

LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

**BOARD OF
POLICE COMMISSIONERS**

EILEEN M. DECKER
PRESIDENT

WILLIAM J. BRIGGS, II
VICE PRESIDENT

DALE BONNER
MARIA LOU CALANCHE
STEVE SOBOROFF

MARIA SILVA
COMMISSION EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT II



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

RICHARD M. TEFANK
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARK P. SMITH
INSPECTOR GENERAL

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
POLICE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
100 WEST FIRST STREET, SUITE 134
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4112

(213) 236-1400 PHONE
(213) 236-1410 FAX
(213) 236-1440 TDD

April 26, 2021

BPC #21-0177

The Honorable City Council
City of Los Angeles, Room 395
c/o City Clerk's Office
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Honorable Members:

RE: COMMISSION EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT, DATED APRIL 15, 2021,
REALTIVE TO POLICE COMMISSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPREHENSIVE
REVIEW OF PAST POLICE REFORM REQUIREMENTS

At the regular meeting of the Board of Police Commissioners held Tuesday, April 20, 2021 the Board REVIEWED the Department's report relative to the above matter.

This matter is being forwarded to you for further action.

Respectfully,

BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Maria Silva".

MARIA SILVA
Commission Executive Assistant

Attachment

c: Chief of Police

INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

April 15, 2021
1.0

TO: The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

FROM: Executive Director, Board of Police Commissioners

SUBJECT: POLICE COMMISSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPREHENSIVE
REVIEW OF PAST POLICE REFORM RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners APPROVE and TRANSMIT to City Council the attached charts in response to City Council Motion 20-0764.

DISCUSSION

The Police Commission Advisory Committee has completed a thorough review of the *“Report of the Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department – Christopher Commission – July 1991”*, *“Federal Consent Decree – June 2001”* and *“Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing – May 2015”*.

Charts that provide the recommendations and status to each of the reports are linked on Board of Police Commissioners Agenda dated April 20, 2021, Item C as follows:

- Report of the Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department – Christopher Commission – July 1991
- Federal Consent Decree – June 2001
- Final Report of the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing – May 2015

Should you have questions or require any additional information please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 236-1400.

Respectfully,



RICHARD M. TEFANK, Executive Director
Board of Police Commissioners

**BOARD OF
POLICE COMMISSIONERS**
Approved
Secretary

Past LAPD Reforms Christopher Commission Report (1991)

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>The Problem of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Leadership: The leadership of the LAPD must give priority to curbing excessive force – through the use of powerful incentives and disincentives that influence police behavior. Police Commission audits and review of the excessive force problem must be accompanied by a firm resolve to accord this issue the priority it requires in the LAPD's policies and goals.</p>	<p>In 2020, the Police Commission passed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new Use of Force policy, which can be found here: UOF policy; • New In-Custody Death Adjudication Protocols; and • Banned the use of the Carotid Restraint Control Hold (which was subsequently banned throughout the State of California). <p>The Police Commission publishes summaries of its Categorical Use of Force decisions.</p> <p>The LAPD Annually publishes Use of Force Data Reports.</p> <p>The Use of Force policy explicitly requires the use of de-escalation techniques: "to reduce the intensity of any encounter with a suspect and enable an officer to have additional options to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force while maintaining control of the situation."</p> <p>In 2020, the Commission required the Department to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand Mental Health Intervention Training to train 900 officers in 2020 from 700 in 2019; • Complete De-escalation and Crowd Control Training for the entire Department by end of 2020; • Deliver Procedural Justice Training to remainder of Department; and • Deliver Implicit Bias Update Course to Department and complete retraining by end of 2020. (see http://www.lapdonline.org/police_commission/news_view/66600). <p>Select 2020 Courses and Total Attendees:</p> <p>Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT) (C208): 745 FTO School (A205): 71 FTO Update (A306): 153 Supervisory Course (L308): 55 Watch Commander Course (L309): 44 Command and Control (T273): 3,667 PSL 1 (L150): 96</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>The Problem of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Command Accountability: Command officers must be held accountable by evaluating them on the basis of how officers under their supervision adhere to the Department's policies regarding use of force. When an incident of excessive force occurs, supervisors up the chain must be held accountable, regardless of whether they actually participated in the wrongful conduct.</p>	<p>In the Annual Use of Force Report, pages 46-51, the Department highlights command and control as its use of active leadership, and the important role of supervisors:</p> <p>Responsibility for command and control lies with the senior officer of any officer on scene who had gained sufficient situational awareness. Supervisors shall take responsibility for exercising command and control when they arrive to the scene of an incident. ... It is the expectation of this Department that the highest-ranking supervisor at scene assume the role of IC and communicate the transfer of command to all personnel involved.</p> <p>In July 2018, the Department published the command and control Training Bulletin and in March 2019, implemented training on the Advanced Strategies of Command and Control (ASCC).</p> <p>In its 2019 report entitled Follow-up Review of National Best Practices, the Office of the Inspector General notes that a police officer survey noted that officers perceived inequities/inconsistencies in the disciplinary system relating to supervisors and how they are given preferential treatment/not always held accountable in the same way as line officers. As a result, the Chief of Police instituted single purpose innovation groups to evaluate the discipline system.</p> <p>https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c9fb06e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_55ab7b0cb5124b879f612eeb877a0aadb.pdf</p> <p>Manual Section 158.20 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION. A supervisor shall be responsible for the appraisal and analysis of the work accomplishment of subordinates coming within the scope of his/her supervision. Such evaluation shall be based on continuous observation and inspection and shall take into consideration the quality of the employee's work accomplishment and those personal traits that are related to his or her duty performance. Commanding officers shall ensure that supervisory personnel provide a Training Evaluation and Management Systems II (TEAMS II) summary report to each employee in conjunction with the service of the employee's annual (post-probationary) performance evaluation report.</p> <p>As a part of the assessment of the performance of Command Officers they must submit a Supervisory Assessment for each Categorical Use of Force Incident that is presented to the Use of Force Review Board and the Chief of Police.</p> <p>See also: Command Officers must submit an assessment of compliance with the Special Orders governing reporting a CUOF by all personnel involved.</p> <p>Commanding Officers have included in the Annual Performance evaluation an assessment of their performance during presentations to the Use of Force Review Board, CompStat and Board of Rights.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>The Problem of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Supervision, Monitoring & Counseling: Supervisors must assess information from complaint histories, especially repetitive patterns, in performance evaluation reports. Command officers must have access to statistical information, understand what force is being used and why, detect "early warning" signs, and arrange for training and counseling of officers.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Police Department maintains as its central database the Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS). Among other things, TEAMS functions as an Early Warning System (EWS) that alerts the Department when sworn officers exhibit potentially problematic behavior.</p> <p>According to the LAPD Manual, Section 668.02:</p> <p>668.02 USE OF TEAMS II.</p> <p>The Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS II) is a "pointe" system to be used not only to obtain a complete or modified personnel summary report, but to identify those employees and organizational entities whose performance is well outside that of their respective peer group average, and encourage appropriate supervisory recognition or mentoring.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of managers and supervisors to regularly review an employee's personnel file and other documents which are source documents for a TEAMS II entry. It is only from actual review of such documents that a conclusion may be made as to whether or not a problem exists and what, if anything, should be done. In no case shall a TEAMS II report be used as a substitute for an employee's personnel file or any other document(s) which is the source for a TEAMS II entry.</p> <p>TEAMS II Employee Summary Report. The TEAMS II Employee Summary Report contains personnel summary information. Currently, a TEAMS II Employee Summary Report includes the following personnel information categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arrest/Crime Reports summary - Attendance data summary - Citations data summary - Civil Litigation data summary - Major and Minor Commendations summary - Discipline data summary - In-Service Training Courses summary - Pursuit data summary - Rank/Assignment summary - STOPS data summary - Traffic Collisions data summary - Use of Force (all) data summary - Work Permit data summary <p>An inquiry to obtain a TEAMS II Employee Summary Report will not only provide summary data, but will also allow the operator to select a specific entry and view associated reports in RMS and in the case of UOF or complaints, the completed investigation.</p> <p>The Office of the Inspector General generated a report entitled, A Review of the Department's Early Warning System, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-83d0-44b8-8142-1376cfb06e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_5f7b5a0861414ed05b528563191f63cc.pdf</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>The Problem of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Management Attention to Civil Litigation: Information about officers' conduct that becomes available in litigation should be used in evaluating those officers. Conduct that results in large settlements or judgments should be carefully studied. The Department and City might consider arbitration or mediation of claims that are now routinely denied and often lead to more expensive litigation.</p> <p>Audio and Videotaping of Contacts Between the Police and the Public: LAPD should pursue efforts to use video technology in patrol cars (dash cams) and formulate Department guidelines for use of such technology, including studying possible ways to address the concern that officers may fail, intentionally or otherwise, to use the video and audio equipment properly to record the event at issue.</p>	<p>Employee TEAMS reports track civil litigation. Civil litigation is evaluated during all universal threshold Action Items in TEAMS. Department Manual Section 093.57 references a Liability Management Committee (LMC), and provides that the LMC is responsible for developing strategies to improve risk management policies, procedures, and foster better coordination between Department entities and the City Attorney's Office.</p> <p>The City Attorney includes in their recommendation for settlement letters to the City Council and assessment of the individual employee liability, training issues and policies and procedures that should be reviewed. There is currently a good level of cooperation between the LAD and City Attorney's office relative to discussion and lessons learned from civil litigation.</p> <p>Digital-In-Car-Video System (DICVS) and Body Worn Video (BWV) cameras are standard equipment throughout the department. All officers and patrols cars are equipped with such cameras. See DICV policy and BWV policy.</p> <p>Body Worn Video Policy, Digital In-Car Video Special Order 12</p> <p>Body Worn Video Policy, Digital In-Car Video Special Order 45</p> <p>Compliance with video and audio equipment policies is published in all Categorical UOF case summaries.</p> <p>Videos of critical incidents are released publicly.</p> <p>LAPD currently evaluates the proper use of video, at a command level, during its Comstat oversight process of each division. Video is now used in audits and OIG reviews of departments systems and adherence to policies. See July 2020 CalGangs Report and the OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://az7e0q481-83d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_d38e88738022547ac555f3aed9dd7a1dcb.pdf</p> <p>In August 31, 2020, BWV was added to academy training in that all Recruits are equipped with BWV and use it throughout their Academy training.</p> <p>In the 2019 Complaint report, which can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102020/BPC__20-0139.pdf, the Department recorded 24 complaints for BWV and DICVS violations, the first time such complaints were logged. Four of the 24 complaints were sustained, a rate of 16.7%.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>The Problem of Excessive Force</p>	<p>"Mid-Level" Use of Force Options: A thorough study by police, medical, scientific, psychological and other appropriate experts should be undertaken as part of a comprehensive evaluation of middle-level use of force options by the Department and the Police Commission. Among the "middle-level" use of force proposed by those testing before the Commission included the use of chemical mace and taser, the reinstatement of the carotid or bar-arm chokehold, the use of a chemical agent used by the FBI and others called capstun, and the use of the stun gun.</p>	<p>In 2017, the Office of the Inspector General issued a report entitled: <i>Overview of Less-Lethal Tools and Deployment</i> which can be found here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6b6e32f/filesusr.com/ugqf/b2dd23_486428073d694a2aa412c01014b500b4.pdf.</p> <p>The Annual Use of Force Report (the most recent of which was for 2019), provides detailed descriptions of the less lethal equipment available to officers, and their usage. This equipment includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 Millimeter Launcher • Beanbag Shotgun • Oleoresin Capsicum Spray • Taser <p>These items can be found on pages 58 through 71 of the report, which can be located here: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/2019_uof_review.pdf</p> <p>621.10 REQUIRED EQUIPMENT--UNIFORMED OFFICERS.</p> <p>In addition to the basic uniform (Manual Section 3/614), officers assigned to uniformed field duty, a geographic Area front desk, or traffic division front desk-related duties, shall carry the following equipment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baton. Officers using motorized equipment while on-duty shall carry their batons in a manner authorized by their commanding officer. The carrying of the baton by officers assigned to intersection traffic control shall be at the option of their commanding officer. • Electronic Control Device (TASER). The authorized Electronic Control device shall be carried in a department approved holster that is on the support side of the duty belt in either a cross draw or support side draw position; • Hobble Restraint Device. Exception for motorcycle officers, the hobble restraint device shall be carried on the key ring holder of the officer's equipment belt, in either saps pocket of the uniform trouser or in a Department approved carrying case. Motorcycle officers shall carry the hobble restraint device in a uniform pants pocket, or in a Department approved carrying case; • General Duty Helmets. Uniformed officers while assigned in vehicles shall keep their general duty helmets in their helmet bags and stored in the vehicles trunk. All other uniformed officers shall keep their helmets at locations convenient to their assignment. Officers shall store their helmets in their station lockers when off-duty or on plainclothes assignments; • ... • Flashlight. A flashlight shall be carried during the hours of darkness; • Handheld Radio; • ... • Personal Protective Equipment Kit (Fire/Communicable Disease PPE Kit) consisting of work gloves, nitrile gloves, goggles, and a N95 respirator mask. <p>In 2020, the use of the Carotid Restraint Control Hold was banned by the Police Commission and was subsequently banned throughout the State of California.</p> <p>The BOPC approved, and the LAPD is currently engaged in, a pilot on the use of the BolaWrap Remote Restraint Device. See: http://www.lapdonline.org/home/news_view/56191</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>Racism and Bias Affecting Use of Excessive Force</p>	<p>No Tolerance for Racism & Bias: The Chief of Police should seek tangible ways (e.g., through discipline) to establish principles that racism and ethnic and gender bias will not be tolerated.</p>	<p>The 2020 Use of Force Policy explicitly states: "Officers shall carry out their duties, including use of force, in a manner that is fair and unbiased. Discriminatory conduct on the basis of race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, housing status, or disability while performing any law enforcement activity is prohibited."</p> <p>Annual Complaint Reports are published annually, describing bias policing allegations. The 2019 Complaint report can be found here: http://www.lapppolice.com/lacity.org/102020/BPC_20-0139.pdf.</p> <p>Office of the Chief of Police, Administrative Order No. 19, Definitions of Terms Used in the Department Manual – Revised; and, Policy Prohibiting Biased Policing – Revised, November 8, 2019.</p> <p>345. POLICY PROHIBITING BIASED POLICING. Discriminatory conduct on the basis of an individual's actual or perceived race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, disability, immigration or employment status, English language fluency or homeless circumstance, is prohibited while performing any law enforcement activity. All law enforcement contacts and activities, including, but not limited to, calls for service, investigations, police-initiated stops or detentions, and activities following stops or detentions, shall be unbiased and based on legitimate, articulable facts, consistent with the standards of reasonable suspicion or probable cause as required by federal and state law. Officers shall not initiate police action where the objective is to discover the civil immigration status of any person and shall strictly adhere to the Department's immigration enforcement guidelines as outlined in Department Manual Sections 4/264.50 and 4/264.55.</p> <p>Department personnel may not use race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, or disability (to any extent or degree), immigration or employment status, English language fluency or homeless circumstance as a basis for conducting any law enforcement activity, including stops and detentions, except when engaging in the investigation of appropriate suspect-specific activity to identify a particular person or group. Department personnel seeking one or more specific persons who have been identified or described in part by their race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, disability (to any extent or degree), immigration or employment status, English language fluency or homeless circumstance: may not grant the specified identifier or description only in combination with other appropriate identifying factors; and may not grant the specified identifier or description undue weight.</p> <p>A failure to comply with this policy is counterproductive to professional law enforcement and is considered to be an act of serious misconduct. Any employee who becomes aware of biased policing or any other violation of this policy shall report it in accordance with established Department procedures.</p> <p>1/345. POLICY PROHIBITING BIASED POLICING. (A failure to comply with this policy is counterproductive to professional law enforcement and is considered to be an act of serious misconduct. Any employee who becomes aware of biased policing or any other violation of this policy shall report it in accordance with established Department procedures.)</p> <p>Outsourced Training conducted by the Museum of Tolerance: Diversity and Racial Profiling (Tools for Tolerance).</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>Factism and Bias Affecting Use of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Cultural Awareness Training: The LAPD must establish a program of cultural awareness training (or retraining) to eliminate stereotypes for all officers, developed by independent organization experienced in such training. Supervisory/ administrative officers (Lieutenant I and higher) should be trained first, with remaining officers trained on specified schedule. Retaining of all officers should be done on regular basis.</p>	<p>According to the LAPD website:</p> <p>Your Department's Commitment to Having Training Focused on Reducing Prejudice and Bias</p> <p>Your Department starts this training in the academy through the introduction of the Mission Statement and Core Values of the Department. Additionally, every academy class has eight hours of State required training on Principled Policing that incorporates a review of the historical impact of policing, implicit bias awareness, and procedural justice. These topics are incorporated into ongoing officer training and promotional schools and are completed in collaboration with academic and community members. While your Department has been training with the Museum of Tolerance since 2004, in 2014 several trainers were trained by outside experts in Fair and Impartial Policing before implementing the concepts into various Department courses. In 2017, all sworn members of your Department were trained by an outside expert on Implicit Bias and Community Policing. In support of ongoing training development, a Training Bulletin on Procedural Justice was completed in April, 2020 and will be used as a source document for these courses and for promotional examinations.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Your Departments Commitment to the Diverse Communities We Serve</p> <p>Your Departments officers are challenged to recognize the diverse communities that they come from and to cultivate awareness of how they have been impacted by living in a society where access to all systems and forms of justice have not been equal. Core to the academy and in-service training is understanding how to empathize with those we serve and to ensure that all of our officers understand the complex multi-cultural history of Los Angeles. In more recent years, law enforcement has been working with community partners to increase the number of referrals to divert people in crisis out of the system or to utilize restorative justice programs.</p> <p>Procedural Justice has now become an integral part of the training throughout your Department and part of adopting this framework is to recognize the need to work in collaboration, to hear the voices of the community, and to never stop working toward a better Los Angeles for everyone.</p> <p>The Procedural Justice training bulletin can be found here: http://lappd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/procedural_justice.pdf</p> <p>Training for officers was mandated at the Museum of Tolerance – Tools for Tolerance Training starting in 1996. This training is now called "Building Community Trust and Biased Policing"</p> <p>Currently under development is a project relative to the history of the LAPD and interaction with community members that have left lasting memories of those incidents. The intent is to present this information during academy training and, when an officer is assigned to one of the 21 police divisions, be required to attend an 8-hour training session specifically about the history of that division and LAPD interactions over the years.</p> <p>In its 2019 report entitled "Follow-up Review of National Best Practices," which can be found at https://a27e0481-a3dd0-44b8-8142-1376cfb06e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2d4d23_55abfb0c6b5124b879f612eeb877a0ad8.pdf, the Office of the Inspector General found:</p> <p>As noted above, the Task Force Report recommended that agencies acknowledge policing's past role in injustice and discrimination, and address how this affects community trust. As part of this process, the Department has created a page on its website entitled "Historical Documents and Internal Reports" that includes a section on the Consent Decree and the Rampart Corruption Scandal. It has worked with the OIG to locate and post a number of reports and assessments of the LAPD conducted by outside entities, and it continues to add to this section as appropriate.</p> <p>The OIG's initial report noted that training courses, such as the recent Department-wide "Public Trust and the Preservation of Life" course, included a block on the history of the LAPD. The OIG recommends that the Department continue to include a discussion of such issues in future trainings where appropriate.</p> <p>At the request of the Board of Police Commissioners, an assessment was conducted for the Implicit Bias training provided to the Department in 2017 by Dr. Bryant Marks, with a total number of 9189 officers trained.</p> <p>Supervisor School is for Detective II and Sergeants: the curriculum was revised in October 2019. The California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training has a two-week requirement for the school. The LAPD adds an additional two-weeks of curriculum specifically to address LAPD responsibilities.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>Racism and Bias Affecting Use of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Creation of "Community Relations Officer"-. A new, separate position should be created at the commander level, reporting to the Chief of Police. Responsibilities will include: (i) liaison with those conducting the cultural awareness program; (ii) establishment of liaisons with representatives of minority communities in LA; (iii) establishment of an "ombudsman" to deal with LAPD officers concerning racial and gender matters, including complaints concerning bias and discrimination within LAPD; and (iv) monitoring use of force reports regarding minorities, and public complaints involving racial matters. It is essential that officers have means to address racial grievances to someone other than the officer in charge of the station where the act occurred.</p>	<p>CRO program was created and continues to exist. Community Relations Section, Special Assistant Fred Booker is a Direct Report to Chief of Police.</p> <p>The LAPD currently has a racial equity officer, Commander Ruby Flores.</p> <p>Currently, the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) handles intake of complaints regarding internal retaliation/discrimination. Furthermore, the OIG maintains a Community Relations section that acts as a conduit to the community and to various stakeholders in the oversight of the LAPD.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>Racism and Bias Affecting Use of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Address Improper Use of "Prone-Out" Tactic and Unjustified Stops in Minority Communities: The LAPD must address the problems created in minority communities by the inappropriate and unnecessary use of the "prone-out" tactic and the practice of stopping young minority males without proper justification.</p>	<p>LAPD officers record all stop information on the Automated Field Data Report which is then reported to the California Department of Justice. The City of Los Angeles maintains an Open Portal that contains the data, which is made available to public.</p> <p>A Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, prepared by the Office of the Inspector General, can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom/lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0162.pdf</p> <p>In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom/lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolicecom/lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0165.pdf</p> <p>Previous reports prepared by the Inspector General related to stops are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Review of National Best Practices," Office of the Inspector General, May 2017; • "Review of Arrests for Violations of California Penal Code Section 148(A)(1)," Office of the Inspector General, August 2018; • "Review of Gang Enforcement Detail Stops," Office of the Inspector General, February 2019; and • "Follow-Up Review of National Best Practices," Office of the Inspector General, October 2019. <p>All reports can be found on the OIG's website at oig.lacity.org.</p> <p>The LAPD Manual provides:</p> <p>1/574. HIGH-RISK PRONE SEARCH. The Department has authorized the use of the high-risk prone search to ensure the safety of both officers and suspects. The high-risk prone search shall only be used when the officer has a reasonable suspicion of a risk for serious injury to the officer and/or the public.</p> <p>Note: A "reasonable suspicion" can include an officer's observations of the suspect's activity, the suspect's demeanor during the stop or any other factor that clearly indicates the risk for serious injury. Any or all of these could give an officer a reasonable suspicion that a suspect might be armed. The justification for an extent of the search shall be based on current law applicable to searches.</p> <p>The goal of any tactic, including search techniques, is to maintain control of the suspect while reducing the potential for violence. The use of the high-risk prone search tactic must be based on the totality of the circumstances that reasonably pose a threat to officers or bystanders. The high-risk prone search tactic shall not be used routinely or as an instrument of intimidation. Officers will be held accountable for the judicious use of discretion in the application of this tactic. Additionally, officers shall be held responsible for explaining to involved parties why this tactic was used.</p> <p>4/243. HIGH-RISK PRONE SEARCH.</p> <p>Officer's Responsibility. When the high-risk prone search is used, the officer shall explain the reason for its use to the involved parties. If the officer is unsuccessful in convincing the parties that the search tactic was necessary and appropriate, the officer shall request that a supervisor respond to the scene.</p> <p>Supervisor's Responsibility. When requested to respond to an incident where the high-risk prone search has been used, a supervisor shall determine whether use of the search tactic was appropriate and assist the officer in making the proper explanation to the involved parties. The incident shall then be fully documented.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status																											
<p>Racism and Bias Affecting Use of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Minority & Female Recruitment: The recruitment effort for African-American, Latino, and female officers should be sustained. Because the Asian population is underrepresented in the LAPD, a special effort should be mounted to recruit Asian officers, especially those with relevant language capabilities.</p>	<p>The gender and ethnic diversity of the LAPD can be tracked in the Sworn Personnel by Rank, Gender, and Ethnicity Report (SPRGE) which is updated every deployment period, and can be found here: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/PR91%200c%2020.pdf</p> <p>Recruitment efforts can be found here: https://www.joinlapd.com/qualifications</p> <p>In September 2020, the recruit class was described as the "most diversified recruit class in LAPD history." It was comprised of Females: 27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - African American – 2 - Hispanic – 20 - Asian – 2 - Caucasian – 2 - Filipino – 1 • Males: 21 - African American – 13 - Hispanic – 6 - Asian – 0 - Caucasian – 2 - Filipino – 0 																											
<p>Details of this class can be found at: https://www.lapdonline.org/home/news_View/66929</p> <p>The current overall composition of the LAPD is as follows:</p> <p>LAPD Sworn Staffing (as of 11/22/20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Hispanic: 49.7% -White: 29.6% -Black: 9.4% -Asian Pacific Islander: 7.9% -Filipino: 2.7% -American Indian: .34% -Other: .36% -Male: 81.7% -Female: 18.3% <p>See also: Demographics of both sworn and civilian personnel</p> <p>On Page 32 of the Los Angeles Police Department's Strategic Plan, the department cited as its ongoing recruitment goals:</p>	<p>Initiative A: Strengthen Recruitment Efforts to Increase Diversity Among Ranks</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>KEY ACTIVITY</th> <th>MILESTONE 2019–2020</th> <th>MILESTONE 2020–2021</th> <th>ENTITY LEAD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Improve recruitment process for police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve a 90-day application process from test to hire for recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate and adjust hiring process for greater efficiency. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Expand hiring of female police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and conduct annual law enforcement career workshops at universities. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand law enforcement career workshops to additional university locations. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Expand hiring of African-American police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 195 female officers representing 35% of all new recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase female police officer hiring to 40% of all new recruits. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Expand hiring of Asian-Pacific Islander (API) police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 100 African-American police officers representing 18% of all new recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase African-American police officer hiring to 22% of all new recruits. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Enhance marketing and advertisement strategy for recruitment.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 45 API police officers representing 8% of all new recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase API police officer hiring to 10% of all new recruits. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement new recruitment campaign. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and assess effectiveness of campaign. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	KEY ACTIVITY	MILESTONE 2019–2020	MILESTONE 2020–2021	ENTITY LEAD	1. Improve recruitment process for police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve a 90-day application process from test to hire for recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate and adjust hiring process for greater efficiency. 	OSS	2. Expand hiring of female police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and conduct annual law enforcement career workshops at universities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand law enforcement career workshops to additional university locations. 	OSS	3. Expand hiring of African-American police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 195 female officers representing 35% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase female police officer hiring to 40% of all new recruits. 	OSS	4. Expand hiring of Asian-Pacific Islander (API) police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 100 African-American police officers representing 18% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase African-American police officer hiring to 22% of all new recruits. 	OSS	5. Enhance marketing and advertisement strategy for recruitment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 45 API police officers representing 8% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase API police officer hiring to 10% of all new recruits. 	OSS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement new recruitment campaign. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and assess effectiveness of campaign. 	OSS
KEY ACTIVITY	MILESTONE 2019–2020	MILESTONE 2020–2021	ENTITY LEAD																										
1. Improve recruitment process for police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve a 90-day application process from test to hire for recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate and adjust hiring process for greater efficiency. 	OSS																										
2. Expand hiring of female police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and conduct annual law enforcement career workshops at universities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand law enforcement career workshops to additional university locations. 	OSS																										
3. Expand hiring of African-American police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 195 female officers representing 35% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase female police officer hiring to 40% of all new recruits. 	OSS																										
4. Expand hiring of Asian-Pacific Islander (API) police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 100 African-American police officers representing 18% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase African-American police officer hiring to 22% of all new recruits. 	OSS																										
5. Enhance marketing and advertisement strategy for recruitment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hire 45 API police officers representing 8% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase API police officer hiring to 10% of all new recruits. 	OSS																										
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement new recruitment campaign. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and assess effectiveness of campaign. 	OSS																										

