan (officer or supervisor), Limited Tour Extensions (officer/supervisor), and Current Suitability (officer/supervisor).

The GED/CLEAR personnel categories of New Officers and New Supervisors consisted of personnel who had entered the unit during the time period selected for this audit and were commencing a 39 DP tour of duty. The GED/CLEAR personnel category of Loan consisted of personnel who had entered the unit on loan during the time period selected for this audit. The GED/CLEAR personnel category of Limited Tour Extensions consisted of personnel who had received an extension to their tour of duty during the time period selected for this audit.⁴ The GED/CLEAR personnel category of Current Suitability consisted of personnel who were assigned to a GED/CLEAR unit on April 11, 2011, and had been reviewed in the prior audit.

The aforementioned categories totaled 118 GED/CLEAR selection packages which were reviewed in this audit; the sampled selection packages were bifurcated to implement appropriate testing instruments, as indicated below.

There were a total of 160 GED/CLEAR personnel that represented new selections into GED/CLEAR. A stratified statistically valid sample of 73 New Officers and New Supervisors were randomly selected.⁵

The entire population of 45 GED/CLEAR personnel for the categories of Loan, Limited Tour Extensions, and Current Suitability was utilized.⁶

THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

⁴ The aforementioned categories of officers were also included if they had joined the unit prior to our selected time period for this audit, and for which their respective selection packages had *not* been previously reviewed.

⁵ This sample consisted of 55 New Officers and 18 New Supervisors; the sample size was obtained utilizing a one-tail test with a 95% confidence level and a 4% error rate.

⁶ The population consisted of 1 Loan, 17 Limited Tour Extensions, and 27 Current Suitability.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

TABLE NO. 1– SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Objective	Description of Audit Objectives	Results ⁷
		FY 2010/11
1	Eligibility Requirements Met	74/74 (100%)
2	Completeness of the Selection Package	54/91 (59%)
3(a)	Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER)	84/91 (92%)
3(b)	Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TER	36/74 (49%)
3(c)	Timely Supervisor Approval of the Selection on the TER	79/91 (87%)
4	Completion of Financial Disclosure (CFD)	113/113 (100%) ⁸
5(a)	Documented Review of Sustained Complaints	118/118 (100%)
5(b)	Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings	117/118 (99%)
6	Adherence to Limited Tour Assignment Guidelines	90/91 (99%)

DETAILED FINDINGS

Objective No. 1 - Eligibility Requirements Met

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Basic Eligibility Requirements – Officers - states, *“Completed probation and have acquired three years as a police officer with the Department, two years (26 deployment periods) of which must have been service performed in a geographic field (patrol), Transit Bus/Rail patrol, and/or traffic assignment.”*

Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Basic Eligibility Requirements – Supervisors - states, *“A minimum of one year as a patrol supervisorand completed and wheeled from a probationary Area of supervisory assignment.”*

Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Transfer/Loan Requirements – states, *“Transfers/loans to GED based on operational needs shall be justified in writing on an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00.”*

⁷ The methodology and population used in the FY 2009/10 audit varies significantly from the present audit, as a result findings are not comparable.

⁸ Five packages were not reviewed for CFD. Of the five packages, 1 Extension officer and 2 Current Suitability officers were loaned out to Van Nuys Division Patrol from Van Nuys Area GED. One New Officer at Pacific Area was loaned out to Operations West Bureau Task Force. All four of the mentioned officers are no longer assigned to GED. The remaining New Officer was assigned to Southeast Area GED Admin. As of DP 6, the New Officer is assigned to regular GED duties and has completed the CFD.

Audit Procedures

A total of 74 GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for this objective.⁹ The selection packages and TEAMS II reports of GED/CLEAR personnel were reviewed to determine whether the requirements for time periods and specific assignments were satisfied. The Department met the standards if GED/CLEAR personnel satisfied the eligibility requirements at the time of application.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 74 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 2 – Completeness of the Selection Package

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.75, Gang Enforcement Detail – Qualification and Selection Requirements - states, "... *sworn personnel applying for assignment to a GED shall submit the following:*

- *Standards Based Assessment, Form 01.87.00, the last two ratings (annual or transfer) due prior to the start of the selection process. The two most recent ratings reviewed to determine selection to a GED must cover a period over a year;*
- *GED Selection Checklist, New Selection, Form 12.16.00; and;*
- *Training, Evaluation and Management Systems II (TEAMS II) report (promotion/paygrade advancement TEAMS II report only);*
- *The employee's Training Evaluation and Management Systems (TEAMS) report should not be over 30 days old; and*
- *TEAMS Evaluation Report.*

Audit Procedures

A total of 91 GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for this objective.¹⁰ TEAMS II reports met the standard if they were submitted on or before the watch commander approved the selection of the personnel.