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>Racism and Bias Affecting Use of Excessive Force</p>	<p>Promotion of Minority & Female Officers: Female and minority officers must be given full and equal opportunity to assume leadership positions in the LAPD and must be assigned on a nondiscriminatory basis to so-called "coveyed positions" and promoted to supervisory and managerial positions on the same basis.</p> <p>Nondiscrimination of Gay & Lesbian Officers: The LAPD must fully implement in practice its policy of non-discrimination in recruitment and promotion of gay and lesbian officers.</p>	<p>The Police Commission receives an annual report from the Department that describes the promotion of minority and women officers, as well as the hiring of minority and women officers in the LAPD. The latest report can be found at: http://www.lapdpolicecommunity.org/081820/BPC__20-0097.pdf</p> <p>The LAPD has a named LGBTQ Liaison at the Assistant Chief level; hosts two LGBTQ forums annually and the BOPC LGBTQ Mixer is open to all Department employees; In 2018/2019, collaborated with the LGBTQ Working Group and created the LAPD Transgender, Gender Non-Conforming, and Non-Binary Employee Guidebook; developed an LAPD Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation Training Bulletin; provided a Reference link on LAN Home Page for LGBTQ Liaison with reference material and resource links; hosted LGBTQ recruitment days.</p> <p>The Department Manual, Section 285, provides:</p> <p>SEXUAL ORIENTATION DISCRIMINATION.</p> <p>It is the policy of the Los Angeles Police Department that discrimination in the workplace on the basis of an individual's sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression is unacceptable and will not be tolerated. Department personnel shall not consider an applicant's or employee's known or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression in any pre-employment or employment action or decision, including but not limited to background checking, testing, hiring, assigning, training, transferring, upgrading, promoting, compensating, evaluating, disciplining and discharging.</p> <p>It is the responsibility of all commanding officers and supervisors to take the necessary steps, including training and appropriate disciplinary action, to ensure and maintain a working environment free from discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. The Department shall prohibit, as a form of discrimination, the creation of or contribution to a hostile, intimidating, threatening, offensive, or abusive work environment on the basis of an individual's known or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. This includes written, spoken, graphic or demonstrative derogatory terms, slurs, comments, gestures, ridicule, threats, rumors, or jokes with respect to an individual's known or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. The Department is committed to eliminating discriminatory conduct in the workplace and will not tolerate or condone any form of discrimination or harassment based on sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression by any Department or City employee.</p> <p>4101</p> <p>It is the responsibility of all commanding officers and supervisors to take the necessary steps, including training and appropriate disciplinary action, to ensure and maintain a working environment that is free from discrimination. Discrimination, whether physical, psychological or verbal, based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, accent, age, language, or any other legislatively or judicially prohibited grounds, can subject the Department and City to severe legal consequences, including significant monetary liability. Employees who engage in such acts and supervisors who knowingly fail to act, to prohibit, or prevent them, subject themselves to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.</p> <p>The Department is committed to eliminating any discriminatory conduct and will not tolerate or condone any form of discriminatory actions or activities by Department employees.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
Community-Based Policing	<p>Adoption of Community-Based Policing Model: LAPD should adopt the community-based policing model and implement it fully, albeit carefully, throughout the Department. Continued experimentation with individual programs that use community policing principles can have only limited success, so long as the demand for crime control and crime statistics remains at the core of the Department's values. It is now time to develop programs to deemphasize force and promote restraint, to foster within the LAPD a different attitude toward the population it serves, and to assist the public to gain greater trust in the Department. Creation of the high-ranking position of Community Relations Officer should assist in breaking down racial barriers and promote greater cooperation between the police and local communities. The Department must develop and employ tactics that emphasize containment and control, rather than confrontation and physical force. LAPD must recognize the merits of community involvement, and must understand that it is accountable to all segments of the community.</p>	<p>In 2020, the Chief of Police created the Community Safety Partnership Bureau (CSPB), following a study prepared by UCLA on the effectiveness of the CSP program. The UCLA Report can be found at: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/051220/CSP%20Evaluation%20Report_2020_FINAL.pdf</p> <p>The LAPD website describes the CSP program and the new bureau as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CSP Bureau fully integrates community voice into its structure. Rather than having a structure built entirely of sworn personnel, the top leadership of the CSP Bureau will consist of a sworn Deputy Chief partnered with a civilian commander (Police Administrator II). The civilian commander will oversee a Regional Advisory Council comprised of leaders within community-based organizations, representatives from City Council offices, and CSP funding partners. The commander and their council will collectively head a Safety Strategy and Innovation Center that develops community-responsive, site-specific plans for existing CSP sites, looks for opportunities for CSP site expansion across the city, and coordinates with other LAPD entities to ensure the CSP model is being integrated throughout all Department's operations. - The CSP Bureau will provide the breadth of leadership necessary to address the various evaluation recommendations. The addition of regional, mid-level supervision will enhance the oversight of administrative and operational functions, while the newly created captain positions will coordinate with both community stakeholders and Department commanding officers to create problem-solving strategies that can be implemented beyond the confines of CSP sites. - By creating a bureau structure to oversee CSP operations, the LAPD is establishing the support systems vital to allowing existing CSP personnel to build on their current successes. The bureau will relieve them of the need to split their attentions between community engagement and administrative functions. They will instead be able to return their full energy and focus to the relationships with community members that have allowed the program to take hold and create dramatic shifts in safety. - Emada Tinglides was selected to be the Deputy Chief overseeing the CSP Bureau. - One of the most significant mandates the CSP Bureau will fulfill is developing strategies to fully implement and institutionalize the CSP model across all aspects of the LAPD. The CSP model's effectiveness is not limited to the stakeholders within tightly defined neighborhood partnering with ten officers and a supervisor. The model's tenets have a place across all of Department operations, and developing a strategy for the Departmentwide integration of these tenets will be taken on by the bureau's leadership and Regional Advisory Council. This complete embrace of policing built on relationships and the pursuit of long-term solutions rather than ongoing enforcement plans will serve as the foundation of the reimagined Los Angeles Police Department. <p>Community Relations Section, Special Assistant is a direct report to Chief of Police.</p> <p>The Pat Brown Institute at California State University Los Angeles provided training to the Department on the topic of Community Policing for Managers. The institute offered the course between 1999 and 2011 on Community Policing and Community Governance. It was supported by a grant from the Ahmanson Foundation and the course was POST certified. See also the following Office of the Inspector General Reports, which discuss Community Engagement: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ade7e6e3971bb5f.pdf https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_55ab1b0cb5124b879f612eab877a0ad8.pdf</p>

Topic	Recommendation	Status
<p>Community-Based Policing</p>	<p>Create Incentives for Community-Based Policing: Incentives should be created to encourage officers to develop innovative programs within their assigned communities. Credit for pay advances and promotions should be given not simply for arrest statistics, but for innovation and creativity in developing and implementing crime prevention programs.</p>	<p>See the above section describing the CSP program, and the newly created CSPB. All sworn positions in CSPB are with pay grade advancements. See also the following Office of the Inspector General Reports which discuss Community Engagement:</p> <p>https://a227e0481-e3dc0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440624094a9e7e6e3971bb5f.pdf</p> <p>https://a227e0481-e3dc0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_55ab7f0cb5124b879f612eebb877e0ad8.pdf</p>
<p>Recruitment, Selection and Psychological Testing</p>	<p>Focus on Past Behavior: The initial psychological evaluation process should be improved by focusing less on test and oral interview results, and more on an analysis of past behavior as a predictor of future behavior.</p> <p>Better, Formalized Training for Background Investigators: In addition to the practice of assigning new investigators to accompany veterans, investigators need formal instruction in how to question candidates and their references. They should be schooled in the basic indicators of abnormal psychological behavior.</p> <p>Periodic, Unannounced Audits of Background Investigations and Files: More comprehensive audits should be done (by officers who are not members of the Background Investigations Unit or perhaps by the City Personnel Department) to evaluate whether the LAPD focuses too much or too little attention on particular background standards, maintains uniform application of those standards, and appropriately limits inquiries about the sexual history of candidates.</p>	<p>During the background investigation process a candidate's past choices are considered and provided to the psychologist for the interview process. The past behavior of a candidate is considered along with the age, maturity and significance of choices however they are evaluated under the "whole person" standard.</p> <p>The background investigators attend a 32-hour background investigation course hosted at Ben Clark Public Safety Training Center. Upon completion of this course, investigators receive a California POST certificate. Following the course, the Background Investigation Division of Personnel Department hosts a 3-day training for new background investigators. Following that training, the new background investigators are assigned a training officer to provide on the job training. Background investigators are civilian employees of the City Personnel Department. They are required to attend a California Peace Officer Standards and Training Background Investigator class prior to starting the assignment. Sworn LAPD supervisors monitor their work.</p> <p>On a regular basis, the Office of Support Services reviews the background files of all disqualified candidates and the areas during the background process where candidates drop out of the process. In conjunction with this regular review the Chief of Police is briefed by the Office of Support Services regarding the progress and cooperation between the City Personnel Department and the Recruitment and Employment Division of the Department. Additionally, the California Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training will periodically audit background files.</p>

<p>Recruitment, Selection and Psychological Testing</p>	<p>Candidate Should Not be Certified for Hire Until Background Investigation is Complete: Currently, a background investigation may continue even after a candidate has graduated from the Police Academy and begun work as a police officer, which puts public and other officers at risk because candidate may be unsuitable to work as an officer.</p> <p>Officers Should be Retested Periodically: Officers should be retested every three years to uncover both psychological and physical problems. The proposed retesting would also train officers to develop coping skills to effectively manage stressful situations.</p>	<p>At time of academy appointment, a thorough background investigation has been completed. Furthermore, the Department investigates all information that comes to light at all times for candidates. This information can lead to removal from the academy (or as an officer) at any point.</p>
	<p>Supervisors Should Emphasize the Detection of Problems In Officers' Field Work: Supervisors must make it clear to officers that they may seek counseling or training either formally or informally, on a confidential basis and without punitive action being taken as a result.</p>	<p>The Chief of Police gave approval in July 2020 for a Biennial Officer Wellness Check-in program with the Behavioral Sciences Section. The program began in the Fall of 2020 with officers assigned to Office of Operations/patrol divisions. This will be a program where officers are offered the opportunity to meet with a Department psychologist to discuss any concerns or issues they may have.</p> <p>The Department has a very viable Peer Support Program for both sworn and civilian personnel. The peer counselors receive periodic training and are available to assist employees with personal or work issues.</p> <p>All sworn personnel are required on an annual basis to be tested on the Force Options Simulator to test their decision-making skills, de-escalation skills and knowledge of the Use of Force policy.</p> <p>All personnel involved in a Categorical Use of Force incident or traffic accident in which a person is severely injured or killed are required to meet with a Department psychologist for a minimum of three visits prior to returning to the field.</p>
<p>Academy Training</p>	<p>Appointment of Police Training Administrator (PTA): The PTA should be identified and appointed as soon as possible, consistent with proper selection procedures.</p>	<p>This position is called the Director of Police Training and Education position, which is held by Dr. Luann Pannell.</p>

<p>Academy Training</p>	<p>Review of Human Relations/Cultural Awareness and Verbal Skills Training: These trainings should be reviewed by the PTA and the Professional Advisory Committee (PAC), who should consider expanding and moving those classes to the beginning of the curriculum, and integrating those skills with the tactical, use of force, physical, and foreign language training through the use of "filleke" situation simulations.</p> <p>Review of Foreign Language Training: Foreign language training, especially Spanish, should be reviewed by the PTA to correct present deficiencies. Incentivize recruits and officers with an interest in developing broader language skills.</p> <p>Field Work Before Graduation: Recruits should spend a significant amount of time in the field before graduation or should return to the Academy for additional training after having spent a period of time in the field.</p> <p>The Academy's Commanding Officer & Instructional Staff: The Academy's commanding officer should serve a minimum period of time in that position, such as 3 years, and have greater discretion to remove instructional staff. Instructional staff should have either a minimum period of field experience, such as 5 years, or some unique expertise. The term of service for instructors should be limited to a specified period, such as 5 years.</p>	<p>The Office of the Inspector General conducted a review of the program and issued two reports in 2017 and 2019 on national best practices, which can be found at: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c8fbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6a3971bb5f.pdf and http://www.lapcpolicecom.lacity.org/100119/BPC_19-0264.pdf</p> <p>These reports discuss trainings, such as the Police Sciences and Leadership (PSL) Program, Implicit Bias, and Procedural Justice. Also, Department has integrated life-like UOF simulations via the force-option simulator. PSL II is designed to take place after the 3rd year of an officer's tenure, and it uses extensive role playing scenarios to build officers' skills in effective communication, procedural justice, de-escalation, use of force, and advanced tactics.</p> <p>Officers in the academy receive basic communication skills in Spanish. The Department is approximately 49% Hispanic with a large percentage of those officers speaking Spanish. Additionally, there are many officers who are proficient in various languages. Officers also have a resource via telephone through Communications Division of a "language bank" where they can be connected to an interpreter.</p> <p>The Department's Police Sciences and Leadership (PSL) Program has two parts, PSL I and PSL II. PSL I was implemented in 2016 and is provided to officers during the 11th month of their one-year post-Academy probationary period. PSL II is designed to take place after the 3rd year of an officer's tenure, and it uses extensive role playing scenarios to build officers' skills in effective communication, procedural justice, de-escalation, use of force, and advanced tactics.</p> <p>The Office of the Inspector General conducted a review of the program and issued two reports in 2017 and 2019 on national best practices, which can be found at: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c8fbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6a3971bb5f.pdf and http://www.lapcpolicecom.lacity.org/100119/BPC_19-0264.pdf</p> <p>Current acceptance of a position within Training Division and In-Service Training Division has a maximum 5-year term limit (Sergeant and Officer Ranks).</p> <p>The Commanding Officer is appointed at the discretion of the Chief of Police, and assignment is based on the needs of the Department.</p> <p>All academy instructors are subject matter experts in the area they provide instruction. They are also certified instructors by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.</p>
--------------------------------	--	--

<p>Academy Training</p>	<p>High Performance Standards: The Academy should establish high performance standards in academic as well as physical fitness endeavors for recruits to qualify for graduation. The Academy should terminate those recruits who fail to meet those standards.</p>	<p>POST regulations used by the academy allow for each test to be taken twice with minimum passing scores. The minimum passing scores for each test vary with the lowest score being 70%. If a recruit fails the first attempt he/she is remediated and permitted to retake the test. However, if a recruit fails the second attempt, he/she is disqualified from the academy. LAPD Academy is 912 hours compared to only 664 hours required by POST.</p>
--------------------------------	---	---

<p>Field Training</p>	<p>Content of Training: Probationers' training should include systematic instruction on the use of verbal skills, recognition of when force is appropriately used, and cultural awareness and sensitivity.</p> <p>Termination of Unsatisfactory Probationers: The Department should encourage and facilitate Field Training Officer (FTO) efforts to terminate unsatisfactory probationers, including those exhibiting an inability to interact appropriately with the public.</p>	<p>A Probationary Police Officer Weekly Evaluation Report (PPOWER) includes categories for: Department Policies/Procedures; Law, LAMC; Search and Seizure; Use of Common Sense and Good Judgment; Relationships with Citizens in General; and Relationships with Ethnic Groups or Gender Other Than Own.</p> <p>See also: Links to Special Orders: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/2017%20Special%20Orders%2013.pdf http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/SO_19.pdf http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/2018%20admin%20order14.pdf</p> <p>Department Manual 760.45, provides:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entry-level Police Officers. A Probationary Police Officer Weekly Evaluation Report (PPOWER), Form 0176.01, shall be completed for each entry-level probationary police officer who has completed the recruit phase of training. • During the Structured Field Training Program Period (SFTPP), each probationary police officer shall be rated weekly on the PPOWER. <p>The PPOWER report includes categories for: relationships with citizen in general, and with ethnic groups and genders other than their own.</p>
<p>Development of Selection Criteria of FTOs: Uniform criteria for selection of FTOs should be established. FTOs should be required to have at least 5 years' field experience. Priority should be given to officers with the ability and interest to train junior officers.</p>	<p>Department policy and the Field Training Manual states that all sworn personnel who desire to be a Field Training Officer (FTO) must meet the requirement of three years of service, with two years in a patrol and/or traffic assignment. (Department Manual Volume III, Section 763.85). The 3-year level of experience was adopted based on the requirements of the California State Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, which requires 3 years. In order to be considered, FTO applicants must meet all of the requirements regarding lack of complaint history, lawsuits, and out-of-policy use of force cases.</p>	

<p>Field Training</p>	<p>Complaints History as Factor In FTO Selection: Officers with sustained complaints for use of excessive force or other serious violations of Departmental policy within the past 5 years should be disqualified from serving as FTOs, except as specifically approved for the position under guidelines established by the Department. An officer's entire disciplinary record, including unsustained complaints and the officer's history of use of force, should be weighed in the FTO selection process.</p>	<p>Department Manual Volume III, Section 763.95 provides the following in terms of the review of work history prior to the selection of Field Training Officers (FTOs):</p> <p>Review of Selected Candidate's Work History and Evaluation of Findings. In addition to reviewing documentation listed above, commanding officers will utilize existing Departmental databases, information and other documents to assess a selected FTO candidate's work history, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the employee's entire complaint history, including failure to appear, failure to qualify, and preventable traffic collision; • Review all sustained and pending complaints to ascertain if they contain elements of excessive force, false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty; • Review any adverse judicial findings that contain any element of excessive force; false arrest or charge, improper search/seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty and the judicial finding in making the selection; and, • Ensure that any information obtained regarding LERI and In-Custody Deaths from the Use of Force Division is documented in the narrative section. <p>The intent of reviewing a selected candidate's work history is to assist in the evaluation of that candidate's appropriateness for FTO duties and responsibilities.</p> <p>The Department currently uses an oral interview process for FTO selection after three years of qualified work experience submitted and verified by Personnel Division.</p> <p>Interview questions are geared toward field training questions and test a candidate's knowledge and experience with Department policies, procedures, field training manual, use of force, implicit bias and procedural justice.</p>
<p>Tests and Incentives for FTOs: To become FTOs, officers should be required to pass written and oral tests designed to measure communication skills, teaching aptitude and knowledge of Departmental policies regarding appropriate use of force and cultural sensitivity.</p>		

<p>Field Training</p>	<p>FTO School: Successful completion of FTO School should be required before an FTO begins training probationers. FTO School curriculum should be modified to place greater emphasis on communication skills, teaching skills, appropriate use of force, and sensitivity to specific cultural differences within Los Angeles. FTO training should include a substantial continuing education component.</p>	<p>Department policy and the Field Training Manual states that all sworn personnel who desire to be a Field Training Officer (FTO) must meet the requirement of three years of service, with two years in a patrol and/or traffic assignment. (Department Manual Volume III, Section 763.85). This Manual provision provides:</p> <p>Basic Eligibility Requirements. Prior to applying for a FTO position, officers must have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met the eligibility requirements established in the Field Training Manual; and • Demonstrated analytical skills, cultural and community sensitivity, diversity and commitment to police integrity that meet or exceed standards. <p>Per Department Policy, an FTO holds the rank of Police Officer III and has completed the Department's 40-hour FTO Basic Course, conducted by the FTO Unit of Training Division. To maintain certification, FTOs must attend the 32-hour FTO Update Course during the three years following appointment. Although California POST requires every FTO to attend a minimum 24-hour FTO Update Course, the Department mandates a 32-hour FTO Update Course. Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT) is attended within 6 months of promotion.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Department Manual provides:</p> <p>It remains the responsibility of each FTO to maintain proficiency in the performance as an FTO including the requirements established for eligibility and in the Field Training Manual. The FTO must also remain in compliance with current requirements, including the successful completion of the Peace Officer Standards and Training mandated FTO Course and any required FTO recertification course(s). It is incumbent upon commanding officers to continually monitor the performance of their commands' FTOs and their compliance with FTO training standards.</p> <p>The Department must ensure that FTOs receive adequate training, including training to be an Instructor, and training in Department policies and procedures to enable them to carry out their duties. Training requirements are detailed in the Department's Field Training Manual.</p>
------------------------------	--	--

<p>Continuing Education</p>	<p>Roll Call and In-Service Training: The Academy should take responsibility over roll call and other in-service training by providing a pool of officers whose function is supervising roll call training and the implementation of effective in-service training days. The Academy should develop detailed training outlines that every division would use, and have Academy instructors available to assist watch commanders implement.</p>	<p>Electronic roll call training site on the Department's Local Area Network ("LAN") provides training for each day, provided by In-Service Training Division ("ISTD"). Pursuant to the Chief of Police Correspondence to the Police Commission on September 30, 2020 (found at: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102020/BPC_20-0139.pdf), the following are some of the most recent training available to the department:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Police Training and Education (PTE) is actively engaged in a wide variety of cutting-edge training designed to mitigate some of the at-risk behaviors. Below is a brief synopsis of PTE programs and initiatives related to Department efforts to decrease complaints and support officer wellness. Police Science and Leadership (PSL) – The PSL program focuses on developing empathic, relationship-focused police officers who solve long-term community problems, supporting the Department's goal of Preservation of Live through modern policing techniques and reinforcing the benefits of deescalation practices build public trust. Implicit Bias and Resiliency are aspects of this that directly address policing, substance abuse and domestic violence. Supervisor School – This course was recently updated with an enhanced three-hour block of instruction on how to properly respond to and complete a Biased Policing complaint. Distance Learning Education – PTE recently developed an application -based learning platform, specifically devoted to Implicit Bias / Racial Profiling and Organizational Wellness. Professional Standards Bureau will participate in the development of the source material for these courses to address topics in this report. Roll-Call Training – The Field Services Training Unit (FSTU) will be scheduling various wellness topics to be reviewed during roll-call training and bringing discussions on awareness, prevention, and intervention to the forefront. The FSTU plans to collaborate with Behavioral Science Services (BSS) and create videos providing personnel with in-depth information every other month. Leadership Enhancement and Development Sessions (LEADS) – PTE is continuing to hold LEADS for Command Staff. George Washington University professors on Policing History, Culture, and Race will be providing instruction, which supports the Department's efforts on understanding and supporting racial equity initiatives. Peer Support Program – In 2019 the Peer Support Team created a Substance Abuse Task Force that is comprised of BSS psychologists and staff from the Addiction Prevention Unit, and Peer Support members. A voluntary skills-based group called Sobriety Tactics meets regularly to learn skills for maintaining sobriety.
<p>Continuing Education</p>	<p>Command Accountability: Command accountability and effective supervisory techniques should be the primary focus of the training of sergeants, lieutenants, and captains.</p>	<p>Supervisors attend the following training either upon promotion or in some cases prior to promotion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon promotion to Detective Supervisor (DII) and Sergeant they must attend Supervisor School, which is a four-week training program where they will be educated on the responsibilities of being a first line supervisor. Upon pay-grade advancement to Sergeant II (Assistant Watch Commander) or Lieutenant personnel are assigned Watch Commander School where they learn the responsibilities of the Watch Commander position. LAPD Leadership School (formerly known as the West Point Leadership School) is available to Sergeants and Lieutenants where they learn the skills of being a leader in law enforcement. This program is recognized by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training and supervisors from other Departments can also attend. Command Development is for Lieutenants on the promotion list to Captain or recently appointed Captains. It is a four-week program, presented one week every other month. It provides an orientation to new Captains on their responsibilities as managers in the organization. Peace Officer Standards and Training Management course is an 80-hour training program required by POST to all new mid managers which provides training on the responsibility of being a manager in a law enforcement agency.

<p>Promotions</p>	<p>Consider Sustained and Not Sustained Complaints: Summaries of non-sustained complaints, as well as sustained complaint information that is presently available, should be included in an officer's central and division personnel file. The full complaint file should be available for review on request. Interview Boards and those making discretionary pay-grade advancement decisions should carefully consider these complaints.</p>	<p>All sustained complaints with penalties are available for review to the interview board. All sustained complaints with or without penalties within the previous five years of the date application are available for review to the interview board. Non-sustained complaints are not available for review to the interview board. This process is a result of an agreement between the department and the Police Protective League, following a meet and confer process, in which the parties both agreed that "Non Sustained" complaints should not influence a selection panel.</p>
<p>Assignment & Transfer</p>	<p>Remaining In Patrol a Positive Factor: An officer's decision to remain in patrol (especially where the officer's record demonstrates the qualifications to transfer out of patrol) should be a positive factor in promotion decisions.</p> <p>Consider Sustained and Not Sustained Complaints: Histories of sustained and non-sustained complaints should be available to managerial officers for use in making desirable assignments.</p>	<p>Officers receive a Geographic Patrol and Crime Suppression Incentive bonus of 1.25% as an incentive to remain in patrol. See also: Memorandum of Understanding between City and Police Protective League.</p> <p>All sustained complaints with penalties are available for review to the interview board. All sustained complaints with or without penalties within the previous five years of the date of application are available for review to the interview board. Non-sustained complaints are not available for review to the interview board. This process is a result of an agreement between the department and the Police Protective League, following a meet and confer process, in which the parties both agreed that "Non Sustained" complaints should not influence a selection panel.</p>
<p>Assignment & Transfer</p>	<p>Administrative Transfers: Administrative assignments should not be used simply to transfer a problem officer from one division to another. Rather, division commanding officers should enroll such an officer in a formal or informal training or counseling program. If that program is unsuccessful, an assignment should not place the officer in the position of repeating inappropriate conduct. If an administrative transfer is necessary, an explicit statement as to any appropriate assignment limitations should be included with the transfer, and such officers should not be transferred to the jail division.</p>	<p>Administrative Transfers are overseen by the Department Employee Relations Administrator and are approved by the Director, Office of Support Services. See also: Employee Relations Administrator Notice which outlines process for Administrative Transfers</p>

<p>Other Personnel Issues</p>	<p>Assignment Policy for Patrol Officers: The assignment policy for patrol officers should be modified to require periodic, mandatory rotations every 5 years in a manner designed to increase ethnic and gender diversity among divisions, and to expose officers to a broad variety of division experiences. Officers should rotate back into patrol after reasonable tours of duty in non-patrol assignments.</p>	<p>This is negotiated between the Los Angeles Police Protective League and the City and was not implemented.</p>
	<p>Incentives for Patrol: Increased rewards for patrol functions should be provided. The Department should consider, for example, augmenting the longevity pay program already in place.</p>	<p>Officers receive a Geographic Patrol and Crime Suppression Incentive bonus of 1.25% as an incentive to remain in patrol. See also: Memorandum of Understanding between City and Police Protective League.</p>
	<p>Psychological Retesting: Officers should be retested psychologically during their careers to recognize and treat early signs of stress. The Behavioral Science Services Section can be used to help treat stress and in training supervisory officers to recognize stress symptoms in those they supervise.</p>	<p>Officers can be referred to Behavioral Sciences Section based on observed behavior for a fitness for duty evaluation. Additionally, all personnel involved in a Categorical Use of Force incident or traffic accident in which a person is severely injured or killed are required to meet with a Department psychologist for a minimum of three visits prior to returning to the field.</p>
<p>Other Personnel Issues</p>	<p>Support City Charter Amendment Impacting Pension for Disability Caused By Serious Misconduct: The Commission supports a City Charter amendment that would direct the Board of Pension Commissioners to take into account as a negative factor if an officer's disability is a direct result of serious misconduct (based on a similar Labor Code provision limiting workers compensation benefits if activity giving rise to death/disability was expressly prohibited by departmental regulations).</p>	<p>Los Angeles City Charter Section 1506 provides: (i) Exclusion for Willful Conduct. In making its determinations and findings relative to subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, the Board shall consider whether and to what extent the activity giving rise to the disability of a member of the Police Department was caused or aggravated by such member's willful misconduct. If the Board finds that the disability was caused or aggravated by such willful misconduct, the Board shall deny the Plan Member's application for a disability pension. The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only to those Plan members who became members of the Police Department on or after July 6, 1992.</p>

<p>Complaint Intake</p>	<p>Creation of Office of the Inspector General: The Police Commission should create an Office of the Inspector General within the Police Commission, reporting directly to the Commission and its Chief of Staff, to audit and oversee the complaint and disciplinary process.</p>	<p>City Charter Amendment in 1995 – Volume 1, Article V, Section 573 created the OIG. Section 573 provides as follows:</p> <p>Sec. 573. Inspector General</p> <p>The Inspector General shall report to the Board of Police Commissioners and shall have the same access to Police Department information as the Board of Police Commissioners. The Inspector General shall have the power and duty to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) under rules established by the Board of Police Commissioners, audit, investigate and oversee the Police Department's handling of complaints of misconduct by police officers and civilian employees and perform other duties as may be assigned by the board; (b) conduct any audit or investigation requested by majority vote of the board; (c) initiate any investigation or audit of the Police Department without prior authorization of the Board of Police Commissioners, subject to the authority of the board by majority vote to direct the Inspector General not to commence or continue an investigation or audit; (d) keep the board informed of the status of all pending investigations and audits; and (e) appoint, discharge, discipline, transfer and issue instructions to employees under his or her direction.
--------------------------------	---	---

<p>Complaint Intake</p>	<p>Ease Barriers to Public In Filing Complaint: The Police Commission should publicize the ways to obtain complaint forms and to complete and file them. The straightforward form (and related posters) should be printed in English, Spanish, and other appropriate languages. Complaint should be received at places in addition to the police station, such as City Council district offices. The Inspector General should have trained personnel available through a telephone hotline ready to help people complete and file complaints.</p>	<p>There are many avenues to filing a complaint, which are listed on the LAPD website (found at: http://www.lapdonline.org/home/content_basic_view/666661), and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Call the LAPD's complaint hotline: 1-800-339-6868/TDD 213-978-3500 or send email to LAPDCMS@LAPD.ONLINE; • Ask to speak to a supervisor at any LAPD station; • Visit the Internal Affairs website or click on the Complaint Form links below; and • Visit any LAPD Community Police Station and speak directly with an LAPD supervisor, regardless of where the incident occurred. <p>The following options are available to file a complaint with the OIG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit our office in person. We are in the World Trade Center, in Downtown Los Angeles. Address: 350 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1002, Los Angeles, CA 90071 • Call the OIG. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phone: (213) 893-6400 TTY: (213) 482-7002 • Send us a Fax. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fax numbers: (213) 687-7473; (213) 687-7487; or (213) 687-7493 Email us at oigcomp@lapd.online • Send us a message via our mobile application, which is available via both Apple Store and Google Play. • Mail us a letter at the office address designated above. • Request to speak with OIG staff at a public meeting of the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners. • Send us a message via our Facebook page. • Send us a message via our Twitter profile. • Comment on our Google Business profile. <p>Complaint forms are available in the following languages: English, Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese.</p>
<p>Inspector General's Retention of Complaints: The IG's office should maintain a file of each complaint, and then route the complaint to IAD. If complaint initiated at IAD, it should be routed to the IG's office.</p>	<p>The OIG currently maintains a file on each complaint that it receives, and it routes each complaint to Internal Affairs Group (IAG). The OIG also maintains direct access to all complaints that are received by IAG via the TEAMS II System.</p>	
<p>Extend Statute of Limitations: The one year statute of limitations set forth in City Charter Section 202 should be extended and modified.</p>	<p>Government Code Section 3304(d) establishes a 1-year statute of limitations in which discipline must be imposed upon discovery of a violation by a supervisor. State law supersedes the City Charter.</p>	

<p>Complaint Intake</p>	<p>Investigate Civil Claims of Police Misconduct: The City Attorney's Office should promptly notify the Police Commission and the Department when civil claims are filed against the City arising out of alleged police misconduct. The Department, through IAD, should investigate every significant claim.</p>	<p>All civil claims generate a complaint investigation by Internal Affairs Group.</p>
	<p>Business Cards Handed Out Following Contact with Public: The Department should actively enforce the already existing requirement that business cards be handed out following police contact with the public.</p>	<p>The LAPD Manual provides: 41296.01 BUSINESS CARDS--DETAINEE RELEASED WITHOUT BEING BOOKED OR CITED. When any person detained by an employee of this Department is subsequently released without being booked or cited, the responsible officer shall explain the reason for the detention. Prior to the person's release, the officer shall offer to provide the detained person an official Department business card, and, if requested, provide the business card complete with the officer's name and the division of assignment.</p> <p>In its 2017 Report on national best practices, the Office of the Inspector General wrote: "LAPD policy currently requires that officers provide a business card to those they have detained and released without a citation or arrest, and that, for stops that are documented in the stop data system, the business card include the date and time of the stop as well as the last four digits of the related incident number. It also requires that the person be informed of the reason for the detention." (2017)</p> <p>"Despite these mandates being written in the policy manual, however, the OIG has observed that officers do not appear to consistently provide subjects of a stop with a business card. It has also noted in a previous report that reviewers could not always identify the explanation of the stop in videos associated with a pedestrian stop. Following the OIG's raising of this issue, the Office of Operations moved quickly to prepare a notice reminding all Bureau commanding officers of requirements relating to collecting stop data and, when no enforcement action is taken, providing those stopped with a business card." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department should continue to reinforce and hold officers accountable for requirements that they identify themselves during a stop, provide a business card, and explain the reason for the stop." "In recent months, the Department has been reviewing how best to apply and enforce the business card policy, and it is currently working to finalize a change in language that will require officers to "offer" a business card rather than to "provide" it. As noted in Section A-1, it has also been developing a Procedural Justice Review form that specifically incorporates an assessment of whether the officers explained the reason for each stop, as required. The OIG will continue to monitor this issue, and officers' adherence to these policies, as part of its auditing responsibilities."</p>

Investigation of Complaints	<p>Excessive Force Complaints Investigated by IAD: All complaints relating to excessive force (including improper tactics) should be investigated by IAD rather than the division, and should be subject to periodic audits by the Police Commission through its Inspector General.</p> <p>IAD's Composition: IAD investigators should generally be detectives. Longer assignments to IAD should be established to allow investigators to develop the detachment necessary for full and fair investigations.</p> <p>IAD's Structural Independence: The head of IAD should be a deputy chief and should report directly to the Chief of Police, and work closely with the Police Commission and its Inspector General.</p> <p>Inspector General Oversight: IAD should route the completed investigation file to the IG, which will be able to satisfy itself that the investigation is thorough and complete.</p> <p>Immediately Discontinue Improper Investigative Practices: There should be no group interviews of officers and no "pre-interviews" of officers before taking their statements. As is currently done by IAD, all interviews should be tape recorded in excessive force related cases (including improper tactics) as well as in cases involving shootings.</p> <p>Special Precautions If Conduct Potentially Criminal: In an investigation where the officer's conduct is potentially criminal, special precautions should be taken to protect against compromising evidence against the officer.</p>	<p>Complaints related to excessive force are categorized as Unauthorized Force and Investigated by Internal Affairs Group. The OIG conducts periodic audits, as reflected here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2ddc23_e7798ead7a404e66918012682144c09a.pdf https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2ddc23_6991ca7f7969d215704378ac6866271849.pdf</p> <p>All investigators assigned to Internal Affairs Group are supervisors at the ranks of Detective II, Detective III or Sergeant II.</p> <p>Currently, the Commanding Officer for Professional Standards Bureau (Internal Affairs Group is part of Professional Standard Division) is Deputy Chief Robert Marino. The Deputy Chief reports to the Assistant Chief of the Office of Support Services.</p> <p>A representative from the Office of the Inspector General attends all Internal Affairs presentations and signings by the Chief of Police.</p> <p>In Use of Force cases, interviews are conducted by Force Investigation Division (FID), and such interviews are recorded and transcribed for the investigation. This is implemented in the case of all investigations.</p> <p>This practice is in place. These types of investigations are assigned to Internal Affairs Criminal Division investigators.</p>
-----------------------------	---	---

<p>Investigation of Complaints</p>	<p>Investigation of Bystander Officers: In excessive force cases, IAD should investigate the role of all bystander officers to determine whether and to what degree they are in violation of Department policy.</p>	<p>All substantially involved officers are evaluated. The Inspector General, with the concurrence of the Board of Police Commissioners, has the opportunity to expand the list of officers investigated, should they determine any officers were substantially involved. This includes bystander officers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, the 2020 Use of Force Policy provides (the new Use of Force policy can be found here: UOF policy): <p>Requirement to Report Potential Excessive Force. An officer who is present and observes another officer using force that the present and observing officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable superior officer, under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer, shall report such force to a superior officer.</p> <p>Requirement to Intervene When Excessive Force is Observed. An officer shall intervene when present and observing another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances, taking into account the possibility that other officers may have additional information regarding the threat posed by a subject.</p> <p>The Department Manual provides:</p> <p>210.46 EMPLOYEES DUTY TO REPORT MISCONDUCT. The reporting of misconduct and prevention of the escalation of misconduct are areas that demand an employee to exercise courage, integrity, and decisiveness. Department Manual Section 3/813.05 requires that when an employee, at any level, becomes aware of possible misconduct by another member of this Department, the employee shall immediately report the incident to a supervisor or directly to Internal Affairs Group. Furthermore, an employee who observes serious misconduct shall take appropriate action to cause the misconduct to immediately cease. The fact that a supervisor is present and not taking appropriate action to stop the misconduct does not relieve other employees present from this obligation.</p> <p>An employee's obligation to report and prevent misconduct begins the moment the employee becomes a member of the Los Angeles Police Department. Police officers, because of their status as peace officers, have an even greater responsibility to report and prevent misconduct. Experience, rank, or tenure are not factors in knowing the difference between right and wrong, and they do not provide an excuse for failing to take appropriate action. Although supervisors are responsible for investigating allegations of misconduct, all Department employees are responsible for preventing and reporting misconduct.</p> <p>The citizens of Los Angeles expect and deserve employees who possess a high degree of integrity. Any employee who is perceived, justifiably or not, to be condoning or concealing misconduct impairs the trust of the public. Employees must respect and be aware of their responsibility to freely and truthfully report all acts of misconduct and to act, if necessary, to prevent the escalation of those acts. This is essential if the Department is to maintain the trust of the public.</p>
<p>Classification & Adjudication of Complaints</p>	<p>Initial Classification: The initial classification of complaints should be made by the bureau commanding officer (a Deputy Chief or commander) not the charged officer's division commanding officer.</p>	<p>The initial classification of complaints is done at the Chain of Command and verified by the Classification Unit in Internal Affairs Group.</p> <p>See also: Department Complaint Process</p> <p>Pursuant to the Chief of Police Correspondence to the Police Commission on September 30, 2020 (found at: http://www.lapdpolicy.com/lacfty.org/102020/BPC_20-0139.pdf), while allegation classification typically occurs as the investigation draws to a close, due to the critical importance of identifying increasing rates of at-risk behavior and initiating corrective action prior the completion of investigations, the Department will implement a semi-annual report on the following complaint investigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biased Policing/Discrimination; Domestic Incident/Altercation; Alcohol related to include driving while impaired; and Unauthorized Use of Force.

<p>Classification & Adjudication of Complaints</p>	<p>Modify Classification Terminology: The "not sustained" classification should be renamed "not resolved."</p>	<p>As noted in the 2019 Annual Complaint Report, found at http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacjty.org/102020/BPC__20-0139.pdf, the following is the classification terminology used (indicating that the "not resolved" category was adopted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfounded: When the investigation indicates the act complained of did not occur; • Exonerated: When the investigation indicates the act occurred but that the act was justified, lawful and proper; • Not Resolved: When the investigation disclosed that the act complained of did not occur and constitutes misconduct; • Sustained: When the investigation discloses that the act complained of did not occur and constitutes misconduct; • Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate of Department Employee Not Involved: The investigation could not be thoroughly or properly investigated/completed for reasons beyond the Department's control or determines no Department Employee was involved; and • Demonstrably False: When it is clearly proven that an allegation did not occur. <p>A "not resolved" finding can be used for future investigations, and considered in future investigations to establish a pattern of conduct. It cannot be used for promotions or upgrades. Training can be given regardless of complaint.</p> <p><u>See also:</u> Personnel Complaint Letter of Transmittal</p>
<p>Use of Findings: A "not resolved" finding, while not sufficient to impose discipline in that particular case, should be available for review in future investigations, as well as considered in employee evaluations and for purposes of promotions and upgrades. Any finding, including "unfounded" and "exonerated," should be available for non-punitive purposes such as training, counseling, and assignment.</p>	<p>All available evidence, including statements from witnesses (whether they are deemed independent or involved), is evaluated in making a classification based on a preponderance of the evidence standard.</p>	
<p>Discontinue "The Goes to Officer" Approach: The automatic preference for officers' testimony should not be relied on as a decision-making technique. All available evidence, including statements from witnesses (whether they are deemed independent or involved) should be fairly and dispassionately evaluated in making a classification based on a preponderance of the evidence standard.</p>	<p>After the initial adjudication is completed, IAD reviews the final adjudication and either concurs or recommends a different penalty to the Chief of Police. The Inspector General has access to all complaint files.</p>	
<p>IAD "Second Look" at Investigation and Classification: After the initial adjudication is complete, the file should be sent back to IAD for its review of the investigation and classification. A copy of the completed complaint file should simultaneously be routed to the IG's office.</p>		

<p>Classification & Adjudication of Complaints</p>	<p>Evaluation of Command Officers & Bureau Chiefs: The bureau chief should provide subordinate command officers monthly with a list of officers who have been the subject of personnel complaints and the results of the adjudicated complaints. Evaluation of command officers should take into account and give significant weight to the complaint histories of the officers under that person's command. Likewise, bureau chiefs should be evaluated on their effectiveness in dealing with subordinate commanders whose divisions are a source of high levels of personnel complaints.</p>	<p>This is managed in TEAMS II where Bureau Chiefs and Area Captains receive the information on their subordinate personnel. Also, these matters are discussed in CompStat without the involved officers' names being disclosed. Area Captains are evaluated relative to their management of personnel, complaint investigation and adjudication of those complaints.</p> <p>See also: The Letter of Transmittal will contain a review of the TEAMS II and complaint history of the involved employee and a rationale for the adjudication.</p> <p>See also the Office of the Inspector General Report:</p> <p>https://a27e048f-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7b6e327.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_55abf0c0cb5124b879f612eeb877a0ad6.pdf (officers' perceived inequities/inconsistencies in the disciplinary system relating to supervisors and how they are given preferential treatment/not always held accountable in the same ways that line officers are).</p>
<p>Written Explanation by Police Chief:</p>	<p>If a complaint is sustained and there is a recommendation for suspension or removal, the Chief of Police should submit to the IG a written explanation containing the facts and reasons for any modification in the classification or penalty.</p>	<p>A representative of the Office of the Inspector General attends all Internal Affairs presentations and signings by the Chief of Police. Additionally, the Chief of Police reports to the Commission and not the Inspector General.</p> <p>See also: The Letter of Transmittal will contain a review of the TEAMS II and complaint history of the involved employee and a rationale for the adjudication.</p>
<p>Consideration of Evidence from Past Complaints:</p>	<p>Bureau chiefs and Board of Rights should be permitted to consider evidence adduced in prior complaints that were classified "sustained" or "not resolved," and the City Charter should be amended to so provide. These fact finders should be permitted to give whatever weight to that evidence they deem appropriate. The Board of Rights may, in its discretion, consider evidence of such complaints, including the testimony of the prior complainant.</p>	<p>This information is considered by the adjudicator of a complaint relative to the penalty recommendation if the complaint is sustained.</p> <p>See also: The Letter of Transmittal will contain a review of the TEAMS II and complaint history of the involved employee and a rationale for the adjudication.</p>

<p>Classification & Adjudication of Complaints</p>	<p>Composition of Board of Rights: The City Charter should be amended to provide that if a Board of Rights is convened, one of the three members should be a civilian representative from the IG's office. The other two Board members should be randomly selected from among qualified officers, without further selection by the charged officer as is now allowed.</p>	<p>The Office of the Inspector General does not sit on the Board of Rights. The City Charter, Section 22.290, provides the following with respect to the composition of the members of the Board of Rights, and the oversight of the Board to be conducted by the Office of the Inspector General:</p> <p>Sec. 22.290. Board of Rights Optional Composition.</p> <p>(a) Composition. Pursuant to Charter Section 1070(h), the accused shall have the option of having the complaint heard and decided by a Board of Rights composed of three individuals who are not members of the Department (three civilian members) instead of a Board composed of two officers and one civilian.</p> <p>(b) Qualifications and Compensation of the Civilian Members. The Board of Police Commissioners shall maintain a panel of competent adult civilians to serve as members of Boards of Rights and to be compensated at a per diem rate established for City hearing examiners.</p> <p>(c) Selection Procedures for Civilian Members to Board of Rights. Upon the filing of the request for a hearing before a Board of Rights, the Police Commission staff shall randomly draw nine names from the approved panel of individuals who are qualified to be civilian members of the Board of Rights. The Department representative and the employee shall each strike three of the nine names selected. The Department representative shall strike the first name and the employee shall strike the second name in alternating fashion until there are three remaining names. Those three remaining names shall serve as members of the Board of Rights. The Board of Police Commissioners shall establish any additional procedures necessary to effectuate the selection process above.</p> <p>(d) No Retroactive Application. This section shall not apply to any complaint that has been filed by the Chief of Police with the Board of Police Commissioners prior to the effective date this section.</p> <p>(e) Annual Audit by Inspector General. The Inspector General of the Police Commission shall conduct an annual audit on the Board of Rights proceedings.</p> <p>(f) Release of Board of Rights Decisions. The Board of Rights decisions shall be released to the public as permissible under law.</p> <p>(g) Repeal Period and Evaluation. This section shall not be repealed for at least two years after its adoption. At the end of the two-year period, the Department shall submit a report to the City Council evaluating the effectiveness of the ordinance.</p>
<p>Public Accountability</p>	<p>Annual Disciplinary Audit by IG: The Inspector General should audit the disciplinary system at least annually, and forward that detailed audit to the Police Commission for its review and approval. The results of this audit should be incorporated into the Chief of Police's performance review. The Chief of Police should be required to respond to this audit. The Police Commission should publish the audit and the Chief of Police's response to the public, and should set aside a particular public meeting or meetings to review the audit and to take public comment.</p>	<p>The OIG continuously oversees the discipline system. The decisions on Non-Categorical Use of Force cases, and Categorical Use of Force cases are presented in the Use of Force year-end review (Use of Force Data Reports). In addition, the annual complaint report is also published. See, for example: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/10202018PC_20-0139.pdf.</p> <p>Both of the above annual reports are presented at Police Commission meetings, and public comment is accepted at that time.</p> <p>The OIG also provides the Police Commission with an annual assessment of the discipline imposed in Categorical Use of Force cases that result in Out of Policy and/or Administrative Disapproval findings, which is used for purposes of the annual performance review of the Chief of Police.</p>

<p>Structural issues</p>	<p>Police Commissioners: The Police Commission should remain a 5-member part-time body. Police Commissioners should reflect the City's diversity, and be persons of stature and experience with the ability to make balanced, fair-minded judgments and to act constructively and decisively. Police Commissioners should serve a maximum of 5 years, with staggered terms, and no one should serve more than two consecutive years as President. Police Commissioners' compensation should be increased substantially to reflect importance of the position and significant time commitment required. Approximately \$1500 per month seems reasonable.</p>	<p>The Police Commission is comprised of 5 members of the community who serve in voluntary positions. The Los Angeles City Charter provides as follows: Sec. 571. Board of Police Commissioners. (a) Members of the Board of Police Commissioners shall serve for a maximum of two five-year terms, except that a member may serve up to two years of an unexpired term plus two terms of five years. A member of the Board of Police Commissioners shall be limited to two consecutive one-year terms as President of the Board of Police Commissioners. (b) The Board of Police Commissioners shall have the power to: (1) issue instructions to the Chief of Police concerning the exercise of the authority conferred on the Chief of Police by the Charter, other than the disciplinary authority conferred by Section 1070; (2) evaluate the Chief of Police annually, set or adjust the compensation for the Chief of Police within the salary guidelines established by Council after recommendations concerning those guidelines have been made to the Council by the Director of the Office of Administrative and Research Services; and forward a copy of the evaluation and salary determination to the Mayor and Council for information; (3) appoint and remove an Executive Director whose position shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the Charter and who shall not be a member of the Police Department; and (4) appoint and remove an Inspector General of the Police Department subject to Section 245, whose position shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of Article X of the Charter and who shall not be a member of the Police Department.</p>
---------------------------------	--	---

Structural Issues

Increase of Police Commissioners Staff: The Police Commission's independent staff should be increased and placed under the direction and control of a civilian Chief of Staff. Most, if not all, of the additional staff should be civilian employees with expertise in areas most useful to the Police Commission, including management auditors, computer-systems data analysts, investigators with law enforcement experience, and attorneys. Anticipate at least 15 to 20 such positions will be needed, including 4-5 staff attorneys. Additional staff will also be needed to assist the Police Commission in carrying out its recommended citizen complaint function.