The Selection Packages of GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for completeness. A package was defined as complete if all items were present in the package and in accordance with Department policy as described above.

⁹ This included 73 New Officers/Supervisors, and 1 Loan.

¹⁰ This included 73 New Officers/Supervisors, 1 Loan, and 17 Limited Tour Extensions.

Findings

Fifty four (59%) of the 91 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.¹¹

Findings - NEW OFFICERS

Thirty one (56%) of 55 GED/CLEAR New Officers met the standards for this objective.

Findings – NEW SUPERVISORS

Twelve (67%) of 18 GED/CLEAR New Supervisors met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LOAN

The one (100%) GED/CLEAR Loan met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LIMITED TOUR EXTENSIONS

Nine (53%) of 17 GED/CLEAR Limited Tour Extensions met the standards for this objective.

TABLE NO. 2 – COMPLETE SELECTION PACKAGE

GED/CLEAR Selection Packages	Correct TER Version	GED Checklist / Extension Request	SBAs Covering One Year¹²	TEAMS II Promotion/ Paygrade Version	TEAMS II Report w/in 30 Days
Totals	70/91(77%)	88/91(97%)	86/91(95%)	86/91(95%)	77/91 (85%)

Objective No. 3(a) – Completeness of TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER)

Criteria

Department Manual Section 5/01.78.04, TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04 – states “*A TEAMS Evaluation Report shall be completed for each officer transferring in or loaned to a new command, and when selecting sworn personnel to ...Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) positions. This form is used to ensure that all required information has been evaluated and the findings documented, as appropriate. The commanding officer gaining the transferred or loaned officer or selecting officers for assignment to ... GED shall review the required documentation specific to each selection procedure and complete a TEAMS Evaluation Report.*”

Audit Procedures

A total of 91 GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for this objective. The TERs in the selection packages were examined for the following documentation:

- Divisional employee folder reviewed;
- Department personnel package reviewed;
- Adverse Judicial Findings reviewed;
- “Watch Commander/Supervisor Completing Review” field completed; and,
- “Commanding Officer Approving” field completed.

¹¹ During the past six years, there have been six different versions of the TER (12/2005, 1/2008, 10/2008, 12/2008, 2/2011 and 4/2011).

¹² Findings related to untimely SBAs are not directly attributable to officers applying to the GED/CLEAR units, or the supervisors conducting the eligibility reviews.

The Department met the standards if all of the above items were completed.

Findings

Eighty four (92%) of the 91 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.¹³

Findings - NEW OFFICERS

Fifty (91%) of 55 GED/CLEAR New Officers met the standards for this objective.

Findings – NEW SUPERVISORS

Sixteen (89%) of 18 GED/CLEAR New Supervisors met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LOAN

The one (100%) GED/CLEAR Loan met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LIMITED TOUR EXTENSIONS

Each (100%) of the 17 GED/CLEAR Limited Tour Extensions met the standards for this objective.

TABLE NO. 3 – COMPLETENESS OF TEAMS EVALUATION REPORT

GED/CLEAR Selection Packages	Reviewed Div. Employee Folder	Reviewed Dept Pers Package	Reviewed Adverse Judicial Findings	Watch Cmdr Signature	Commanding Officer Signature
Totals	90/91(99%)	91/91(100%)	91/91(100%)	86/91(95%)	90/91(99%) ¹⁴

Objective No. 3(b) – Documentation of Suitability Interview in the TER

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.76, Suitability Interview – states, “*The Suitability Interview..... is a vehicle used to confirm a selectee’s suitability for assignment to a GED.... Commanding officers shall be responsible for documenting on a TEAMS II Evaluation Report, a brief, positive evaluation of all GED/CLEAR selectees, incorporating reasons for that employee’s selection. For applicants selected via the Suitability Interview, one TEAMS II Evaluation Report may be used to document both the positive evaluation and the Suitability Interview.*”

Audit Procedures

A total of 74 GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for this objective. The TER in the selection package was examined to determine if written documentation existed indicating that a Suitability Interview had occurred. The selection package met the standard when articulation indicated a suitability interview had taken place.

¹³ Transfer dates are missing on GED/CLEAR personnel TERs.

¹⁴ The commanding officer’s signature was not dated which is critical in determining approval of the review/selection after checks were made and not before.