Reassignment of Permit Function: The Police Commission's permit function should be reassigned to another body, either inside or outside the Police Department.

Chief of Police Exempted From Civil Service Provisions: The selection, tenure, discipline, and removal of the Police Chief should be exempted from existing civil service provisions.

Appointment of Police Chief: The Police Chief should be appointed by the Mayor, with the advice and consent of a majority of City Council. Candidates for Chief should be recruited, tested and ranked through a system of open competition administered by the City's Personnel Department.

The Police Commission has limited staff, and no staff attorneys. The Executive Director of the Commission is responsible for staff assigned to the Commission.

Section 572 of the Los Angeles City Charter provides as follows:

Sec. 572. Executive Director of the Board of Police Commissioners.

Subject to the provisions of the Charter, the rules of the Police Department, and the instruction of the Board of Police Commissioners, the Executive Director of the Board of Police Commissioners shall have the power and duty to:

- (a) administer the affairs of the Board of Police Commissioners as its chief administrative officer;
- (b) appoint, discharge, discipline, transfer and issue instructions to employees appointed as independent staff of the Board of Police Commissioners, except for employees under the direction of the Inspector General, all subject to the civil service provisions of Article X of the Charter;
- (c) expend the funds designated by budgetary appropriations or appropriations made after adoption of the budget for expenditure by the Board of Police Commissioners or its staff, in accordance with the provisions of those appropriations;
- (d) recommend to the Board of Police Commissioners prior to the beginning of each fiscal year a budget covering the anticipated revenues and expenditures of the board and its staff, conforming so far as practicable to the forms and dates provided in the Charter in relation to the general City budget;
- (e) certify the expenditures of the Board of Police Commissioners and its staff to the chief accounting employee; and
- (f) exercise further powers in the administration of the Board of Police Commissioners conferred upon the Executive Director by the board.

The authority of the Executive Director shall not extend to authority over the Chief of Police nor encroach upon the authority of the Chief of Police to administer the affairs of the Police Department as its general manager and chief administrative officer.

Permit function remains within the Board of Police Commissioners. The City Council created the Police Permit Review Panel, which in conjunction with the Executive Director, processes, approves, denies, suspends or revokes all police commission-issued permits.

The position of Chief of Police is exempted from Civil Service Provisions. Pursuant to the Los Angeles City Charter, the Mayor and the Board of Police Commissioners are responsible for the selection, tenure, discipline, and removal of the Chief.

The Los Angeles City Charter, Section 575, provides:

The Chief of Police shall be appointed, shall serve, and shall be removed in accordance with the following provisions:

- (a) Recruitment and Selection. The recruitment and selection of qualified candidates for the position of Chief of Police shall be administered by the general manager of the Personnel Department, in cooperation with the Board of Police Commissioners, through a system of open competition based on professionally accepted recruitment and selection standards. The general manager of the Personnel Department shall refer a group of at least six highly qualified candidates to the Board of Police Commissioners, which shall then provide a list of three recommended candidates, in ranked order, to the Mayor for review and for appointment of one of them to the Office of Chief of Police. At the request of the Mayor, the Board of Police Commissioners shall provide the Mayor with an additional list of three candidates, in ranked order, from the group of candidates previously provided by the general manager of the Personnel Department. The Mayor's appointee shall be subject to confirmation by the Council. Should the Council fail to confirm the appointee, and if any additional candidates remain, the Mayor may request and receive from the Board of Police Commissioners one additional candidate, who will be selected from the group of candidates previously provided by the general manager of the Personnel Department. The Mayor may appoint that candidate or one of the candidates on the list or lists previously provided to the Mayor by the Board of Police Commissioners, subject to Council confirmation.

See also: http://www.lapdonline.org/lppd_manual/volume_2.htm

<p>Structural Issues</p>	<p>Term Limit for Police Chief: The Police Chief should serve a 5-year term, renewable at the discretion of the Police Commission for one additional 5-year term. There should be no property right in or to the position, nor any right to renewal; neither the Mayor nor the City Council should have authority to overrule the Police Commission's decision whether or not to renew the Chief for a second term.</p> <p>Annual Review of Police Chief: The Police Commission should perform a meaningful annual review of the Chief's performance and document its evaluation.</p> <p>Termination of Police Chief: The Police Commission should have the authority to terminate the Chief prior to the expiration of the first or second 5-year term, but the final decision should require concurrence of the Mayor. The Chief thereafter may request a hearing before the City Council, which may in its discretion overrule the decision by a 2/3 vote.</p> <p>Police Chief Should Not Endorse Candidates: The Chief of Police should not endorse candidates for public office.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles City Charter, Section 575, provides:</p> <p>(b) Term. The Chief of Police shall serve a five-year term and may be appointed, in the manner described below, to a second five-year term. No person shall serve as Chief of Police for more than ten years altogether. Time accrued as Acting Chief of Police or as a temporary Chief of Police shall not be included in calculating the ten years.</p> <p>See also: http://www.lapdonline.org/lepd_manual/volume_2.htm</p> <p>Pursuant to the Los Angeles City Charter, Section 571(b)(2), the Board of Police Commissioners is to:</p> <p>(c) evaluate the Chief of Police annually, set or adjust the compensation for the Chief of Police within the salary guidelines established by Council after recommendations concerning those guidelines have been made to the Council by the Director of the Office of Administrative and Research Services; and forward a copy of the evaluation and salary determination to the Mayor and Council for information;</p> <p>The Police Commission conducts an annual review of the Chief of Police.</p> <p>The Los Angeles City Charter, Section 575, provides as follows:</p> <p>(d) Removal by Board. The Chief of Police shall serve at the pleasure of the City, as set forth herein, and shall not attain any property interest in the position of Chief of Police. The Board of Police Commissioners may remove the Chief of Police from office at any time prior to the expiration of a first or second five-year term. Should the Board of Police Commissioners so act to remove the Chief of Police, it shall promptly notify the Mayor of its action. If the Council has not asserted its jurisdiction over the matter of the removal of the Chief of Police as permitted under Section 245, the Mayor shall have five days from the last date on which the Council could have asserted jurisdiction to reverse the action of the Board of Police Commissioners. Upon the Mayor's failure to act within that period, the removal shall become effective. By a letter received by the City Clerk within five days of the effective date of the removal, the removed Chief of Police may request a hearing on the removal before the Council which, by two-thirds vote, may override the removal and restore the Chief of Police to office. If the Council asserts jurisdiction over the matter of the removal of the Chief of Police and acts to retain the Chief, the action shall be final. If the action of the Council is to remove the Chief of Police, the removal shall be effective immediately. Should the provision of an appeal from the removal be required by law, the Council shall, by ordinance, provide an appellate procedure in conformance with the law. The Chief of Police may request an appeal by letter to the City Clerk within five days of the effective date of the removal.</p> <p>See also: http://www.lapdonline.org/lepd_manual/volume_2.htm</p> <p>The Chief of Police does not endorse candidates for public office.</p>
---------------------------------	---	---

Past LAPD Reforms

2020 Status Report re: Consent Decree (2001) and Final Independent Monitor Report (2009)

Report updated as of
January 1, 2021

Early Warning System – Creation of TEAMS II		
2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Establishing Training Evaluation and Management System (“TEAMS II”) (Computer Information System): The City must develop and shall establish a database containing relevant information about its officers, supervisors, and managers to identify and modify at-risk behavior (aka an early warning system).</p>	<p>“Over the initial five-year term of the Decree and its three-year extension, the LAPD dedicated countless hours and resources to successfully develop TEAMS II. Its development and implementation is certainly among the City and Department’s greatest achievements.”</p> <p>See also compliance discussion by sub-section below.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668 (also reference 3/791 for additional general info)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “The information contained in TEAMS II... may contain information obtained from police officer personnel records concerning discipline, use of force, attendance, medical information or injured on duty status....” See LAPD Manual 1/668.06. TEAMS II generates reports used by supervisors to “detect any pattern or series of incidents that may indicate that employees may be engaging in at-risk behavior.” See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. “Commanding officers shall ensure that supervisory personnel provide a TEAMS II report to each employee in conjunction with the service of the employee’s annual (post-probationary) performance evaluation report.” See LAPD Manual 3/791.
<p>Access to TEAMS II: The Commission, Inspector General (IG), and Chief of Police shall have equal and full access to TEAMS II. The Commission may impose an identical access restriction on itself and the IG to highly sensitive information, provided such restriction does not in any way impair or impede implementation of the Consent Decree. The Department shall establish a TEAMS II access policy for all persons, including staff of the Commission and Inspector General.</p>	<p>The Monitor “found that TEAMS II access to all entities was appropriate and that the TEAMS II policy outlining access was approved and distributed as required by the Consent Decree.”</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.06.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Each employee has access to his/her own TEAMS II information. With that exception, only managers, supervisors, the Board of Police Commissioners and the Inspector General, or their approved designees, shall have access to other employee’s TEAMS II information. Their levels of access will vary based on the criteria and procedure established by the Department and mandated by state law. Managers and supervisors are automatically granted access to TEAMS II information for employees below their rank/class and paygrade within their Area, division of bureau of command.” See LAPD Manual 1/668.06. “When a commanding officer has determined that an alternate authorized use is necessary, he/she shall complete a TEAMS II Authorization Form, Form 01.43.00, and forward it to the Commanding Officer, Application Development and Support Division, for approval.” See LAPD Manual 1/668.06. “Access control is dependent upon the DPS system and it is critical that all commands keep the DPS [Deployment Planning System] up to date. Access and proxy delegation may only be made to personnel within the delegating person’s chain of command....” See LAPD Manual 1/668.06.

Early Warning System – Creation of TEAMS II

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>TEAMS II Data: TEAMS II shall include current and historical data of, among other things, use of force, canine bites, fire-arms discharge, vehicle pursuits and traffic collisions, criminal and administrative investigations, written complaints, recommendations and awards, criminal arrests and investigations, civil or administrative claims, civil lawsuits, all reports and citations made by the officer, including vehicle and pedestrian stops, assignment and rank history, performance evaluations, training history, failure to meet weapons qualification requirements, and management and supervisory actions taken. TEAMS II should include the demographic information of involved members of the public and information on officers involved in incidents (work assignment, officer partner, field supervisor, and shift at the time of incident).</p>	<p>"The [Historical] Data Input Plan was written and approved by all parties in the third quarter of 2003 and included an appendix that described data elements and time periods to be included and the amount, type and scope of historical data, as required. Such historical data was imported into TEAMS II over the course of the last few years for all categories, including complaints, UOF, traffic collisions, vehicle pursuits, arrests, claims and lawsuits, and training."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAPD Manual 1/668. TEAMS II includes the following employee activity: "personal complaints (where an employee is the Accused), Use of Force Incidents (where an employee is an Involved Officer), Claims and Lawsuits (where an employee is a Defendant), Claims, Traffic Collisions, and Pursuits." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. The rate and frequency in which an office conducts "stops and arrests" are "analyzed by Risk Management Information System (RMIS)," embedded within TEAMS II. See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. "The information contained in TEAMS II... may contain information obtained from police officer personnel records concerning discipline, use of force, attendance, medical information or injured on duty status...." See LAPD Manual 1/668.06.
<p>Searchability: TEAMS II shall include relevant numerical and descriptive information about each incorporated item and incident and scanned or electronic attachments of copies of relevant documents. TEAMS II shall be searchable via such numerical and descriptive information. TEAMS II shall have the capability to perform percentage and other statistical analyses with such information.</p>	<p>"The Monitor found relevant and descriptive information about various items and incidents included in TEAMS II, and relevant scanned copies of certain documents were available in RMIS, the UOFS and other [component] systems of TEAMS II."</p> <p>The Monitor also "determined that [certain summary and comparison reports run monthly] met the Consent Decree requirement that TEAMS II have the capability to search and retrieve numerical counts, percentages and other statistical analyses for individual employees, LAPD units, groups of officers, incidents or items and groups of incidents or items."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAPD Manual 1/668. "All sworn employees are assigned to a peer group based on the type of work the employee performs (e.g. patrol, gang enforcement detail and vice, etc.) and/or the type of frequency of public contacts. . . Performance thresholds are calculated by applying a statistical model to the counts of employee activity within each peer group. If an employee engages in a type of activity analyzed by RMIS as outlined above, RMIS compares the employee's recent activity to that employee's peer group performance threshold. If the employee's activity meets or exceeds the employee's peer group performance thresholds, RMIS automatically generates an Action Item (AI) and forwards it to the employee's immediate supervisor. The affected employee will be notified by Electronic Mail System of the AI. . . All AIs will appear on an employee's TEAMS II report as 'Pending' until the AI has been reviewed by the employee's bureau or equivalent. Upon final review and approval, the 'Pending' status will change to indicate the final disposition. All AIs, regardless of disposition, will appear on the employee's TEAMS II report once completed." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. "TEAMS II will also provide a number of standardized reports that provide a summary of an employee's performance in comparison to their peer group, their co-workers, watch, division, area, bureau, etc. There are similar reports for supervisors as well as organizational comparisons." See LAPD Manual 1/668.04.

Early Warning System – Creation of TEAMS II

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Cross-Checking Capabilities: TEAMS II shall use common control numbers to link single incidents across several supporting documents and sources. Similarly, all personally identifiable information relating to LAPD officers shall contain the serial or other employee identification number of the officer for such cross-referencing and linking capabilities.</p>	<p>Vetting the "common control number" requirement of the Consent Decree, "The Monitor reviewed working papers for incidents that are associated with other incidents from other source systems that feed the RMIS database and are cross-referenced in RMIS. The TEAMS II staff and Monitor verified that the cross-references that were in the source systems still existed and were working in RMIS."</p>	<p>While not codified, the required functionality is built into TEAMS II.</p>

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Develop TEAMS II Use Protocol: The Department shall develop and implement a protocol for using TEAMS II, for purposes including supervising and auditing the performance of specific officers, supervisors, managers, and LAPD units, as well as the LAPD as a whole.</p>	<p>"During the third quarter of 2007, the Monitor conducted a review of [application of] some of the TEAMS II protocols [implemented by reviewing TEAMS II action items triggered during this time...]"</p> <p>The Monitor broke down its review by subject (e.g., compliance with protocols requiring regular supervisor review, documentation, et al).</p> <p>See also compliance discussion by sub-section below.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "All sworn employees are assigned to a peer group based on the type of work the employee performs (e.g., patrol, gang enforcement detail and vice, etc.) and/or the type of frequency of public contacts. . . Performance thresholds are calculated by applying a statistical model to the counts of employee activity within each peer group. If an employee engages in a type of activity analyzed by RIMS as outlined above, RIMS compares the employee's recent activity to that employee's peer group performance threshold. If the employee's activity meets or exceeds the employee's peer group performance threshold, RIMS automatically generates an Action Item (AI) and forwards it to the employee's immediate supervisor. The affected employee will be notified by Electronic Mail System of the AI. . . All AIs will appear on an employee's TEAMS II report as 'Pending' until the AI has been reviewed by the employee's bureau or equivalent. Upon final review and approval, the 'Pending' status will change to indicate the final disposition. All AIs, regardless of disposition, will appear on the employee's TEAMS II report once completed." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. "When a supervisor receives a RIMS generated AI in their TEAMS II Personal Worklist for an employee within his/her chain of command, the supervisor shall review the following for non-supervisory personnel. . . TEAMS II Report; and Summary of Employee Activity." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01 (emphasis added). "When a supervisor receives a RIMS generated AI in their TEAMS II Personal Worklist for an employee within his/her chain of command, the supervisor shall review the following for supervisory personnel. . . TEAMS II Report; Summary of Employee Activity; and Comparison of Employee Average Activity for selected organizations." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01 (emphasis added). "When a supervisor receives a RIMS generated AI in their TEAMS II Personal Worklist for an employee within his/her chain of command, the supervisor shall review the following for captains and above. . . TEAMS II Report; and Comparison of Employee Average Activity for selected organizations." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01 (emphasis added).

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Require Regular Supervisor Review of TEAMS II Data: Require that, on a regular basis, supervisors review and analyze relevant TEAMS II information about officers under their supervision to detect any pattern or series of incidents that indicate that an officer, group of officers, or LAPD unit may be engaging in at-risk behavior. When at-risk behavior may be occurring, managers and supervisors must undertake a more intensive review of the officer's performance.</p>	<p>By Q3 2008, "all . . . [relevant TEAMS II information was] reviewed by supervisors on a regular basis and analyzed and . . . these action items were initiated when required." However, "[t]he Monitor found [only] 9% of the action items reviewed were in compliance with the requirements to conduct a further review when at-risk behavior may be occurring. Of those non-compliant action items, some supervisors or managers did not conduct thorough enough reviews of work histories, did not consider any specific incidents within the work histories and did not document the justification for their dispositions."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The supervisor shall analyze all relevant information to detect any pattern or series of incidents that may indicate that employee may be engaging in at-risk behavior. Additionally, the supervisor shall assess the affected employee's performance against that of similar employees, such as employees in the same peer group, organization or similar job assignment. . . If the supervisor identifies that at-risk behavior may be occurring, the supervisor shall undertake a more detailed review of the employee's performance. The review may include arrest reports, use of force reports, personnel complaints (pending and adjudicated), traffic collision reports, vehicle pursuit reports, etc. The review of these additional reports should assist the supervisor to determine whether an employee's behavior is outstanding, acceptable, or possibly constitutes at-risk behavior needing further monitoring or action." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01.
<p>Require Regular Manager Review of TEAMS II Data: Require that, on a regular basis, managers review and analyze relevant TEAMS II information about subordinate managers and supervisors in their command regarding the ability to manage adherence to policy and address at-risk behavior. Appropriate managers should regularly review TEAMS II information to evaluate officer performance citywide and make appropriate comparisons regarding the performance of all LAPD units in order to identify any patterns or series of incidents that may indicate at-risk behavior.</p>	<p>"The Monitor concluded that all action items were being reviewed and analyzed for adherence to policy and addressing potentially at-risk behavior on every review level by the appropriate managers and supervisors. The Monitor also found that managers were providing both direction and feedback for their subordinates' review and analysis of these action items and their adherence to policy and addressing at-risk behavior."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "When a supervisor receives a RMIS generated AI in their TEAMS II Personal Worklist for an employee within his/her chain of command, the supervisor shall review the following for <i>supervisory personnel</i>. . . TEAMS II Report; Summary of Employee Activity; and Comparison of Employee Average Activity for selected organizations." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01 (emphasis added). • "The supervisor shall analyze all relevant information to detect any pattern or series of incidents that may indicate that employee may be engaging in at-risk behavior. Additionally, the supervisor shall assess the affected employee's performance against that of similar employees, such as employees in the same peer group, organization or similar job assignment. . . If the supervisor identifies that at-risk behavior may be occurring, the supervisor shall undertake a more detailed review of the employee's performance. The review may include arrest reports, use of force reports, personnel complaints (pending and adjudicated), traffic collision reports, vehicle pursuit reports, etc. The review of these additional reports should assist the supervisor to determine whether an employee's behavior is outstanding, acceptable, or possibly constitutes at-risk behavior needing further monitoring or action." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01.

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Develop Guidelines for Additional Reviews/Audits: Develop guidelines for numbers and types of incidents requiring a TEAMS II review (in addition to routine reviews) by supervisors and managers, and the frequency of these reviews, and the follow-up managerial or supervisory actions (including non-disciplinary actions) to be taken based on reviews of the TEAMS II information. TEAMS II information shall be one source of information in determining when to undertake an audit of an LAPD unit or group of officers.</p>	<p>"The Monitor found that the protocols appropriately provide the guidelines required for the numbers and types of incidents requiring a TEAMS II review. The Monitor also found that the protocols appropriately indicate the guidelines required for the follow-up managerial or supervisory actions, including non-disciplinary actions, to be taken based on reviews of the information in TEAMS II."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "In the 'Investigative Narrative' section of the AI, [the supervisor will] document the [employee's] performance assessment. . . The narrative shall include, but is not limited to, the following: Brief summary of each Use Of Force (UOF), Complaint, Claim/Lawsuit, Vehicle Pursuit, or Traffic Collision occurring within the evaluation period; Analysis of the events as a whole and determine if there's a pattern of conduct; Comparison of the employees performance against that of similar employees, such as employees in the same peer group, organization or similar job assignment and explain any significant differences between the affected employee's performance and that of similar employees; Justification for the disposition selected, including any decision to take no action, and; Brief summary of the discussion with the affected employee regarding the supervisor's review and selection of disposition." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. "In order to complete an AI, the supervisor must choose from one or more of the following listed in the 'Conclusion/Recommendation' section of the AI: No Action; Further Action Not Required (see 'Narrative'); Commendation; Informal Meeting; Training; Special Evaluation Reports; Modified Field Duties; Assigned to Non-Field Duties; Risk Management Executive Committee (RMEC) Referral; Directed Behavioral Science Services (BSS) Referral; Comment Card; Notice to Correct (NTC); and/or, Complaint." -- No Action. Used when no pattern of behavior posing potential risk was identified. If a significant difference in comparison with the employee's peer group was identified, further review verified that the difference was justified and did not require further action. -- Further Action Not Required. This disposition selection is used if some action was taken in connection with the same triggering incident/event before the AI was activated and no further action is required. In such an instance, the Investigative Narrative shall include an explanation as to what action was previously taken. See LAPD Manual 1/668.01.

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Use of TEAMS II for Assignment Selection & Promotions: All relevant information (except complaints prohibited to be used by state law) shall be taken into account when selecting officers for certain assignments (such as the Operations Headquarters Bureau (OHB) [Note: OHB is now the Office of Operational Unit, IAG Investigator, Field Training Officer, and gang units), pay grade advancement, promotion, and annual personnel performance evaluations. Supervisors and managers must document their considerations. Actions based on TEAMS II information must be based on all relevant and appropriate information, not solely the number or percentages of recorded incidents. Managers' and supervisors' annual personnel performance evaluations will take into account their performance in implementing the TEAMS II protocol.</p>	<p>"Regarding system generated action items for annual performance evaluations, the Monitor found that 87% of them were completed within the Department's 60 day requirement from the date of the supervisors' or managers' anniversary date, and 53% of them included assessments of the supervisors' or managers' performance in implementing the provisions of the TEAMS II protocol in their annual performance evaluations. Based on these results, the Monitor concluded that the requirements had not been fully addressed in these annual performance evaluations, nor were the action items related to these annual performance evaluations being completed in a timely manner."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.38 (FTO), 3/763.68 (IAG), and 1/668.04 (Performance Evaluations).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TEAMS II Reports may be used "by a panel during the interview portion of the civil service or advanced paygrade selection process;" "by a commanding officer as part of the final selection process for job opportunities and promotions once a candidate is placed in a selection pool;" or "for personnel transferring into or loaned to Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), Force Investigation Division (FID), Gang Enforcement Detail (GED), Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Program, Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED), Gang and Narcotics Division (GND), Marco Section, or the position of Field Training Officer (FTO)." See LAPD Manual 1/668.04. "Currently, a limited tour assignment to Internal Affairs Group (IAG) as a Sergeant II or Detective II is contingent on an employee's successful completion of a two-month loan to IAG. This loan process enables IAG to select from a pool of qualified candidates when filling regular assignments. A detective/sergeant with at least one year in grade is eligible for loan to IAG, and candidates must possess outstanding leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills. Investigative experience is desirable, but not required for an investigator position. The selection of candidates who lack investigative experience must be justified in writing on a Training Evaluation and Management System II (TEAMS II) Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04." See LAPD Manual 3/763.68. Currently, a review of TEAMS II is conducted for all pay grade advancements and promotions, and that review is provided to all oral boards for their review and is required to be submitted for all FTO selections.

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Access and Ability to Correct TEAMS II Information: Each officer shall be able to review on a regular basis all personally-identifiable data about him/her in TEAMS II, and procedures should allow for correcting data errors discovered by officers.</p>	<p>"The Consent Decree also required that each officer be able to regularly review all personally identifiable data in order to ensure the accuracy of data. The Monitor found these provisions related to access were being met. The Monitor also reviewed a list of requests for corrections to TEAMS II and found the Department in full compliance with requirements related to correcting data errors."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668 & 3/791.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Employees are responsible for reviewing his/her TEAMS II Employee Summary Report to ensure the information is accurate and complete. Any discrepancies will be brought to the attention of the appropriate entity." See LAPD Manual 1/668.12; 3/791.05. • "After receiving a request to correct inaccurate or incomplete information, the commanding officer of the entity responsible for entering the information into TEAMS II will: Investigate the disputed information; Ensure that a resolution is obtained within 30 days of the request; Correct the disputed information, if appropriate; and Notify the employee's commanding officer of the resolution in an Intradepartmental Correspondence, Form 15.02.00." See LAPD Manual 1/3791.05. • "An employee who disputes any information in his/her TEAMS II report shall complete an Employee's Report, Form 15.07.00, include a thorough description of the disputed information, attach any supporting documentation, and submit it to his/her commanding officer." See LAPD Manual 1/3791.12.

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Documentation of Use: Routine and timely documentation in TEAMS II should be made of actions taken as a result of reviews of TEAMS II information.</p>	<p>"The Monitor also reviewed system-generated action items for transfers that had been completed in the third quarter of 2008 and found that the Department was not fully meeting the requirements regarding timeliness of the review, supervisory approval, adequate reviews and timely TEAMS II reports."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "All AIs will appear on an employee's TEAMS II report as 'Pending' until the AI has been reviewed by the employee's bureau or equivalent. Upon final review and approval, the 'Pending' status will change to indicate the final disposition. All AIs, regardless of disposition will appear on the employee's TEAMS II report once completed." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. • "In order to complete an AI, the supervisor must choose from one or more of the following listed in the 'Conclusion/Recommendation' section of the AI: No Action; Further Action Not Required (see 'Narrative'); Commandation; Informal Meeting; Training; Special Evaluation Reports; Modified Field Duties; Assigned to Non-Field Duties; Risk Management Executive Committee (RMEC) Referral; Directed Behavioral Science Services (BSS) Referral; Comment Card; Notice to Correct (NTC); and/or, Complaint." - No Action. Used when no pattern of behavior posing potential risk was identified. If a significant difference in comparison with the employee's peer group was identified, further review verified that the difference was justified and did not require further action. - Further Action Not Required. This disposition selection is used if some action was taken in connection with the same triggering incident/event before the AI was activated and no further action is required. In such an instance, the Investigative Narrative shall include an explanation as to what action was previously taken. See LAPD Manual 1/668.01. • "In the 'Investigative Narrative' section of the AI, the supervisor will document the [employee's] performance assessment. The narrative shall include, but is not limited to, the following: Brief summary of each Use Of Force (UOF), Complaint, Claim/Lawsuit, Vehicle Pursuit, or Traffic Collision occurring within the evaluation period; Analysis of the events as a whole and determine if there's a 'pattern of conduct'; Comparison of the employee's performance against that of similar employees, such as employees in the same peer group, organization or similar job assignment and explain any significant differences between the affected employee's performance and that of similar employees; Justification for the disposition selected, including any decision to take no action; and Brief summary of the discussion with the affected employee regarding the supervisor's review and selection of disposition." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01.

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Review of Transfer Records: Whenever an officer (other than a probationary officer) transfers into a new Division or Area, the Commanding officer of the 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.</p>	<p>"The Monitor also reviewed system-generated action items for transfers that had been completed in the third quarter of 2008 and found that the Department was not fully meeting the requirements regarding timeliness of the review, supervisory approval, adequate reviews and timely TEAMS II reports."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668.04; see also 3/762.80.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "TEAMS Evaluation Report, Form 01.78.04, Used for personnel transferring into or loaned to Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), Force Investigation Division (FID), Gang Enforcement Detail (GED), Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Program, Narcotics Enforcement Detail (NED), Gang and Narcotics Division (GND), Narco Section, or the position of Field Training Officer (FTO). The Department has established specific criteria for selecting sworn personnel to specialized or sensitive assignments. This information is to be used to ensure that all mandated selection criteria for these assignments are appropriately addressed." See LAPD Manual 1/668.04 (emphasis added). • "When an officer transfers or is loaned into a new command, the commanding officer shall ensure that the watch commander or officer in charge reviews the officer's TEAMS report and completes the Transfer Action Item (TAI) or TEAMS Evaluation Report (TER), Form 01.78.04. Probationary police officers transferring from Training Division (Academy) are exempt from this requirement. The intent of the review is to ensure supervisors are aware of an officer's history in order to provide appropriate supervision and oversight over the employee(s)." See LAPD Manual 3/762.80.

TEAMS II – Development of Use Protocol to Identify At-Risk Behavior

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>TEAMS II Training: The LAPD shall train managers and supervisors, consistent with their authority to use TEAMS II to address at-risk behavior.</p>	<p>"Requirements to train managers and supervisors, consistent with their authority, to use TEAMS II to address potentially at-risk behavior and to implement the TEAMS II protocol were met in the first quarter of 2007. The Monitor conducted this review again in the second quarter of 2008 and found that all supervisors who were required to do so had taken the RMIS TEAMS II training."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/668; LAPD Manual 1/670.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The Department has an obligation to provide a professional standard of law enforcement to service to the community. In fulfilling that responsibility, it is essential that Department personnel be properly trained. This is true not only at the entrance level where officers must receive basic training prior to their assumption of police responsibilities, but it is a continuous process throughout their careers. Training is provided to accommodate Department needs and to actualize the interest and concern which the Department has for the self-improvement and personal development of its employees." Divisional and Bureau TEAMS II Coordinators are required to attend a three-day TEAMS II training provided by the Application Development and Support Division. 1/67020 ON - THE - JOB TRAINING. "An officer's training continues after graduation through his assignment with training officers, roll call training, and supervision. It is the responsibility of all officers to teach those with whom they work the skills and knowledge necessary to perform the job at hand. Supervisory and commanding officers of all ranks have the responsibility not only to train subordinates to perform assigned tasks, but also to familiarize all subordinates with their supervisor's job as well, so that employees are prepared to assume additional responsibilities should the need arise."

Information Retention

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Retention of Information: The City shall maintain all personally identifiable information about an officer included in TEAMS II during the officer's employment with the LAPD and for at least three years thereafter. Information necessary for aggregate statistical analysis shall be maintained indefinitely in TEAMS II.</p>	<p>"The Consent Decree also required the City to maintain all personally identifiable information about an officer included in TEAMS II. During the second quarter of 2007, the Monitor... found that the [relevant] employee events were included in the current data [as required]."</p>	<p>Not codified but consistent with existing practice.</p>

Risk Assessment Unit		
2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Creation of Risk Assessment Unit: The LAPD shall designate a unit within the Human Resources Bureau that is responsible for developing, implementing, and coordinating LAPD-wide risk assessments. This unit shall be responsible for the operation of TEAMS II, ensuring that information is properly entered into and maintained in TEAMS II, providing assistance to managers and supervisors using TEAMS II, and programming appropriate standardized reports and queries to provide the information to perform these tasks.</p>	<p>"The Monitor reviewed these [HR sub-unit] requirements over the course of the Consent Decree and reported in the second quarter of 2007 that the PAS within Risk Management Group (RMG) was providing the Department with assistance in connection with TEAMS II, including providing a help desk for LAPD personnel to call when guidance is needed on how to evaluate risk and write a proper narrative to support any conclusions made based on that evaluation."</p>	<p>Created TEAMS II Bureau early in Consent Decree but no longer in existence with reorganization. Applications Development and Support Division ("ADSD") now facilitates TEAMS II; Risk Management Executive Committee ("RMEC") also addresses risk assessments.</p>
Annual Performance Evaluations		
2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Reforming Personnel Performance Evaluations: The Department shall develop and implement a plan consistent with applicable law that ensures that annual personnel performance evaluations for sworn employees accurately reflect the quality of each sworn employee's performance, including with respect to: (a) civil rights integrity and the employee's community/policing efforts (commensurate with the employee's duties and responsibilities); (b) managers' and supervisors' performance in addressing at-risk behavior, including responses to complaint investigations; (c) managers' and supervisors' response to and review of Categorical and Non-Categorical Use of Force incidents, review of arrest, booking, and charging decisions, and review of requests for warrants and affidavits to support warrant applications; and, (d) managers' and supervisors' performance in preventing retaliation. Job descriptions should reflect these requirements. Managers shall analyze the circumstances surrounding the presence or absence of a supervisor at (a) a Categorical Use of Force incident, and (b) the service of a search warrant. In each case, such analysis shall occur within one week of the occurrence of the incident or service to determine if the supervisor's response to the incident or service was appropriate. Such supervisory conduct shall be taken into account in each supervisor's annual personnel performance evaluation.</p>	<p>"Although there has been no assessment of post-SBA [Standards Based Assessment- order, issued November 2008] compliance, the Monitor is confident that the implementation of the SBA combined with the oversight of AD, OIG and Police Commission will ensure that the Department continues to improve its performance evaluation system." Moving forward, "[the Monitor offers the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LAPD should assess the SBA after it has been implemented for one year in order to gauge its effectiveness in the selection of officers to covered positions such as Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) officers and FTOs. • The Department should continue to audit compliance with the mandates of subparagraphs 62c, 70c, 108i and paragraph 116 [which the Monitor found LAPD to be noncompliant with pre-SBA issuance]." 	<p>Standards Based Assessment Form and Instructions are used for officer performance evaluations. Supervisors are evaluated on a number of criteria to include, holding subordinates accountable, providing training to subordinates, providing first line supervision at crime scenes and other locations of officer response, and ensuring subordinates adhere to Department policies and procedures. The actions of supervisors at the scene of a Categorical Use of Force are analyzed via a supervisory assessment conducted by the divisional commanding officer. Supervisor SBA includes categories for UOF:</p>

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Creation of Operations Headquarters Bureau (OHB) Unit: All Categorical Use of Force administrative investigations shall be conducted by a unit assigned to OHB, which shall report directly to the OHB's commanding officer. Investigators in the unit shall have specialized training and shall be detectives, sergeants, or other officers with supervisory rank. The OHB's commanding officer shall not have direct line supervision of the LAPD's geographic bureaus.</p>	<p>In March 2006, the Department "issued Special Order No. 8, Force Investigation Division – Established" and thereby established the FID to handle CUOF investigations.</p> <p>"The FID continues to operate under the direction of the Commanding Officer of Professional Standards Bureau (PSB)" which does not "maintain[] geographical responsibility" and therefore complies with the Consent Decree.</p> <p>"The LAPD appropriately established, defined selection criteria for, staffed and trained those Investigators assigned to the FID, and CUOF Incident Investigations were appropriately assigned to and managed by FID investigators."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/794, (name of unit has changed to FID): LAPD Manual 3/763.70.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Force Investigation Divisions (FID) is responsible for investigating all aspects of Categorical Use of Force incidents (except as detailed below) and other investigation at the direction of the Chief of Police." See LAPD Manual 3/794.10. "[FID] [c]andidates must possess the requisite experience, as well as outstanding leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills. Sworn personnel seeking selection FID must submit a Transfer Applicant Data Sheet, Form 15.88.00, their two most recent Standards Based Assessment-Lieutenants and Below, Form 01.8700, and a current copy of their TEAMS II report." See LAPD Manual 3/793.70. Investigators assigned to FID hold the rank of Detective II/ Sergeant II and above. Investigations are divided into two sections, criminal and administrative. <p>LAPD Manual 3/794.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Force Investigation Division (FID) shall be available to respond 24-hours a day to incidents for which it has investigative responsibility. Upon receiving notification of an incident, a FID investigator shall respond to the scene promptly. When multiple Investigating entities are present (i.e. Area detectives), the senior FID member present shall have overall command of the crime scene and the on-scene investigation. This does not preclude the Chief of Police or his/her designee from assuming command when there is a specific need to do so." See LAPD Manual 3/794.37. Timely dispatch and notification are matters presented to the Board of Police Commissioners in every Categorical Use of Force case.
<p>OHB Unit Incident Response: The OHB Unit shall have the capability to "roll out" to all Categorical Use of Force incidents 24 hours a day. The Department shall require immediate notification to the Chief of Police, the OHB Unit, the Commission, and the Inspector General whenever there is a Categorical Use of Force. Upon receiving each such notification, an OHB Unit Investigator shall promptly respond to the scene of each Categorical Use of Force and commence his or her investigation. Generally, the senior OHB Unit manager present shall have overall command of the crime scene and investigation at the scene where multiple units are present to investigate a Categorical Use of Force Incident.</p>	<p>After some initial struggles with response times, "the FID timely dispatched adequate personnel in response to notification of a CUOF. Simultaneously, the LAPD adequately addressed notification to the Chief of Police, the Police Commission, the OIG and the DAO, with few exceptions."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/794.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Force Investigation Division (FID) shall be available to respond 24-hours a day to incidents for which it has investigative responsibility. Upon receiving notification of an incident, a FID investigator shall respond to the scene promptly. When multiple Investigating entities are present (i.e. Area detectives), the senior FID member present shall have overall command of the crime scene and the on-scene investigation. This does not preclude the Chief of Police or his/her designee from assuming command when there is a specific need to do so." See LAPD Manual 3/794.37. Timely dispatch and notification are matters presented to the Board of Police Commissioners in every Categorical Use of Force case.

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Separate Criminal Investigations: In addition to administrative investigations and where the facts so warrant, the LAPD shall also conduct a separate criminal investigation of Categorical Uses of Force. The criminal investigation shall not be conducted by the OHB Unit.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/794.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When conducting a CUOF investigation, Criminal Investigation Section shall be responsible for: The use of deadly force (e.g., discharge of a firearm) by a Department employee; The use of an upper body control hold by a Department employee; An incident involving a death; Conducting the preliminary investigation of any crime associated with an incident for which FID has investigative responsibility; Conducting the criminal investigation, if appropriate, of the actions of the officer(s) involved in a CUOF incident; Taking charge of the scene of a CUOF incident; Interviewing civilian and non-involved Department employee witnesses; Investigating any incident involving a sworn officer from an outside agency who uses deadly force within the City of Los Angeles; and Investigating any other incident at the direction of the COP. See LAPD Manual 3/794.14. Though FID is in charge of the scene, FID is not responsible for investigating any crime(s) associated with an incident for which they have administrative investigative responsibility. Many incidents investigated by FID are strictly administrative and do not require an on-scene criminal investigation." See LAPD Manual 3/794.14. Criminal investigations are handled by Robbery Homicide Division or Internal Affairs Criminal section. When officers are victims of a violent crime, such as suffering great bodily injury, those cases are investigated by Robbery Homicide Division. When an officer is accused of committing a criminal act, that is investigated by Internal Affairs Criminal Section.

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Notifying & Cooperating with the DA: The LAPD shall continue its policy of notifying the District Attorney's Office whenever an LAPD officer, on- or off-duty, shoots and injures any person during the scope and course of employment. The LAPD shall notify the DA's Office whenever an individual dies while in the custody or control of an LAPD officer or the LAPD and a use of force by a peace officer may be a proximate cause of the death. The LAPD shall continue to provide cooperation to the DA's Office personnel who arrive on the scene of the incident.</p>	<p>"The LAPD issued Special Order No. 39, and... quickly came into compliance with a number of basic policy requirements in this area, including the requirements for OHB to... notify the DAO and cooperate with the DA on scene."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/794.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As soon as possible after the initial required notifications, DOC shall make notifications to the following entities: Commanding Officer; Professional Standards Bureau; involved employee(s) commanding officer; Department Risk Manager; Family Liaison Section; and, Los Angeles District Attorney's Office for those cases identified in the roll out protocol governing such notifications." See LAPD Manual 3/794.35 (emphasis added). "The assigned FID investigator or his/her supervisor shall liaise with the assigned deputy district attorney and Inspector General to ensure that both are briefed and allowed to observe the investigation." See LAPD Manual 3/794.37. In each Categorical Use of Force Investigation, the Force Investigation Division report provided to the Board of Police Commissioners provides details of the notifications given to the District Attorney's Office (and to the IA and others) and whether timely notification was provided. <p>Not consistent with current practice. Officers continue to regularly be represented by the same attorney(s) when involved in an OIS.</p>
<p>Different Lawyers For Officers Involved in Shooting: The Department shall renew the request to revise collective bargaining agreements such that, when more than one officer fires his or her weapon in a single Officer Involved Shooting (OIS) incident, each officer should be represented by a different attorney during the investigation and subsequent proceedings. Each officer retains the right to be represented by an attorney of his or her choice.</p>	<p>"In July 2002, the LAPD proposed meeting with the Los Angeles Protective League and the Command Officers Association to discuss providing officers with separate legal representation when more than one officer is involved in an OIS incident. Both organizations declined discussing the matter any further with the LAPD, and throughout the term of the Consent Decree, officers regularly were represented by the same attorney(s) when involved in an OIS."</p>	<p>Not consistent with current practice. Officers continue to regularly be represented by the same attorney(s) when involved in an OIS.</p>

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Separating Involved Officers and Witness Officers: All involved officers and witness officers shall be separated immediately after an OIS and shall remain separated until all such officers have given statements or, in the case of involved officers, declined to give a statement; provided, however, that nothing in this Agreement prevents the Department from compelling a statement or requires the Department to compel a statement. In such a case, all officers shall remain separated until such compelled statement has been given.</p>	<p>"With the exception of one reporting period, the LAPD successfully implemented a process whereby officers either involved in or directly a witness to an OIS were separated and remained separated pending providing a statement to an investigator."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/795.10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After obtaining sufficient information regarding a Categorical Use-of-Force incident, the supervisor shall immediately cause the individual separation of involved/witness employees and order them not to discuss the incident with anyone other than the assigned investigators and the employee's representative(s). Until authorized to do so by the assigned Force Investigation Division (FID) investigator, the supervisor shall direct each involved/witness employee not to: view any media coverage, recordings, or reports of the incident to include television, Digital In-Car Video (DICV), Body Worn Video (BWV), other social media, or any video or audio from any other source; or to communicate information regarding the incident via email, phone, text, Mobile Data Computer or social media. The supervisor shall continue to ensure that those employees remain separated/monitored until interviewed by FID personnel." See LAPD Manual 3/795. "The actions of each Department employee involved in the separation, transportation and monitoring of employees will be critically evaluated at every Use of Force Review Board. . . After a public safety statement has been obtained and all public safety concerns have been addressed (e.g., establishing a perimeter, protecting the crime scene, locating witnesses/evidence, managing the response of additional resources, etc.), the incident commander shall . . . insure that supervisors transport previously separated involved/witness employees individually to the location of interview as soon as practicable (if the incident occurs outside the city, an outside law enforcement agency's facility may be used). Separation shall remain in effect until the employee is interviewed by Force Investigation Division (FID). . . ." See LAPD Manual 3/795.10. Separation of officers is a matter presented to the Board of Police Commissioners in every Categorical Use of Force case.

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Psychological Evaluation Referrals: The Department shall continue its practice of referring all officers involved in a Categorical Use of Force resulting in death or the substantial possibility of death (whether on- or off-duty) to Behavioral Science Services (BSS) for a psychological evaluation by a licensed mental health professional. The matters discussed in such evaluation shall be strictly confidential and shall not be communicated to other LAPD officers without the consent of the officer evaluated. No such officer shall return to field duty until his or her manager determines that the officer should be returned to field duty upon consultation with BSS.</p>	<p>"Although the Department was adept at identifying and referring officers involved in a CUOF for counseling, the LAPD did not achieve substantial compliance in that involved officers were allowed to return to the field prior to clearance by a BSS doctor or the underlying documentation was insufficient and did not permit an assessment of compliance."</p> <p>While the Department recently issued a notice preventing certain "employees from being deployed... until otherwise advised by the CO of return to field status," a subsequent decline in compliance left "the Monitor... unable to conclude on its effectiveness."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3794.40.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upon notification of an on- or off-duty employee(s) under his or her command who is involved in an officer-involved shooting resulting in an injury to any person or a Categorical Use of Force resulting in death or the substantial possibility of death, the commanding officer shall: <i>Immediately remove the involved employee(s) from field duty (and): Meet with the involved employee(s) to discuss the process that will occur (e.g., Force Investigation Division (FID) interviews, Behavioral Science Services (BSS) referral; Use of Force Review Board),</i> See LAPD Manual 3794.40 (emphasis added). • "The commanding officer of an on- or off-duty employee(s) who is involved in an officer-involved shooting resulting in an injury to any person or a categorical use of force resulting in death or the substantial possibility of death shall: Notify BSS within two administrative working days of the incident; Schedule three mandatory, on-duty appointments for the employee(s) with BSS for a psychological evaluation by a licensed mental health professional; Notify the involved employee of the appointment; and Consult with BSS after the involved employee's first mandated appointment to obtain their recommendation of whether or not to return the employee(s) to field duty." See LAPD Manual 3794.40. • Involved officers are restricted from returning to field duty for a minimum of 14 days following the incident. The COP is briefed on the incident at the "72 hour brief," including BSS recommendations of return to field duty, and the COP ultimately makes the determination to return to field duty. • A commanding officer can refer any employee to BSS for employee wellness, i.e., at scene of fatal incident, death, etc. • Employees can go to BSS under 3 circumstances: directly mandated, referred by CO, or self-reporting. • Special Order 14 (dated August 15, 2018): Procedures Following an Officer Involved Shooting Resulting in Injury or A Categorical Use of Force Resulting in Death or the Substantial Possibility of Death.

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Using Officers' Work History in Use of Force Evaluation: Except as limited or prohibited by applicable state law, when a manager reviews and makes recommendations regarding discipline or non-disciplinary action as a result of a Categorical Use of Force, the manager will consider the officer's work history, including information contained in the TEAMS II system, and that officer's Categorical Use of Force history, including a review of the tactics the officer has used in past uses of force.</p>	<p>"[O]ver the course of the Consent Decree, the LAPD was successful overall in considering officer work history and recommending discipline, and achieved substantial compliance."</p>	<p>The Officer's work history is considered in Categorical Use of Force cases, including prior use of force history and a review of tactics that the officer has used in the past (including Categorical and Non-categorical).</p>
<p>Self-Reporting and Supervisory Oversight: The Department shall continue to require officers to report to the LAPD without delay the officer's own use of force, using the revised use of force form. This requirement also applies to all uses of force that are not Categorical Uses of Force ("Non-Categorical Uses of Force"), which must be reported to a supervisor who shall conduct a timely supervisory investigation of the incident, including collecting and analyzing relevant documents and witness interviews.</p>	<p>"[T]he LAPD did not achieve substantial compliance [i.e., compliance for two consecutive years] with the supervisory oversight requirements relative to reviews of supervisor responses to search warrants and CUOF incidents."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/245.10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An employee who becomes involved in a reportable Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF) incident shall: Notify a supervisor without delay; The author of the report shall report the full details of the use of force incident in the related Department arrest or crime report; Use an Employee's Report, Form 15.07.00, to report the full details of the use of force incident when a crime or arrest report is not required; Document the name of the investigating supervisor in the related arrest or crime report, or Employee's Report, under the heading Additional; and, Ensure that all descriptions of suspect's actions and officers' actions are in plain language (versus "aggressive/combative" etc.). See LAPD Manual 4/245.10. • Digital In-Car Video System and Body Worn Video are now used to review compliance, since time stamps are available on all recordings. Those time stamps can be compared to radio communications to determine the timeliness of officers' reporting of incidents. This information is provided in the Force Investigation Division reports on Categorical Uses of Force cases (that are provided to the Police Commission) or to the supervisor responsible for reviewing non-categorical use of force incidents.