Findings

Thirty six (49%) of 74 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.

Findings - NEW OFFICERS

Twenty-six (47%) of 55 GED/CLEAR New Officers met the standards for this objective.

Findings – NEW SUPERVISORS

Ten (56%) of 18 GED/CLEAR New Supervisors met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LOAN

The one (0%) GED/CLEAR Loan did not meet the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 3(c) – Timely Supervisor Approval of the Selection on the TER

Criteria

Department Manual 5/01.78.04, TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04 – states “*A TEAMS Evaluation Report shall be completed for each officer transferring in or loaned to a new command, and when selecting sworn personnel to ...Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) positions. This form is used to ensure that all required information has been evaluated and the findings documented, as appropriate. The commanding officer gaining the transferred or loaned officer or selecting officers for assignment to ... GED shall review the required documentation specific to each selection procedure and complete a TEAMS Evaluation Report.*”

Audit Procedures

A total of 91 GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for this objective. Each of the 91 GED/CLEAR personnel TER's had three attributes for evaluation. These attributes included the approval and signature of an Interviewing Supervisor, Watch Commander, and Commanding Officer. An exception to these attributes was the category of Limited Tour Extensions, which did not require an Interviewing Supervisor review process.

Approval of the TER by the required supervisor should not occur until the entire review process has been completed. The Department met the standard when the Interviewing Supervisor signed the TER on or after conducting an interview with the New Officers, New Supervisors, or Loan, and when the respective watch commander and commanding officer approved and signed the TER after all the appropriate reviews had been conducted for all GED/CLEAR personnel.

Findings

Seventy nine (87%) of the 91 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.

Findings - NEW OFFICERS

Forty nine (89%) of 55 GED/CLEAR New Officers met the standards for this objective.

Findings – NEW SUPERVISORS

Thirteen (72%) of 18 GED/CLEAR New Supervisors met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LOAN

The one (100%) GED/CLEAR Loan met the standards for this objective.

Findings – LIMITED TOUR EXTENSIONS

Sixteen (94%) of 17 GED/CLEAR Limited Tour Extensions met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 4 – Completion of Financial Disclosure

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/381, Confidential Financial Disclosure Policy and Procedures for Gang Enforcement Detail – states, “*As part of the selection process and retention of an existing position within any assignment or loan to ...Gang Enforcement Detail (GED), Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (LEAR) Unit....positions, sworn employees at the rank of lieutenant or below shall submit a completed Confidential Financial Disclosure Face Sheet, Form 01.74.00, and a Confidential Financial Disclosure Report, Form 01/74.01*”

Audit Procedures

Internal Audits and Inspections Division personnel ensured that steps were taken with respect to the confidentiality of all material submitted by GED/CLEAR personnel regarding the Confidential Financial Disclosure (CFD). As such, a list was provided by the Financial Disclosure Section of IAID. This list *only* contained the names of GED/CLEAR personnel in the audit’s population, and the date they signed the disclosure. This spreadsheet was utilized to verify compliance. *No other financial disclosure material or information was utilized in this audit.*

All 113 applicable GED/CLEAR personnel selection packages were examined for this objective.¹⁵ The Department met the standards if the GED/CLEAR personnel signed the CFD within the time constraints as delineated by Department policy.

¹⁵ Five packages were not reviewed for CFD. Of the five packages, 1 Extension officer and 2 Current Suitability officers were loaned out to Van Nuys Division Patrol from Van Nuys Area GED. One New Officer at Pacific Area was loaned out to Operations West Bureau Task Force. Each of the mentioned officers are no longer assigned to GED. The remaining New Officer was assigned to Southeast Area GED Admin. As of DP 6, 2011 the New Officer is assigned to regular GED duties and has completed the CFD.

Finding

Each (100%) of the 113 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 5(a) – Documented Review of Sustained Complaints

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.77, Review of Selected Candidates Work History and Evaluation of Findings – states, “*Supervisors shall document in writing on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, their consideration of any sustained complaint...or discipline against an officer for each of the following:*

- *Excessive Force;*
- *False arrest or charge;*
- *Improper search/seizure;*
- *Sexual Harassment;*
- *Discrimination; or,*
- *Dishonesty.”*

Audit Procedures

All 118 GED/CLEAR personnel selection packages were examined for this objective. The TEAMS II reports of the GED/CLEAR personnel who were categorized as New Officers, New Supervisors, or Loan were reviewed for their work history of complaints involving excessive force, false arrest, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty. The GED/CLEAR personnel in the remaining categories of Current Suitability and Limited Tour Extensions were reviewed for their work history of complaints only subsequent to the point they were previously reviewed. The appropriate review, evaluation, and documentation were evaluated within the TER.