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Revise the Use of Force Report Form: The LAPD shall modify its current use of force report form to include data fields that require officers to identify with specificity the type of force used for the physical force category, to record the body area impacted by such physical use of force, to identify fractures and dislocations as a type of injury, and to include bean bag shot gun as a type of force category.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/245.10; LAPD Form 01.6705.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An employee who becomes involved in a reportable Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF) incident shall: Notify a supervisor without delay; The author of the report shall report the full details of the use of force incident in the related Department arrest or crime report; Use an Employee's Report, Form 15.0700, to report the full details of the use of force incident when a crime or arrest report is not required; Document the name of the investigating supervisor in the related arrest or crime report, or Employee's Report, under the heading Additional; and, Ensure that all descriptions of suspect's actions and officers' actions are in plain language (versus "aggressive/combative" etc.); See LAPD Manual 4/245.10 (emphasis added). TEAMS II captures this information. It is completed by the investigating supervisor.
<p>Commission Review of Categorical Uses of Force: The Commission shall continue its practice of reviewing all Categorical Uses of Force including all the reports prepared by the Chief of Police regarding such incidents and related investigation files. These reports shall be provided to the Police Commission at least 60 days before the running of any statute of limitations that would restrict the imposition of discipline. The Commission shall review whether any administrative investigation was unduly delayed due to a related criminal investigation, and, if so, shall assess the reasons therefor.</p>	<p>"[W]ith the exception of two rating periods, the Monitor noted that the LAPD provided the Police Commission, via the OIG, with completed CUOF investigations in a timely fashion."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/792.10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tactics, drawing and exhibiting a firearm, and use of force shall be evaluated during the CUOF adjudication process. The Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) shall convene and evaluate the CUOF incident. The Use of Force Review Board shall make recommendations to the COP. The Chief of Police shall evaluate the CUOF incident and report his/her recommendations to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC). See LAPD Manual 3/792.10 The Board of Police Commissioners reviews Categorical Use of Force cases approximately 10 months following the use of force and 2 months before the statute of limitations.

Use of Force Investigations & Review

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Department Review of Categorical and Non-Categorical Uses of Force: The Department shall continue to have the Use of Force Review Board review all Categorical Uses of Force. The LAPD shall continue to have Non-Categorical Uses of Force reviewed by chain-of-command managers at the Division and Bureau level. Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations shall be reviewed by Division management within 14 days of the incident, unless a member of the chain-of-command reviewing the investigation detects a deficiency in the investigation, in which case the review shall be completed within a period of time reasonably necessary to correct such deficiency in the investigation or reports.</p>	<p>"With regard to NCUOF... By the end of the Initial Consent Decree term, the LAPD and its supervisors demonstrated their ability to timely respond to and investigate the multiple less than lethal uses of force that occur on a daily basis. Therefore, the Monitor found the Department in substantial compliance with this requirement."</p> <p>"For CUOF Investigations reviewed, the Monitor noted all were presented to a UOFRB containing appointees with varying levels of experience, expertise and perspective." The "Department was always in compliance with this requirement."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/793 (NCUOF); 3/792 & 3/794 (CUOF).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Upon receipt of a Non-Categorical use of force investigation, the commanding officer shall: Utilize the Area/Division Training Coordinator to evaluate the incident; Contact subject matter experts (e.g., Training Division) to obtain additional information, as needed; Review all reports and make a recommendation on the disposition; Sign the Use of Force Internal Process Report, Form 01.6704; Notify the employee of Critical Incident Review Division final disposition as soon as practicable; and, Ensure the officer is served with a copy of the Non-Categorical Use of Force Administrative Disapproval Internal Process Receipt, Form 01.6707, when the final disposition for tactics and/or the use of force is administrative Disapproval." See LAPD Manual 3/793.05. "Non-Categorical use of force investigations shall be reviewed by Area/division commanding officers or the acting commanding officer within 14 calendar days of the incident. Investigations not reviewed within the 14-day time frame require a written explanation on the Non-Categorical Use of Force Internal Process Report (IPR). Upon Area/division commanding officer approval, the IPR shall be forwarded to the bureau immediately." See LAPD Manual 3/793.05. "Tactics, drawing and exhibiting a firearm, and use of force shall be evaluated during the CUOF adjudication process. The Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) shall convene and evaluate the CUOF Incident. The Use of Force Review Board shall make recommendations to the COP. The Chief of Police shall evaluate the CUOF incident and report his/her recommendations to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC)." See LAPD Manual 3/792.10 "[The] Force Investigation Division (FID) is responsible for investigating all aspects of Categorical Use of Force (CUOF) incidents (except as detailed below) and any other investigation at the direction of the Chief of Police (COP)." See LAPD Manual 3/794.10.

Arrest Procedures

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Watch Commander's Personal Review of Booking Recommendations: The Department shall continue to require all booking recommendations and arrest reports be personally reviewed and approved by a watch commander as to appropriateness, legality, and performance with Department policies. The quality of these supervisory reviews shall be taken into account in the supervisor's annual personnel performance evaluations.</p>	<p>See compliance discussion by sub-section below.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/216.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "When a person is charged with the California Penal Code (PC) sections listed below, the watch commander shall conduct a pre-booking evaluation to determine whether issues or concerns regarding training, policy, or tactics need to be addressed. . . Additionally, the watch commander shall: Document that an evaluation was completed on the Watch Commander's Daily Report, Form 15.80.00; Take appropriate action when the results of the evaluation raise issues or concerns regarding training, policy, or tactics; and, Reference all forms used for documenting the results of the pre-booking evaluation on the Watch Commander's Daily Report." See LAPD Manual 4/216.23.
<p>Scope of Review: Such reviews shall continue to entail a review for completeness of the information that is contained on the applicable forms and an authenticity review to include examining the form for "canned" language, inconsistent information, lack of articulation of the legal basis for the action, or other indicia that the information on the forms is not authentic or correct.</p>	<p>"At the end of the initial term of the Consent Decree, the Monitor found the LAPD in substantial compliance with subparagraph 70a [on the portion entailing a review for completeness within the watch commander's personal review]."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/216.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "When a person is charged with the California Penal Code (PC) sections listed below, the watch commander shall conduct a pre-booking evaluation to determine whether issues or concerns regarding training, policy, or tactics need to be addressed. . . Additionally, the watch commander shall: Document that an evaluation was completed on the Watch Commander's Daily Report, Form 15.80.00; Take appropriate action when the results of the evaluation raise issues or concerns regarding training, policy, or tactics; and, Reference all forms used for documenting the results of the pre-booking evaluation on the Watch Commander's Daily Report." See LAPD Manual 4/216.23.
<p>Special Review of Certain Types of Arrest: Supervisors shall evaluate each incident in which a person is charged with interfering with a police officer (California Penal Code § 148), resisting arrest, or assault on an officer to determine whether it raises any issue or concern regarding training, policy, or tactics.</p>	<p>A 2008 audit on compliance with subparagraph 70b "found that 88% of packages it reviewed were in compliance [but]... [t]he remainder either contained no documentation of the incidents on the watch commander's daily reports or did not include the watch commander's evaluation of the incident on the Watch Commander's Log." "While compliance did not reach the level of 89.4%, the Department is close to compliance, and the Monitor hopes that the combination of AD, OIG and Police Commission oversight can ensure that the Department retains a process to evaluate California Penal Code § 148 type incidents."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/216.23.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The use of the Watch Commander's Daily Report to document personnel issues associated with evaluations compromises the confidentiality of employee files. Therefore, the watch commander shall document positive and negative duty performance, training needs, and any counseling associated with the evaluation on an Employee Comment Sheet, Form 01.77.00." See LAPD Manual 4/216.23. Office of the Inspector General, Review of Arrests for Violations of California Penal Code Section 148 (A) (1), August 28, 2018: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_4c3e1e1c7628d45a_e9bbc6375a88dd974.pdf.

Arrest Procedures

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Watch Commander's Inspection of Detainees/Arrestees: All detainees and arrestees brought to an LAPD facility shall be brought before a watch commander for inspection. The watch commander shall visually inspect each such detainee or arrestee for injuries as required by LAPD procedures and, at a minimum, ask the detainee or arrestee the questions required by current LAPD procedures, which are: 1) "Do you understand why you were detained/arrested?;" 2) "Are you sick, ill, or injured?;" and, 3) "Do you have any questions or concerns?;" In the rare cases where circumstances preclude such an inspection and interview by a watch commander, the LAPD shall ensure that the person is inspected and interviewed by a supervisor who did not assist or participate in the person's arrest or detention. In each instance, the watch commander or supervisor, as appropriate, shall sign the related booking documentation, which shall indicate their compliance with these procedures.</p>	<p>"At the end of the initial term of the Consent Decree, the Monitor found the LAPD in substantial compliance with... paragraph 73 [requiring watch commanders' inspection of detainees and arrestees]."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/216. "When a person is charged with the California Penal Code (PC) sections listed below, the watch commander shall conduct a pre-booking evaluation to determine whether issues or concerns regarding training, policy, or tactics need to be addressed... Additionally, the watch commander shall: Document that an evaluation was completed on the Watch Commander's Daily Report, Form 15.80.00; Take appropriate action when the results of the evaluation raise issues or concerns regarding training, policy, or tactics; and, Reference all forms used for documenting the results of the pre-booking evaluation on the Watch Commander's Daily Report." See LAPD Manual 4/216.23. In 2020, the Board of Police Commissioners passed New In-Custody Death Adjudication Protocols.</p>

Warrant Procedures

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Ramey Warrants: [Note: A Ramey Warrant is a probable cause to arrest warrant signed by a magistrate prior to the filing of criminal charges by the District Attorney]. The LAPD shall continue to implement procedures with respect to search warrants and probable cause arrest warrants as defined in the LAPD manual (commonly known as "Ramey" warrants), which require, among other things, that a supervisor shall review each request for a warrant and each affidavit filed by a police officer to support the warrant application. Such review shall include: a review for completeness of the information contained therein and an authenticity review to include an examination for "canned" language, inconsistent information, and lack of articulation of the legal basis for the warrant and a review of the information on the application and affidavit, where applicable, to determine whether the warrant is appropriate, legal, and in conformance with LAPD procedure. In addition, a supervisor shall review the officer's plan for executing the search warrant and, after execution of the search warrant, review the execution of the search warrant. A supervisor shall be present for execution of the search warrant.</p>	<p>As recently as 2007 and 2008, the Department did not comply with requirements regarding completeness of information, inconsistent information, conformance with LAPD procedures, supervisory oversight of the application/affidavit and post-incident review for search warrants. In addition, the search warrant tracking logs were not meeting the requirements regarding completeness and accuracy of information. The Monitor recognized that although the Department did not meet the requirements regarding supervisory oversight of the application/affidavit and post-incident review, as indicated above, these compliance rates did increase significantly. In the 2008 audit from the previous year's audit, in sum, the Monitor believes that substantial progress has been made on the most material aspects of these provisions, and recognizes that these warrants meet the specific requirements regarding legality."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/742.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The concerned supervisor shall place his or her initials and serial number on the lower right hand corner of each page of the original copy of the affidavit, indicating that he or she has thoroughly reviewed the document. Supervisors are reminded that every page must be reviewed and initialed in order to document a thorough review." See LAPD Manual 4/742.10 • "All Areas/specialized divisions responsible for the service of search and arrest warrants shall designate a WRO in accordance with the guidelines established in this section. The WRO shall be the rank of Sergeant I, Detective II, or higher and shall conduct a final quality assurance review for completeness and accuracy of all warrant documentation. This review shall include: The initiation of a search Warrant and Warrant Service/factual Plan Checklist, Form 12.25.01, to be completed only by a WRO after the execution and completion of the search warrant, and placed into the Search Warrant Package; The required notation is included in the Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report indicating that the concerned CO's review and approval was performed within 14 calendar days after the warrant service; The Warrant Tracking Log entry is complete and accurate; The Property Report and the Receipt for Property Taken Into Custody forms match; and, Any errors, inaccuracies, or omissions within the search warrant package are promptly corrected prior to proper storage." See LAPD Manual 4/742.10. • "A supervisor shall be present for all warrant services that require a Tactical Plan Report." See LAPD Manual 4/742.30. • On November 17, 2020, the Board of Police Commissioners passed a consent to search policy. See: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity/org/11720/BPC_20-0156.pdf • On November 17, 2020, the Board of Police Commissioners passed a search and arrest warrant policy. See: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity/org/11720/BPC_20-0163.pdf • The forms utilized to prepare for the service of an arrest or search warrant, including the tactical plan and supervisory oversight, are being revised.

Warrant Procedures

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Warrant Log: Each Area and specialized Division of the LAPD shall maintain a log listing each search warrant, the case file where a copy of such warrant is maintained, and the officer who applied for and each supervisor who reviewed the application for such warrant.</p>	<p>See immediate discussion above.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/742.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Upon obtaining a search or Ramey warrant issued by a magistrate, the officer obtaining the warrant shall complete all of the required information on the Warrant Tracking Log, Form 08.1705. . . Complete pages 1- 6 of the Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report, Form 12.25.00, submit it for approval; Refer to the Search Warrant and Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Checklist, Form 12.25.01, as a guide only, since the Warrant Review Officer is the only authorized supervisor who shall complete this form after the execution of the search warrant; and, Complete the search or Ramey warrant and other related documents including the completed Warrant Service/Tactical Plan Report; Property Report Form 10.01.00; Receipt For Property Taken Into Custody Form 10.10.00; and Addendum to Return to Search Warrant (Search Warrant Return) and maintain them in the warrant package (in the Detective Case Package, Control Folder, or Murder Book, as applicable)." See LAPD Manual 4/742.10.

Initiation of Complaints

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Initiation of Complaints Generally: The Department shall continue to provide for the receipt of complaints as follows: (a) in writing or verbally, in person, by mail, by telephone (or TDD), facsimile transmission, or by electronic mail; (b) anonymous complaints; (c) at LAPD headquarters, any LAPD station or substation, or the offices of the Police Commission or the Inspector General; (d) distribution of complaint materials and self-addressed postage-paid envelopes in easily accessible City locations throughout Los Angeles and in languages utilized by the City of Los Angeles in municipal election ballot materials; (e) distribution of the materials needed to file a complaint upon request to community groups, community centers, and public and private service centers; (f) the assignment of a case number to each complaint; and, (g) continuation of a 24-hour toll-free telephone complaint hotline. The Department shall record all calls made on this hotline.</p>	<p>"[E]arly on during the term of the Decree, the LAPD coordinated the production of complaint material and informative posters and made information available to the public and community groups. On many occasions the Monitor conducted unannounced verifications of complaint materials at various locations, primarily Divisions, and noted that, for the most part, the LAPD was in compliance." After initial technical difficulties were resolved, the Monitor found the 24-hour hotline was "adequately staffed" and "the system performed flawlessly."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/811 & 3/815.01.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "A supervisor receiving a complaint in person, by telephone or in any written form, shall: Conduct a preliminary investigation, as established in <i>Complaint Investigations: A Guide for Supervisors</i> and as outlined in Manual Section 3/815.01; Complete a Complaint Form, summarizing the complaint and the complainant's statements under the Summary portion; Tape-record all interviews, if not practical, supervisors shall include a written justification under the Summary portion of the Complaint Form; Provide the complainant with the bottom copy of the Complaint Form, and advise the complainant that another copy will be mailed out with an assigned case number; If the complaint was made by telephone, leave the triplicate form intact and advise the complainant that a copy will be mailed out by IAG once a case number has been assigned; Attempt to resolve the matter to the satisfaction of the complainant and take appropriate action to prevent aggravation of the incident; Determine the complainant's willingness to participate in the Alternative Complaint Resolution (ACR) process, if appropriate; and, Submit the Complaint Form and preliminary investigation to the watch commander, Section officer in charge (OIC), or civilian equivalent, for review." See LAPD Manual 3/811 • "In addition to existing procedures set forth in both the Department Manual and the Internal Affairs Group (IAG) functional manual, <i>Complaint Investigations: A Guide for Supervisors</i>, the following procedures shall apply to complaint investigations: Identifying all involved employees; Obtaining names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all witnesses, and a summary of their statements. (Indicate the times, locations, and business and residence phone numbers where witnesses will be available for re-interview.); [and] The interviews of all complainants, involved Department employees, and witnesses shall be conducted individually (no group interviews) and shall be recorded. Should a non-employee complainant or witness refuse to be recorded, an attempt shall be made to record the refusal on tape or on a signed statement of refusal." See LAPD Manual 3/815.01.

Initiation of Complaints

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>No Waivers to File Complaint of Lawsuit: The Department shall prohibit officers from asking or requiring a potential complainant to sign any form that in any manner limits or waives the ability of a civilian to file a police complaint with the LAPD or any other entity. The Department shall prohibit officers, as a condition for filing a misconduct complaint, from asking or requiring a potential complainant to sign a form that limits or waives the ability of a civilian to file a lawsuit in court.</p>	<p>"During the term of the Decree, the Monitor reviewed thousands of complaint investigations and not once did it identify any indications that officers asked or required a civilian in any way to execute documentation waiving or limiting their ability to file a complaint with the LAPD or any other entity or file a lawsuit in court."</p>	<p>There is no requirement for a community member to waive filing a lawsuit as a precursor to making a complaint. Related to LAPD Manual 3/811.05 & 3/816.01.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A watch commander, section officer in charge (OIC) or civilian equivalent who becomes aware of a complaint shall ensure that a Complaint Form is prepared without unnecessary delay. Upon receipt of a Complaint Form submitted by a supervisor, the watch commander, section OIC or civilian equivalent, shall: Review the form for completeness and accuracy, ensuring that a thorough preliminary investigation was conducted; Using the <i>Cose Screening Factors</i> box on the Complaint Form, determine whether the complaint should be classified as Disciplinary or Non-Disciplinary (Refer to Manual Section 3/817 for classification guidelines); When appropriate, facilitate the Alternative Complaint Resolution process; and Sign and date the Complaint Form and submit the complaint investigation and attachments as soon as practicable to the commanding officer for approval." See LAPD Manual 3/811.05. • "When a supervisor becomes aware of a public complaint, or a complaint of misconduct initiated by Department personnel, the supervisor shall accept the complaint and: Conduct a preliminary investigation, as established in <i>Complaint Investigations: A Guide for Supervisors</i>; Complete a Complaint Form, summarizing the complaint and the complainant's statements under the Summary portion; Tape-record all interviews. If not practical, supervisors shall include a written justification under the Summary portion of the Complaint Form; Provide the complainant with the bottom copy of the Complaint Form, and advise the complainant that another copy will be mailed out with an assigned case number. If the complaint was made by telephone, leave the triplicate form intact and advise the complainant that a copy will be mailed out by IAG once a case number has been assigned; Attempt to resolve the matter to the satisfaction of the complainant and take appropriate action to prevent aggravation of the incident; Determine the complainant's willingness to participate in the Alternative Complaint Resolution (ACR) process, if appropriate; and, Submit the Complaint Form and preliminary investigation to the watch commander, Section officer in charge (OIC), or civilian equivalent, for review." See LAPD Manual 3/816.01.

Initiation of Complaints

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Administrative Investigation of Officers Who Impede Complaint Process: The LAPD shall initiate an administrative investigation (Complaint Form 1,28 Investigation) against (i) any officer who allegedly fails to inform any civilian who indicates a desire to file a complaint of the means by which a complaint may be filed; (ii) any officer who allegedly attempts to dissuade a civilian from filing a complaint; or, (iii) any officer who is authorized to accept a complaint who allegedly refuses to do so.</p>	<p>"Other than [several] instances identified during the course of [the Ethics Enforcement Sections of] EES' work, as well as the Monitor's overall review of complaints (in which a relatively small number included allegations of failing to accept a complaint), the Monitor is confident that the Department is making every effort to accept all complaints and in virtually all instances is doing so."</p> <p>"During early 2009, at a point in time when the LAPD received an allegation that officers were not documenting all complaints received, the Chief of Police directed the EES to significantly increase the number and frequency of intake audits to substantiate or refute this allegation. Although subsequent assessments noted some instances in which officers did not document a complaint, the LAPD's overall performance improved, and ultimately the Monitor held the Department in substantial compliance."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/813.10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "A Complaint Form, Form 01,28.00, shall be used to document all complaints when a Department employee allegedly: Fails to inform any member of the public who indicates a desire to file a complaint, of the means by which a complaint may be filed; Attempts to dissuade a member of the public from filing a complaint; or, Refuses to accept a complaint." See LAPD Manual 3/813.10
<p>LAPD Notification of Lawsuits: The City shall cause the LAPD to be notified whenever a person serves a civil lawsuit on or files a claim against the City alleging misconduct by an LAPD officer or other employee of the LAPD.</p>	<p>"In order to track civil lawsuits on or claims against the City alleging misconduct by an LAPD officer, the LAPD established an efficient liaison between the RMD and the City Attorney's office, who regularly reconciled the LAPD's Claims/Litigation Information System Report (CLIS) with the City's report. The Monitor found the LAPD fully in compliance with the related requirements on six separate occasions between the quarters ended June 30, 2002 and March 30, 2006."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/782.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "NOTIFICATION OF PENDING CIVIL TRIALS. Upon notification from the Civil Division, Office of the City Attorney, of a civil trial date of an employee, the commanding officer shall meet with the involved employee to provide support, as necessary." See LAPD Manual 3/782.25.

Initiation of Complaints

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Self-Reporting of Arrests and Lawsuits: The Department shall continue to require all officers to notify without delay the LAPD whenever the officer is arrested or criminally charged for any conduct or the officer is named as a party in any civil suit involving his or her conduct while on duty (or otherwise while acting in an official capacity). The Department shall require such notification from any officer who is named as a defendant in any civil suit that results in a temporary, preliminary, or final adjudication on the merits in favor of a plaintiff complaining of off-duty physical violence, threats of physical violence, or domestic violence by the officer.</p>	<p>"The Monitor found the Department in compliance in all five assessments after reviewing complaint investigations, comparing randomly selected officers with various court indices, and querying claims and lawsuits filed with the City."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/837.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Department employee detained/arrested, or transported to any jail or police facility for any offense committed inside or outside the City, excluding traffic infractions, shall: Advise the detaining/arresting officer of his/her Department employee status; and, Notify the watch commander from his/her Area/division of assignment without delay, or the Department Command Post when the employee's location of assignment is closed. . In addition to notification requirements of detentions, arrests, or when named as a suspect in a written crime report or complaint for any offense excluding traffic infractions as outlined in Manual Sections 3/837.10 and 3/838.20, a sworn Department employee shall notify his/her commanding officer immediately, either directly or through a supervisor of Professional Standards Bureau (PSB), if they are charged with a criminal offense by a prosecutor or a grand jury indictment." See LAPD Manual 3/837.10 • "PROCEDURE WHEN SUED. When an employee is served with a Summons and Complaint resulting from activities within the course and scope of City employment, the employee must within two (2) business days of service complete a Form 15.0700 (Manual Section 3/782.40). The completed Form 15.0700 and the Summons and Complaint must be hand-carried to the Civil Investigation Section, Legal Affairs Division." See LAPD Manual 3/782.30.

Initiation of Complaints

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Self-Reporting and Peer Reporting of Misconduct: The Department shall continue to require officers to report to the LAPD without delay: any conduct by other officers that reasonably appears to constitute (a) an excessive use of force or improper threat of force; (b) a false arrest or filing of false charges; (c) an unlawful search or seizure; (d) Invidious discrimination; (e) an intentional failure to complete forms required by LAPD policies and in accordance with procedures; (f) an act of retaliation for complying with any LAPD policy or procedure; or (g) an intentional provision of false information in an administrative investigation or in any official report, log, or electronic transmittal of information. Officers shall report such alleged misconduct by fellow officers either directly to IAG or to a supervisor who shall complete a Complaint Form 1.28. This requirement applies to all officers, including supervisors and managers who learn of evidence of possible misconduct through their review of an officer's work. Failure to voluntarily report as described in this paragraph shall be an offense subject to discipline if sustained.</p>	<p>"Toward the beginning of [his] assessment period, the Monitor identified some investigations containing information or officer statements suggesting knowledge of misconduct not subsequently reported; however, overall, the Monitor concluded that the investigations were complete and did not contain indicators of officers not reporting misconduct."</p>	<p>The 2020 Use of Force Policy provides (the 2020 Use of Force policy can be found here: UOF policy):</p> <p>Requirement to Report Potential Excessive Force: An officer who is present and observes another officer using force that the present and observing officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer, shall report such force to a superior officer.</p> <p>Requirement to Intercede When Excessive Force is Observed: An officer shall intercede when present and observing another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances, taking into account the possibility that other officers may have additional information regarding the threat posed by a subject.</p> <p>LAPD Manual 1/210.46 & 3/813.05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "When an employee becomes aware of possible misconduct by another Department employee, the employee shall immediately report the incident to a supervisor and/or directly to Internal Affairs Group (IAG). This requirement applies to all employees, including supervisory personnel and managers (the rank of captain or above), who learn of possible misconduct through the review of an employee's work. Generally, the supervisor accepting the complaint shall initiate the Complaint Form. Only supervisors shall initiate Complaint Forms." See LAPD Manual 3/813.05. • "The reporting of misconduct and prevention of the escalation of misconduct are areas that demand an employee to exercise courage, integrity, and decisiveness. Department Manual Section 3/813.05 requires that when an employee, at any level, becomes aware of possible misconduct by another member of this Department, the employee shall immediately report the incident to a supervisor or directly to Internal Affairs Group. Furthermore, an employee who observes serious misconduct shall take appropriate action to cause the misconduct to immediately cease. The fact that a supervisor is present and not taking appropriate action to stop the misconduct does not relieve other employees present from this obligation." See LAPD Manual 1/210.46.

Conduct of Investigations

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Internal Affairs Group's Review of Complaints: Within 10 days of their receipt by the LAPD, the IAQ [Internal Affairs Group] shall receive and promptly review the "face sheet" of all complaints to determine whether they meet the criteria for being investigated by IAQ, or the CHB Unit, or chain of command supervisors.</p>	<p>"[T]he Monitor concluded that the Department was in substantial compliance with the requirements related to the review and classification of complaint face sheets at the end of the original five-year term of the Consent Decree."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/811.15 & 3/811.25.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Commanding officers shall: Ensure that the CF is forwarded to Internal Affairs Group (IAQ) within two business days of complaint initiation. . . ." See LAPD Manual 3/811.05. • "When IAQ receives any complaint from the public, IAQ shall: Complete a CF, documenting the preliminary information only and attach the related correspondence, documents, and statements; Issue a CF number. Assign and forward the CF to the appropriate division/Area for appropriate action; and, Mail an acknowledgment of the complaint to the complainant with the CF number referenced (second copy of CF). " See LAPD Manual 3/811.05.

Conduct of Investigations

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Investigation Protocol: In conducting all Categorical Use of Force Investigations, and certain specified complaint investigations, the LAPD shall, subject to and in conformance with applicable state law: (a) tape record or videotape interviews of complainants, involved officers, and witnesses; (b) whenever practicable and appropriate, and not inconsistent with good Investigatory practices such as canvassing a scene, interview complainants and witnesses at sites and times convenient for them, including at their residences or places of business; (c) prohibit group interviews; (d) notify involved officers and the supervisors of involved officers, except when LAPD deems the complaint to be confidential under the law; (e) Interview all supervisors with respect to their conduct at the scene during the incident; (f) collect and preserve all appropriate evidence, including canvassing the scene to locate witnesses where appropriate, with the burden for such collection on the LAPD, not the complainant; and, (g) Identify and report in writing all inconsistencies in officer and witness interview statements gathered during the investigation. Chain of command investigations of complaints (other than those covered above) and Non-Categorical Uses of Force shall comply with subsections c, e, and f, above where applicable.</p>	<p>"By the end of the second year of the extension, the Monitor concluded that, overall, the Department attained sustained substantial compliance with Decree requirements regarding the investigation of CUOF. The LAPD's CUOF Investigations rightfully are now recognized as state-of-the-art best practices that are studied by other law enforcement agencies nationwide."</p> <p>"[T]he Monitor found the Department in substantial compliance with requirements regarding NCUOF Investigations at the end of the initial five-year term of the Decree. The consistent quality of the investigations and related quality control review provided the Monitor with sufficient assurance that the LAPD would continue with best practices, and additional monitoring during the Decree extension was not required."</p> <p>In June 2008, "the Monitor determined that, despite a few discrepancies, the Department had achieved substantial compliance with the requirement regarding [chain of command of] COC Investigations."</p> <p>Finally, by 2008, the Monitor held that the LAPD "achieved and sustained compliance" with all requirements related to IAG Complaint Investigations.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/815.01</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "In addition to existing procedures set forth in both the Department Manual and the Internal Affairs Group (IAG) functional manual, <i>Complaint Investigations: A Guide for Supervisors</i>, the following procedures shall apply to complaint investigations: Identifying all involved employees; Obtaining names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all witnesses, and a summary of their statements; (indicate the times, locations, and business and residence phone numbers where witnesses will be available for re-interview.); [and] The interviews of all complainants, involved Department employees, and witnesses shall be conducted individually (no group interviews) and shall be recorded. Should a non-employee complainant or witness refuse to be recorded, an attempt shall be made to record the refusal on tape or on a signed statement of refusal." See LAPD Manual 3/815.01. <p>Whenever practicable and appropriate, complainants and witnesses shall be interviewed at sites and times convenient to them, including private residences or places of business; Interview all involved supervisors regarding their conduct at the scene during the incident; The entity responsible for the preliminary complaint investigation shall notify, without delay, the involved Department employee and his or her respective supervisor of a pending investigation(s), excluding those investigations deemed confidential under the law (as determined by the Department); Inconsistencies between statements made by Department employees and witnesses shall be identified and documented; The entity responsible for the investigation shall coordinate the collection and preservation of all appropriate evidence, including canvassing the scene to locate possible witnesses if appropriate; Visual examination for trauma, medical treatment for actual or alleged injury; Photographs (utilize color film when appropriate); Inspection of the object alleged to have caused injury (objects should be photographed and, when practicable, retained); and, Administer appropriate sobriety tests required for the preliminary investigation of the offense (3/836). See LAPD Manual 3/815.01.</p>

Conduct of Investigations

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Investigating Officer Must Report Additional Misconduct Discovered: If during the course of any Investigation of a Categorical Use of Force, Non-Categorical Use of Force, or complaint, the Investigating officer has reason to believe that misconduct may have occurred other than that alleged by the complainant, the alleged victim of misconduct, or the triggering item or report, the Investigating officer must notify a supervisor, and an additional Complaint Form 128 investigation of the additional misconduct issue shall be conducted.</p>	<p>"On eight separate occasions during the term of the Consent Decree and its extension, the Monitor evaluated the LAPD's compliance with requirements related to the identification of any potential misconduct for additional investigation. In some instances, the Monitor placed reliance on AD's audits. In seven of the eight reviews, the Monitor concluded that the LAPD was in compliance with these requirements."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/811, 3/830, & 3/794.30.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If, during the course of a complaint investigation, the investigating supervisor has reason to believe that additional misconduct may have occurred, other than that alleged by the complainant, the Investigating supervisor shall either record the additional misconduct as a separate allegation on the original complaint or initiate a new complaint as appropriate. See LAPD Manual 3/811. <p>Other relevant provisions include:</p> <p>The 2020 Use of Force Policy provides (the 2020 Use of Force policy can be found here: UOF policy):</p> <p>Requirement to Report Potential Excessive Force. An officer who is present and observes another officer using force that the present and observing officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer, shall report such force to a superior officer.</p> <p>Requirement to Intercede When Excessive Force is Observed. An officer shall intercede when present and observing another officer using force that is clearly beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances, taking into account the possibility that other officers may have additional information regarding the threat posed by a subject.</p>

Conduct of Investigations

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Access to TEAMS II Information: Subject to restrictions on use of information contained in applicable state law, the OHB Unit Investigating Categorical Uses of Force and IAG Investigators conducting certain specified misconduct investigations shall have access to all information contained in TEAMS II, where such information is relevant and appropriate to such investigations, including training records, Complaint Form 128 investigations and discipline histories, and performance evaluations.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/210.46 & 3/813.05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "When an employee becomes aware of possible misconduct by another Department employee, the employee shall immediately report the incident to a supervisor and/or directly to Internal Affairs Group (IAG). This requirement applies to all employees, including supervisory personnel and managers (the rank of captain or above), who learn of possible misconduct through the review of an employee's work. Generally, the supervisor accepting the complaint shall initiate the Complaint Form. Only supervisors shall initiate Complaint Forms." See LAPD Manual 3/813.05. • "The reporting of misconduct and prevention of the escalation of misconduct are areas that demand an employee to exercise courage, integrity, and decisiveness. Department Manual Section 3/813.05 requires that when an employee, at any level, becomes aware of possible misconduct by another member of this Department, the employee shall immediately report the incident to a supervisor or directly to Internal Affairs Group. Furthermore, an employee who observes serious misconduct shall take appropriate action to cause the misconduct to immediately cease. The fact that a supervisor is present and not taking appropriate action to stop the misconduct does not relieve other employees present from this obligation." See LAPD Manual 1/210.46. <p>See: Access Control Policy for Teams, Special Order No. 23, 2007.</p> <p>Related to LAPD Manual 1/668.02 & 1/668.06.</p> <p>TEAMS II Reports may be "[u]sed in the event misconduct is identified and a personnel complaint initiated." See LAPD Manual 1/668.01.</p> <p>IA Investigators have access to the TEAMS II material.</p>

Adjudicating Investigations

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Credibility Determinations: The Department shall continue to employ the following standards when it makes credibility determinations: use of standard California Jury Instructions to evaluate credibility; consideration of the accused officer's history of complaint investigations and disciplinary records concerning that officer, where relevant and appropriate; and, consideration of the civilian's criminal history, where appropriate. There shall be no automatic preference of an officer's statement over the statement of any other witness, including a complainant who is also a witness. There shall be no automatic judgment that there is insufficient information to make a credibility determination when the only or principal information about an incident is contained in conflicting statements made by the involved officer and the complainant. Absent other indicators of bias or untruthfulness, mere familial or social relationship with a victim or officer shall not render a witness' statement as biased or untruthful; however, the fact of such relationship may be noted.</p>	<p>"The Monitor's evaluations during the initial five-year period found that in some complaint investigations, undue preference was given to the officer against whom the complaint was alleged, and proper consideration was not given toward the civilian's or officers' histories, respectively. As such, the Department was held largely in non-compliance, and the Monitor continued to assess compliance with these requirements during the three-year extension period."</p> <p>Compliance thereafter during the extension period is not discussed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LAPD Manual 3/825.20. • "In adjudicating a complaint, Department managers (the rank of captain or above) are responsible for assessing the believability and credibility of witnesses in accordance with the standards established in the IAG functional manual, <i>Management Guide to Discipline</i>; specifically, principles adopted from the California Jury Instruction Code. Managers may consider anything that has a tendency, within reason, to prove or disprove the truthfulness of a witness. In making those determinations, the Department shall employ the following standards: <p>Consideration of the history of complaint investigations and disciplinary records of both an accused employee and an employee witness, where relevant and appropriate; Consideration of the criminal histories of civilian complainants and witnesses, where relevant and appropriate; No automatic preference shall be given to a Department employee's statement over the statement of any other witness, including the complainant; There shall be no automatic judgment that insufficient information exists to make a credibility determination when the primary evidence amounts to conflicting statements of the accused employee and the complainant; and, A familial or social relationship with a victim or the employee shall not automatically render a witness statement as biased or untruthful. However, the fact that such a relationship exists may be noted." See LAPD Manual 3/825.20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently, Body Worn Video (BWV) and Digital In Car Video (DICV) are deployed Department wide. For citizen complaints, these devices add to the investigation and evaluation of matters.

Adjudicating Investigations

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Preponderance Standard: The LAPD shall adjudicate all complaints using a preponderance of the evidence standard. Whenever supported by evidence collected in the investigation, complaints shall be adjudicated as "sustained," "sustained-no penalty," "not resolved," "unfounded," "exonerated," "duplicate," or "no Department employee." In no case may a Complaint Form 1.28 Investigation be closed without a final adjudication.</p>	<p>The Monitor's finding of noncompliance over two years with the preponderance standard requirement "was largely the result of the use of an adjudication category denoted as Other Judicial Review (OJR) as reported by the Monitor during the quarter ended September 30, 2005." The Monitor noted that in several investigations selected for review that were adjudicated OJR, the LAPD did not follow its own internal policy as the investigative files were devoid of documentation that the complainant, the complainant's attorney or the prosecuting attorney were interviewed or approached for interview. Most of the investigations reviewed also had no evidentiary hearing or any other documented review of the facts alleged in the complaint. Lastly, the complaint files were devoid of any specific court transcripts or dockets that would support whether the matter was truly addressed at any judicial proceeding. The Monitor expressed concern that the OJR adjudication was a mechanism that permitted the LAPD to quickly render a decision on a complaint investigation in an effort to meet compliance requirements of the Consent Decree. In response, the LAPD issued Special Order No. 34, Other Judicial Review as an Adjudication - Revised, dated November 1, 2007, which rescinded the use of OJR as an adjudication.</p> <p>Compliance following Issuance of Special Order No. 34 is not discussed.</p>	<p>Not codified but consistent with current practice. See: Preponderance of Evidence Guide for Complaint Adjudication</p> <p>LAPD Manual 3/820.25 CLASSIFICATION OF A DISCIPLINARY COMPLAINT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfounded • Exonerated • Not Resolved • Sustained • Sustained-No Penalty • Insufficient Evidence to Adjudicate • Withdrawn by the Chief of Police • Duplicate • Other Judicial Review (Other Judicial Review has not been used by the department since 2005). <p>The 2019 Annual Complaint Report can found at http://www.lapdpolicecom/lacty/02020/BPC_20-0139.pdf</p>
<p>Reasonable Efforts to Investigate All Complaints: Withdrawal of a complaint, unavailability of a complainant to make a statement, or the fact that the complaint was filed anonymously or by a person other than the victim of the misconduct, shall not be a basis for adjudicating a complaint without further attempt at investigation. The LAPD shall use reasonable efforts to investigate such complaints to determine whether the complaint can be corroborated.</p>	<p>"For virtually all reviewed complaints that were anonymous or filed by a third party, the Monitor concluded the Department made a good faith effort to identify the complainant and complete a thorough investigation. As a result, the Monitor concluded that the Department was in substantial compliance with the pertinent Consent Decree requirements, and assessment during the extension period for this particular requirement were placed on inactive status."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/815.01.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The withdrawal of a complaint, the unavailability of a complainant to make a statement, or the fact that the complaint was filed anonymously or by a third party, shall not be reasons to adjudicate a complaint without further attempts to investigate. Commanding officers shall ensure reasonable efforts are made to get to the truth of the matter." See LAPD Manual 3/825.20.
<p>Five Months on Average to Complete Investigations: All investigations of complaints shall be completed in a timely manner, taking into account: (a) the investigation's complexity; (b) the availability of evidence; and, (c) overriding or extenuating circumstances underlying exceptions or tolling doctrines that may be applied to the disciplinary limitations provisions (i) applicable to LAPD officers and (ii) applicable to many other law enforcement agencies in the State of California. The parties expect that, even after taking these circumstances into account, most investigations will be completed within five months.</p>	<p>"The Monitor sought to determine that investigations, in aggregate, more often than not were completed within 150 days. In applying this methodology, the Monitor found the Department in substantial compliance at the end of the initial five-year period."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/824.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "It is the goal of the Department to complete most complaint investigations within five months of the Complaint Form being received by Internal Affairs Group (IAG). Notwithstanding that goal, all efforts should be undertaken to ensure the entire complaint process is completed within the limitations established by state law and the City Charter." See LAPD Manual 3/824. <p>Investigations are completed within a five-month period 80% of the time (note: this is the investigation process, not the adjudication process).</p>

Discipline & Non-Disciplinary Action

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Chief's Quarterly Discipline Reports: The Chief of Police, no later than 45 calendar days following the end of each calendar quarter, shall report to the Commission, with a copy to the Inspector General, on the imposition of discipline during such quarter (the "Discipline Report"). Such report shall contain: (a) a summary of all discipline imposed during the quarter reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau, and rank; (b) a summary comparison between discipline imposed and determinations made by the Boards of Rights during the quarter; (c) a written explanation of each reduction in penalty from that prescribed by the Board of Rights; (d) a description of all discipline and non-disciplinary actions for each Categorical Use of Force; the Commission has determined was out of policy; and, (e) a written explanation, following the Chief of Police's final determination regarding the imposition of discipline, when discipline has not been imposed (other than exoneration by the Board of Rights) and the following has occurred: the officer has entered a guilty plea or has been found guilty in a criminal case; the officer had a Complaint Form 128 investigation sustained; the officer has been found civilly liable by a judge or jury of conduct committed on duty or while acting in his or her official capacity; or, the officer's conduct has been the basis for the City being found civilly liable by a judge or jury. Each quarterly Discipline Report shall include as attachments copies of the monthly Internal Affairs Group Reports on Administration of Internal Discipline for that quarter.</p>	<p>Despite timeliness and comprehensiveness issues early on, "the Monitor concluded that the Department achieved substantial compliance with all requirements of this section of the Decree."</p>	<p>The OIG continuously oversees the discipline system. The OIG provides the Police Commission with an annual assessment of the discipline imposed in Categorical Use of Force cases that result in Out of Policy and/or Administrative Disapproval findings, which is used for purposes of the performance review of the Chief of Police.</p> <p>The decisions in Non-Categorical Use of Force cases, and Categorical Use of Force cases, are presented in the Use of Force Year-end review (Use of Force Data Reports). In addition, the annual complaint report is also published. See e.g., http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacty/org/102020/BPC_20-0139.pdf</p> <p>Both annual reports are presented at Police Commission meetings, and public comment is accepted at that time.</p>
<p>OIG and Commission's Review of Chief's Quarterly Discipline Reports: The Inspector General shall review, analyze and report to the Commission on each Discipline Report, including the circumstances under which discipline was imposed and the severity of any discipline imposed. The Commission, no later than 45 days after receipt of the Discipline Report, following consultation with the Chief of Police, shall review the Discipline Report and document the Commission's assessment of the appropriateness of the actions of the Chief of Police described in the Discipline Report. With respect to Categorical Uses of Force, such assessment and documentation shall be made for each officer whose conduct was determined to be out of policy by the Commission. Such assessment and documentation shall be considered as part of the Chief's annual evaluation.</p>	<p>Despite timeliness/turnaround issues early on, "the Monitor concluded that the Department achieved substantial compliance with all requirements of this section of the Decree."</p>	<p>The OIG continuously oversees the discipline system. The OIG provides the Police Commission with an annual assessment of the discipline imposed in Categorical Use of Force cases that result in Out of Policy and/or Administrative Disapproval findings, which is used for purposes of the performance review of the Chief of Police.</p> <p>The decisions in Non-categorical Use of Force cases, and Categorical Use of Force cases, are presented in the Use of Force Year-end review (Use of Force Data Reports). In addition, the annual complaint report is also published. See e.g., http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacty/org/102020/BPC_20-0139.pdf</p> <p>Both annual reports are presented at Police Commission meetings, and public comment is accepted at that time.</p>

Discipline & Non-Disciplinary Action

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Manager Evaluations of Complaint Form 1.28 Investigations: The LAPD shall continue its practice of having managers evaluate all Complaint Form 1.28 Investigations to identify underlying problems and training needs. After such evaluations, the manager shall implement appropriate non-disciplinary actions or make a recommendation to the proper LAPD entity to implement such actions.</p>	<p>"By the end of 2007, the Monitor concluded that the LAPD attained substantial compliance with requirements regarding manager review of complaints."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/825.05.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "For all complaints in which a specific employee is accused of misconduct, the employee's complete TEAMS II report and Personal and Work History Summary, Form 1.060, shall be forwarded with the completed investigation for the purpose of the commanding officer's review during the adjudication process." See LAPD Manual 3/825.05.
<p>Notice of Resolution: After a complaint is resolved by the LAPD, the LAPD shall inform the complainant of the resolution in writing, including the investigation's significant dates, general allegations, and disposition.</p>	<p>"With regard to notification to the complainant once an investigation was completed, . . . the Monitor found that the LAPD achieved substantial compliance during the last two years of the initial five-year term of the Decree."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/825.30.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Commanding officers adjudicating complaints shall prepare an undated reply letter on Department letterhead addressed to the complainant. . . The reply letter shall, at a minimum, include: The Complaint Form (CF) number, placed in the right quadrant of the letterhead under the Department's return address; The date of occurrence, or the date the complaint was reported to the Department; The general nature of the complaint and/or allegations(s); The resolution and disposition of the complaint and/or allegations; The general acknowledgement that appropriate discipline was imposed, without indicating the specific penalty, when an allegation was sustained; Reference to the Office of the Inspector General's role, address, telephone and fax numbers, and website address; and, The name and phone number of the commanding officer who adjudicated the complaint." See LAPD Manual 3/825.30.

Discipline & Non-Disciplinary Action

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Anti-Retaliation: The City and the Department shall prohibit retaliation in any form against any employee for reporting possible misconduct by any other employee of the LAPD. The Police Commission shall review, on an annual basis, the Department's anti-retaliation policy and its implementation and make modifications as appropriate to protect officers from reprisals for reporting misconduct. The Commission's review of such policy and its implementation shall consider the discipline imposed for retaliation and supervisors' performance in addressing and preventing retaliation.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>(A) LAPD Manual 1/272; (B) Organization and Functions of the LAPD (separate document from the LAPD Manual).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Retaliation and acts contributing to retaliation are serious misconduct. Therefore, any Department employee who engages in, sanctions or supports such activity is subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination. Department managers, commanding officers, and supervisors will be held accountable for providing an atmosphere at work in which employees are free from retaliation. Department managers, commanding officers, and supervisors, are also accountable for subordinate employees who engage in behavior that the manager, commanding officer, or supervisor knew, or should have known, was occurring, that formally or informally punish an employee for engaging in protected activity. . . Protected activities include: Opposing reporting, or participating in any claim, lawsuit, or investigation concerning unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment; Filing a grievance or participating in any unfair labor complaint; Taking advantage of any labor right or benefit such as using sick or family leave, seeking compensation for overtime worked, or filing an objectively valid work-related claim for damages; Reporting misconduct of another Department or City employee to the Office of the Inspector General, or any Department or governmental entity; or, Supporting, assisting or cooperating in a misconduct investigation." See LAPD Manual 3/272. <p>See: Anti-Discrimination and Retaliation Training Bulletin published May 2012</p>

Internal Affairs Group Responsibilities

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Reallocating Responsibility for Complaint Investigations to IAG: The City shall reallocate responsibility for complaint investigations between IAG and chain-of-command supervisors. Under this reallocation, IAG, and not chain-of-command supervisors, shall investigate (a) all civil suits or claims for damages involving on-duty conduct by LAPD officers or civil suits and claims involving off-duty conduct required to be reported, and (b) all complaints which allege: (i) unauthorized uses of force, other than administrative Categorical Use of Force Investigations (which shall be investigated by the OHB Unit as part of its investigation of such Categorical Uses of Force); (ii) Invidious discrimination (e.g., on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability), including improper ethnic remarks and gender bias; (iii) unlawful search; (iv) unlawful seizure (including false imprisonment and false arrest); (v) dishonesty; (vi) domestic violence; (vii) improper behavior involving narcotics or drugs; (viii) sexual misconduct; (ix) theft; and, (x) any act of retaliation or retribution against an officer or civilian.</p>	<p>*Commencing during the quarter ending March 31, 2003, and continuing through the quarter ending June 30, 2006, the Monitor reviewed samples of complaint intake documentation on five separate occasions and determined that the LAPD was in compliance with regard to appropriately assigning investigative responsibility either to the IAG or COC.*</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/837.20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Internal Affairs Group will have investigative responsibility for "high-grade misdemeanors] or felonies] at the direction of the Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group." See LAPD Manual 3/837.20
<p>Additional IAG Investigation Responsibilities: IAG, and not chain of command supervisors, shall also investigate the following: (a) all incidents in which both (i) a civilian is charged by an officer with interfering with a police officer (California Penal Code § 148), resisting arrest, or disorderly conduct; and (ii) the prosecutor's office notifies the Department either that it is dismissing the charge based upon officer credibility or a judge dismissed the charge based upon officer credibility; (b) all incidents in which the Department has received written notification from a prosecuting agency in a criminal case that there has been an order suppressing evidence because of any constitutional violation involving potential misconduct by an LAPD officer, any other judicial finding of officer misconduct made in the course of a judicial proceeding, or any request by a federal or state judge or magistrate that a misconduct investigation be initiated pursuant to some information developed during a judicial proceeding before a judge or magistrate. The LAPD shall request that all prosecuting agencies provide them with written notification whenever the prosecuting agency has determined that any of the above has occurred; (c) all incidents in which an officer is arrested or charged with a crime other than low grade misdemeanors, as defined in the LAPD manual, which misdemeanors shall be investigated by chain-of-command supervisors; and, (d) any request by a judge or prosecutor that a misconduct investigation be initiated pursuant to information developed during the course of an official proceeding in which such judge or prosecutor has been involved.</p>	<p>*Commencing during the quarter ending March 31, 2003, and continuing through the quarter ending June 30, 2006, the Monitor reviewed samples of complaint intake documentation on five separate occasions and determined that the LAPD was in compliance with regard to appropriately assigning investigative responsibility either to the IAG or COC.*</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/837.20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Internal Affairs Group will have investigative responsibility for "high-grade misdemeanors] or felonies] at the direction of the Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group." See LAPD Manual 3/837.20