The Department met the standards if there was appropriate documentation within the TER of the review and evaluation for any sustained complaints consisting of the aforementioned criteria.

Findings

Each (100%) of the 118 GED/CLEAR selection packages met the standards for this objective.

Objective No. 5(b) – Documented Review of Adverse Judicial Findings

Criteria

Department Manual Section 3/763.77, Review of Selected Candidates Work History and Evaluation of Findings – states, “*Supervisors shall document in writing on a TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, their consideration of any ... adverse judicial finding... against an officer for each of the following:*

- *Excessive Force;*
- *False arrest or charge;*
- *Improper search/seizure;*
- *Sexual Harassment;*
- *Discrimination; or,*
- *Dishonesty.”*

Audit Procedures

All 118 GED/CLEAR personnel selection packages were examined for this objective. The TEAMS II reports of the GED/CLEAR personnel who were categorized as New Officers, New Supervisors, or Loan were reviewed for adverse judicial findings involving excessive force, false arrest, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty. The GED/CLEAR personnel in the remaining categories of Current Suitability and Limited Tour Extensions were reviewed for adverse judicial findings only subsequent to the point they were previously reviewed. The appropriate review, evaluation and documentation were evaluated within the TER.

The Department met the standards if there was appropriate documentation within the TER of the review and evaluation of any adverse judicial findings consisting of the aforementioned criteria.

Findings

One hundred seventeen (99%) of the 118 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.

One Limited Tour Extension selection package had an adverse judicial finding consisting of false arrest that was not considered/documented within the TER.

Objective No. 6 – Adherence to Limited Tour Assignment Guidelines

Criteria

Department Manual Section, 3/763.78, Gang Enforcement Detail as a Limited Tour Assignment - states, “*The Gang Enforcement Detail is a limited tour assignment. Officers and supervisors are limited to 39 deployment periods in a GED assignment. A GED officer shall not work in a GED assignment beyond the tour limit of 39 Deployment Periods until his/her extension request has been approved by the appropriate entity and placed in the officer’s interview/selection package.”* Additionally, officers and supervisors, at the end of their GED tours, are not eligible for another GED assignment, except with Chief of Police approval, until 13 deployments periods have elapsed since completion of their most recent GED assignment.”

Audit Procedures

A total of 91 GED/CLEAR personnel were examined for this objective. The TEAMS II reports, Transfer Applicant Data Reports, and GED/CLEAR Selection Checklists were reviewed to determine whether the GED/CLEAR personnel limited tour assignments were within the guidelines set forth in Department policy. The Department met the standard if the GED/CLEAR personnel obtained proper and timely approval for the extension.

The New Officers, New Supervisors, and Loan GED/CLEAR personnel categories tested whether the GED/CLEAR personnel held a previous GED/CLEAR assignment. When a previous assignment of 39 DPs had been completed, this objective tested if 13 DPs had elapsed since the completion of their most recent GED/CLEAR assignment.

The review of the Limited Tour Extension GED/CLEAR personnel category was tested to determine whether the applicant's request for extension received appropriate approval by the Bureau Commanding Officer (if the extension was less than three DPs), or the Chief of Police (if the extension request was more than three DPs).

Findings

Ninety (99%) of 91 GED/CLEAR personnel met the standards for this objective.

One GED/CLEAR personnel in the New Supervisor category had a previous GED/CLEAR assignment, which exceeded the 39 DP limit. The supervisor served a prior GED assignment immediately preceding the current assignment. The Chief of Police waived the 13 DP restriction, providing for the supervisor to proceed from a first limited tour assignment of 39 DPs to another. However, the request to the Chief of Police for the waiver was not submitted and approved prior to the end of the first 39 DP tour. Additionally, an extension request from the Bureau Commanding Officer to extend beyond the 39 DP tour was not submitted or approved. Consequently, the supervisor worked beyond the initial first limited tour assignment of 39 DPs without approval.

RECOMMENDATION

1. It is recommended that Area commanding officers and Gang Impact Team (GIT) Officers in Charge share the findings of this audit with all GED/CLEAR supervisors.

ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE

1. The findings to this audit were shared at a Bureau Gang Coordinator / GIT meeting on June 16, 2011.
2. The GED/CLEAR-Selection Criteria Audit was forwarded to the Assistant Director of the Office of Operations.