Internal Affairs Group Responsibilities

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Investigations of the Chief: The IAG's responsibilities do not include investigations of misconduct complaints lodged against the Chief of Police. Those are directed by the Commission.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>The Board of Police Commissioners evaluates all complaints of misconduct lodged against the Chief of Police.</p>
<p>Annual Sting Audit: The City shall develop and initiate a plan for organizing and executing regular, targeted, and random integrity audit checks, or "sting" operations (hereinafter "sting audits"), to identify and investigate officers engaging in at-risk behavior, including: unlawful stops, searches, seizures (including false arrests), uses of excessive force, or violations of LAPD's Manual Section 4/264.50 (or its successor). These operations shall also seek to identify officers who discourage the filing of a complaint or fail to report misconduct or complaints. IAG shall be the unit within the LAPD responsible for these operations. The Department shall use the relevant TEAMS II data, and other relevant information, in selecting targets for these sting audits. Sting audits shall be conducted for each fiscal year.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>As noted by the Office of the Inspector General in its audit of the Ethics Enforcement Section (EES):</p> <p>The use of ethics enforcement tests, formerly known as "sting audits," was one of the reforms implemented through the 2001 Federal Consent Decree. The consent decree required the Department to develop and initiate a plan for conducting "regular, targeted, and random integrity audit checks [. . .] to identify and investigate officers engaging in at-risk behavior," as well as to identify and investigate officers "who discourage the filing of a complaint or fail to report misconduct or complaints."</p> <p>The EES is a component of Special Operations Division (SOD). As stated in its quarterly reports: The mission of EES is to safeguard the integrity of law enforcement operations within LAPD. In accordance with this mission, EES works closely with Internal Affairs Group and other Department managers to identify at-risk personnel and behaviors. Once identified, EES develops proactive strategies to test and curtail these behaviors.</p> <p>EES objectives fall into three primary categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop tests that assess an employee's conduct when they are "pieced into a situation with the potential for at-risk behavior;" • To serve as a resource for Department personnel who are attempting to identify or investigate an employee involved in potential at-risk behavior; and, • To "create a sense of omnipresence" throughout the organization to ensure that incidents are handled ethically and legally and in compliance with Department policy. <p>The OIG report can be found here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23__f3bb73360db14f7eae091e4ae0c8c159c.pdf</p> <p>See also a report from 2013: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23__f9ae9ee387124c4b8ed4d14d3fd142ea.pdf</p>

Internal Affairs Group Responsibilities

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>IAG Hiring Autonomy and Disqualification: The commanding officer of IAG shall select the staff who are hired and retained as IAG investigators and supervisors, subject to the applicable provisions of the City's civil service rules and regulations and collective bargaining agreements. Investigative experience shall be a desirable, but not a required, criterion for an IAG Investigatory position. Officers who have a history of any sustained investigation or discipline received for the use of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, an improper search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty shall be disqualified from IAG positions unless the IAG commanding officer justifies in writing the hiring of such officer despite such a history.</p>	<p>"Starting with its evaluation in the quarter ended December 2004 and continuing through a final evaluation in March 2006, the Monitor held the Department in compliance with regard to adequate IAG staffing."</p> <p>"[T]he Department's achievement of substantial compliance was, in large part, attributable to its continuation of a temporary tour of duty for supervisors to cycle through the IAG and commitment to training."</p>	<p>Special Order #24 (2003): Assignment to Internal Affairs (See: Selection and Assignment to Professional Standards Bureau). Related to LAPD Manual 3/763.66 & 3/763.69.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Currently, a limited tour assignment to Internal Affairs Group (IAG) as a Sergeant II or Detective II is contingent on an employee's successful completion of a two-month loan to IAG. This loan process enables IAG to select from a pool of qualified candidates when filling regular assignments. A detective/sergeant with at least one year in grade is eligible for loan to IAG, and candidates must possess outstanding leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills. Investigative experience is desirable, but not required for an investigator position. . . Prior to consideration, all loanee applicants will submit the following: Transfer Applicant Data Sheet, Form 15,98.00; Standards Based Assessment Lieutenants and Below, Form 01,87.00 (two most recent); and, Current TEAMS II report (promotion/paygrade advancement version only)." See LAPD Manual 3/763.68. "Managers shall utilize existing Departmental databases, information and documents to assess eligibility for a limited tour assignment to IAG. A Loan/Transfer package, including a TEAMS II Evaluation Report, shall be prepared for all selected candidates indicating that the following documents were reviewed as part of a comprehensive background check: Interview Evaluation/Questions; IAG Loan Rating; TEAMS II Report (promotion/paygrade advancement only); Any pending or sustained complaint investigations, via a CITS report; Complaint Index; and, Adverse Judicial findings." See LAPD Manual 3/763.69.
<p>IAG Officers' Three-Year Terms: The Department shall establish a term of duty of up to three years for the IAG Sergeants, Detectives, and Lieutenants who conduct investigations and may reappoint an officer to a new term of duty only if that officer has performed in a competent manner. Such IAG Investigators may be removed during their term of duty for acts or behaviors that would disqualify the officer from selection to IAG or under any other personnel authority available to the Department.</p>	<p>"In all five [of its] assessments, the Monitor noted that for those investigators whose terms exceeded three years, the LAPD maintained documentation of a complete review of the Investigator's proficiency and for the entire period assessed, none of the officers had a complaint history containing disqualifying behavior. As such, the Monitor concluded the LAPD was in substantial compliance, and the requirements were not actively monitored during the extension."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.67.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Officers assigned to one of the following Internal Affairs Group (IAG) functions within Professional Standards Bureau must be assigned for a period not to exceed three years: Administrative Section; Investigative Section; Advocate Section; and, Support Section." See LAPD Manual 3/763.67.

Internal Affairs Group Responsibilities

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>IAG Investigator Evaluations: IAG Investigators shall be evaluated based on their competency in following the policies and procedures for Complaint Form 1,28 Investigations. The LAPD shall provide regular and periodic re-training and re-evaluations on topics relevant to their duties.</p>	<p>Toward the end of the initial five-year Consent Decree assessment period, "the Monitor noted evaluations were completed timely and thoroughly for most Investigators" and thus "deemed the LAPD in substantial compliance" with the Investigator evaluations requirement.</p> <p>Note that the Monitor "reviewed listings of training sessions attended by investigators for reasonableness and listings of training topics covered that, in the Monitor's opinion, were relevant" in making its decision on substantial compliance.</p>	<p>Evaluations (Standard Based Assessments) are completed on an annual basis and are current.</p>
<p>Referrals to Prosecutors: The LAPD shall refer to the appropriate criminal prosecutorial authorities all incidents involving LAPD officers with facts indicating criminal conduct.</p>	<p>"As of the implementation of the Consent Decree, the Los Angeles DAO established a documented protocol for referral of alleged criminal misconduct by law enforcement personnel. During the quarter ended March 31, 2003, and continuing through the quarter ended September 30, 2005, the Monitor assessed the LAPD's compliance with regard to criminal referrals of officer misconduct on three separate occasions and found the LAPD in compliance each time."</p> <p>Note "the LAPD's move to require all commands, on a weekly basis, to produce a listing of all pending complaints not yet completed nearing the one-year statute deadline was a significant factor in achieving compliance. The purpose of this exercise was to reduce the number of matters submitted past statute."</p>	<p>Not codified but consistent with existing practice. Matters that result in a criminal investigation of an LAPD employee by the Department are referred either to the District Attorney or City Attorney for their review relative to the criminal culpability of the employee. There is a Countywide agreement with law enforcement and the District Attorney that any officer-involved shooting resulting in a community member being shot will be presented to the District Attorney for criminal culpability relative to the actions of the officer.</p>

Non-Discrimination Policing

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Non-Discriminatory Policy: The Department shall continue to prohibit discriminatory conduct on the basis of race, color, ethnicity, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability in the conduct of law enforcement activities. The Department shall continue to require that, to the extent required by federal and state law, all stops and detentions, and activities following stops or detentions, by the LAPD shall be made on the basis of legitimate, articulable reasons consistent with the standards of reasonable suspicion or probable cause.</p>	<p>"While the Department has fallen short of substantial compliance with the Consent Decree requirements [as to Non-Discrimination as a whole], this is clearly not reflective of a lack of effort on the part of the City or the Department. The major problem in determining compliance has resided with the difficulty, despite best efforts, in determining whether biased policing is occurring and, if so, to what extent, if any, it is systemic as opposed to isolated misconduct."</p> <p>"Because substantial compliance was not achieved during the Consent Decree, biased policing is addressed in the Transition Agreement."</p> <p>Nonetheless, among the positive strides made, the LAPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "[I]ssued Special Order No. 23 in August 2001, which prohibits all forms of invidious discrimination." • "Training on field data collection began in October 2001, and the LAPD began collecting motor vehicle and pedestrian stop (MW&PS) data in November 2001, on [Field Data Reports or] FDRs." • "[T]he Department committed resources to the development of a Portable Officer Data Device System (PODDS) in the hopes of streamlining the reporting process required by the Decree. The LAPD began using the PODDS device to collect stop data in May 2004." • "Training on the new FDR, implemented July 1, 2003, incorporated a significant nondiscrimination component. This served to further the Department's commitment to prevent discriminatory practices." 	<p>LAPD Manual 1/345:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Discriminatory conduct on the basis of an individual's actual or perceived race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, disability, immigration or employment status, English language fluency or homeless circumstance, is prohibited while performing any law enforcement activity. All law enforcement contacts and activities, including, but not limited to, calls for service, investigations, police-initiated stops or detentions, and activities following stops or detentions, shall be unbiased and based on legitimate, articulable facts, consistent with the standards of reasonable suspicion or probable cause as required by federal and state law. Officers shall not initiate police action where the objective is to discover the civil immigration status of any person and shall strictly adhere to the Department's immigration enforcement guidelines as outlined in Department Manual Sections 4/264.50 and 4/264.55. . . ." See LAPD Manual 1/345. • Bureaus have BMW Inspection teams that inspect these areas during their audits. • See also the following reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Board of Police Commissioners held a hearing on stop data on October 28, 2020. Reports prepared related to stop data include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_d3e88738022547ac555f3aed9dd7a1dcb.pdf - In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0165.pdf - The annual complaint report is also published. See e.g., http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102020/BPC_20-0139.pdf • The Follow-Up Review of National Best Practices (2019), https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_55ab1b0cb5124b8791612eab877a0ad8.pdf • Review of National Best Practices (2017): https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6e3971bb5f.pdf

Non-Discrimination Policing

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Non-Discriminatory Stops: LAPD officers may not use race, color, ethnicity, or national origin (to any extent or degree) in conducting stops or detentions, or activities following stops or detentions, except when engaging in appropriate suspect-specific activity to identify a particular person or group. When LAPD officers are seeking one or more specific persons who have been identified or described in part by their race, color, ethnicity, or national origin, they may rely in part on race, color, ethnicity, or national origin only in combination with other appropriate identifying factors and may not give race, color, ethnicity or national origin undue weight.</p>	<p>"Because substantial compliance was not achieved during the Consent Decree, biased policing is addressed in the Transition Agreement."</p> <p>That said, on December 9, 2008, the Police Commission approved the IAGs updates to its Biased Policing Investigative protocols.</p> <p>"The protocols, which took effect on January 1, 2009, require officers to articulate their complete reasons for conducting traffic and pedestrian stops. Under the IAGs November 2007 protocols, racial profiling cases were not allowed to be approved for closeout unless the protocols were followed. Additionally, the IAG implemented the following strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended the Complaint Investigation Checklist to include fields that query whether the protocols were followed and whether the Racial Profiling Checklist was included. • Conducted four Internal Investigations courses that include a four-hour block of instruction on investigating racial profiling allegations. • Designated an auditor to coordinate review of racial profiling cases to ensure consistency and adherence to the protocols. This individual also compiles information in an ad hoc database to further evaluate racial profiling investigations. • Conducted occasional undercover surveillance to probe specific allegations of racial profiling." <p>"Additionally, the City and Department have continued to move toward Department-wide implementation of cameras in cars (DICVS), which the Monitor has strongly endorsed and recommended as a best practice in monitoring potential bias in stops." At the time of the Monitor's Final Report here, phase 1 of the dashcam Initiative had not even been completed.</p> 	<p>LAPD Manual 1/345:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Department personnel may not use race, religion, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, gender, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, or disability (to any extent or degree), Immigration or employment status, English language fluency or homeless circumstance as a basis for conducting any law enforcement activity, including stops and detentions, except when engaging in the investigation of appropriate suspect-specific activity to identify a particular person or group." See LAPD Manual 1/345. <p>Stop Data Reports have been published:</p> <p>OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-a8d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_d3a8887380222547acb55f3ad9dcd7a1dcb.pdf</p> <p>In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0165.pdf</p> <p>The California State Racial Identity Profiling Act Report for 2020 can be found here: https://oag.ca.gov/stesat/files/egweb/pdfs/ripa/rpa-board-report-2020.pdf</p>

Non-Discrimination Policing

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Documentation of Vehicle and Pedestrian Stops: The Department shall require LAPD officers to complete a report each time an officer conducts a motor vehicle or pedestrian stop. The report requires extensive information, including identifying information of the officer, perceived demographic information about the driver/pedestrian and passengers, circumstances around and justifying the stop, whether the driver was required to exit the vehicle, whether a pat-down/frisk was conducted, whether driver/pedestrian asked to submit to consensual search, whether a warrantless search was conducted and the basis for and results of such a search, and action taken.</p>	<p>"Because substantial compliance was not achieved during the Consent Decree, biased policing is addressed in the Transition Agreement." Nonetheless, "at the end of March 2009, in an effort to achieve compliance with the data collection requirements of the Consent Decree, the Department developed and implemented Citywide an automated reporting system at the Area level. This system incorporates the collection of stop data as approved by DOJ and provides for its storage in TEAMS II. This system was devised as a result of the Department's inability to analyze and draw conclusions from the aggregate data and the significant expense of replacing the data collection devices, or PODDS." "Additionally, the City and Department have continued to move toward Department-wide implementation of cameras in cars (D/CVS), which the Monitor has strongly endorsed and recommended as a best practice in monitoring potential bias in stops." At the time of the Monitor's Final Report here, phase 1 of the dashcam initiative had not even been completed.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 4/20202: • "Sworn personnel assigned to any field, specialized, or investigative assignment (e.g., patrol, task force, detective, and plain clothes assignments) shall complete an Automated Field Data Report (AFDR), FORM 15.52.00, for every person detained or searched regardless of the initial reason for the encounter (e.g., traffic stop, radio call, observation, task force). All AFDR reports shall be completed by end of watch or, if exigent circumstances exist, as soon as practicable." See LAPD Manual 4/20202. Stop Data Reports have been published: OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-e3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_d3e88738022547acb55f3ad9dd7a1dcb.pdf In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102720/BPC__20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102720/BPC__20-0165.pdf The California State Racial Identity Profiling Act Report for 2020 can be found here: https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf</p>

Management of Gang Units

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Each Gang Unit Managed and Controlled by the Area or Bureau Command Staff: Each LAPD unit that is primarily responsible for monitoring or reducing gang activity, including the Special Enforcement Units (collectively, "gang unit") shall be managed and controlled by the Area or Bureau command staff where it is assigned. The Bureau gang coordinators and the citywide gang coordinator (the Detective Support Division Commanding Officer) coordinate the Bureau-wide and citywide activities of these units, provide training and technical assistance, and are involved in coordinating and providing information for the audits of these units.</p>	<p>Among the "requirements which were met during the initial term [were] Citywide and Bureau-wide gang unit coordination."</p>	<p>Special Order #7 (2004); Gang Unit Management: Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Details The following OIG reports have been issued on the Gang Unit: • Review of Gang Enforcement Detail Stops: https://a27e0481-e3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_7a94219ec43340a484805c8be178bfa.pdf • Audit of Complaint Investigations Involving Gang and Narcotic Officers: https://a27e0481-e3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_cf9224f61e1e7de2f425521940ec182b3.pdf</p>

Management of Gang Units

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Non-Supervisory Officer Eligibility Criteria: Eligibility criteria for selection of a non-supervisory officer in these units shall include that officers have completed probation, have acquired a minimum number of years as a police officer in the LAPD, and have demonstrated proficiency in a variety of law enforcement activities, interpersonal and administrative skills, cultural and community sensitivity, and a commitment to police integrity. Without the prior written approval of the Chief of Police, a non-supervisory officer shall not be reassigned to a unit until 13 LAPD Deployment Periods have elapsed since their previous assignment in these units. A positive evaluation of the officer based upon the officers' relevant and appropriate TEAMS II record is also required. Supervisors shall be required to document in writing their consideration of any sustained Complaint Form 128 investigation, adverse judicial finding, or discipline for use of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, an improper search and seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty in determining whether an officer shall be selected for the unit.</p>	<p>"Special Order No. 27 in July 2003, which outlined the specific criteria required for the selection process. This policy provided the Department with specific guidelines that helped the Department achieve compliance with the requirements regarding minimum selection criteria for gang officers and supervisors."</p> <p>"During the extension period, the Department achieved substantial compliance with . . . the mandate that eligibility for selection into the gang unit include a position evaluation of the officer's TEAMS record and written consideration of sustained complaint, adverse judicial findings for the high risk areas. . . ."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.75.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to applying for a Gang Enforcement Detail (GED) or Community Law Enforcement and Recovery Program (CLEAR) position, officers shall have: Completed probation and have acquired three years as a police officer with the Department; two years [26 deployment periods (DPs)] of which must have been service performed in a geographic field (patrol), Transit Bus/Rail, and/or traffic assignment and demonstrated a history and/or proficiency in a variety of law enforcement activities (i.e., interpersonal skills, administrative skills, cultural and community sensitivity, and a commitment to police integrity and professional conduct) as documented in an applicant's Standards Based Assessment-Lieutenant and Below, Form 01.8700. See LAPD Manual 3/763.75.
<p>Supervisory Eligibility Criteria: Eligibility criteria for selection as a supervisor in these units shall include that supervisors have one year experience as a patrol supervisor, have been wheeled from their probationary Area of assignment, and have demonstrated outstanding leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills. In addition, without the prior written approval of the Chief of Police, an individual shall not be selected as a supervisor in these units until 13 LAPD Deployment Periods have elapsed since the individual's previous assignment in these units as an officer or supervisor.</p>	<p>"Special Order No. 27 in July 2003, which outlined the specific criteria required for the selection process. This policy provided the Department with specific guidelines that helped the Department achieve compliance with the requirements regarding minimum selection criteria for gang officers and supervisors."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.75.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Prior to applying for a GED/CLEAR position, supervisors shall have: A minimum of one year as a patrol supervisor; Completed and transferred from a probationary Area of supervisory assignment; and, Demonstrated outstanding leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills, as documented in an applicant's Standards Based Assessment-Lieutenant and Below." See LAPD Manual 3/763.75
<p>Selection Process: The procedures for the selection of supervisors and non-supervisory officers in these units shall include a formal, written application process, oral interview(s), and the use of TEAMS II and annual performance evaluations to assist in evaluating the application.</p>	<p>"As of the end of the Consent Decree extension period, the Department has not yet achieved compliance with the selection requirements regarding prompt review of any transferred officers' TEAMS I record; and the implementation of a formal, written application process, oral interview(s) and the use of TEAMS II and annual performance evaluations to assist in evaluating the application."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.75.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In addition to participating in a formal documented oral interview, sworn personnel applying for assignment to a GED/CLEAR assignment shall submit the following: Transfer Applicant Data Sheet, Form 15.88.00; Standards Based Assessment-Lieutenant and Below a minimum of the last two most recent 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/CLEAR must cover a period over a year; GED Selection Checklist, New Selection/Loans, Form 12.16.00; and, Training, Evaluation and Management Systems (TEAMS) Evaluation report (Promotion/Paygrade Advancement and BOR)." See LAPD Manual 3/763.75

Management of Gang Units

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Limited Tour Assignments: Supervisors and non-supervisory officers in these units shall have a limited tour assignment to these units, for a period not to exceed 39 LAPD Deployment Periods. An extension of such assignment for up to three LAPD Deployment Periods may be granted upon the written approval of the Bureau commanding officer. Any longer extension shall be permitted upon written approval of the Chief of Police.</p>	<p>"The Department did not achieve compliance with [the limited tour assignment] requirements during the original term or the extension period. The Monitor found that there were gang officers who exceeded their time limit of 39 DPS in these units and did not have either proper extensions or transfers as required. While the Department has struggled with some of these requirements, the Monitor has not identified any individual in recent years who was selected for a gang assignment but should not have been selected."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.7B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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 (i.e., the Bureau commanding officer or the Chief of Police, as determined by the duration of the extension requested) and placed in the officer's interview/selection package. To facilitate this, original extension requests (as submitted via a TEAMS II Evaluation Report) and related attachments shall, upon approval, be returned directly to the originating Area. Approving entities shall forward informational copies of approved extensions to the Commanding Officer, Counter Terrorism and Special Operations Bureau. . . 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 deployment periods have elapsed since completion of their most recent GED assignment." See LAPD Manual 3/763.7B. <p>Unit Requirements: Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Details</p>
<p>Unit Requirements: Unit supervisors and non-supervisory officers shall continue to: (i) be subject to existing procedures for uniformed patrol officers regarding detention, transportation, arrest, processing and booking of arrestees and other persons; (ii) wear Class A or Class C uniforms (and may not wear clothing with unauthorized insignias identifying them as working at a particular unit); (iii) use marked police vehicles for all activities; (iv) check out and return all field equipment from the Area kit room on a daily basis; (v) attend scheduled patrol roll calls; (vi) base all unit activities out of the concerned Area station; and, (vii) not use off-site locations at night other than LAPD primary area stations for holding arrestees (including interviews) or interviewing witnesses; provided, however, that the foregoing does not apply to interviews at the scene of a crime, interviews in connection with a canvass of a scene, or when the witness requests to be interviewed at a different location. Any exceptions from these requirements shall require the approval of the appropriate managers, and shall be for a specified, limited period of time. Exceptions to the requirements set forth in subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) shall be in writing.</p>	<p>"During the last assessment of these [arrest, booking, and charging procedural] requirements, the Monitor reviewed and placed reliance on AD's September 2008 ABC Reports Audit, in which AD found overall compliance with all requirements except post-incident review. Although the Monitor continued to have concerns regarding supervisory oversight of arrest procedures due to the Department's continued non-compliance with the supervisory oversight objective, the Monitor commended the Department for achieving much higher compliance ratings over the years and concluded that the LAPD is in overall compliance with the arrest, booking and charging requirements in this final assessment."</p> <p>"Regarding requirements for uniforms, vehicles, Area kit room, roll call, Area station-based activities and interview locations, the Department quickly achieved compliance with all of these requirements except for Area kit room procedures." LAPD achieved substantial compliance with Area kit room procedures requirements "by June 2004."</p>	

Management of Gang Units

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Unit Supervisor Responsibilities: A unit supervisor shall provide a daily field presence and maintain an active role in unit operations. Unit supervisors shall brief the Area Watch commander regularly regarding the activities of their unit and shall coordinate unit activities with other Area supervisors.</p>	<p>"Prior to the extension, the Department did not achieve substantial compliance with the Consent Decree requirements regarding daily field presence, maintaining an active role, supervisors exercising proper control and oversight over planned tactical operations of the gang units, nor did they achieve compliance with these supervisory oversight requirements during the extension period. During the extension period, the Department continued to fall short of complying with supervisory oversight requirements based on reviews conducted under the new methodology."</p> <p>"In 2007, the Monitor found that supervisory approval of daily logs was not present and supervisors' daily field presence was either not properly documented and/or included inaccuracies between the available field time and what was reflected in the supervisors' log narrative."</p>	<p>See: Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Details</p>
<p>Area Manager Responsibilities: Area managers shall be responsible for ensuring that supervisors exercise proper control over these units and for providing oversight over planned tactical operations.</p>	<p>"Although the Department had early struggles complying with requirements regarding the Citywide . . . coordination of activities, training, technical assistance and audits of gang units, it achieved compliance with these requirements prior to the end of the Consent Decree."</p>	<p>See: Selection and Assignment to Gang Enforcement Details</p>
<p>Bureau Gang Coordinator Responsibilities: Each Bureau gang coordinator shall be responsible for monitoring and assessing the operation of all units in the Bureau that address gang activity. The coordinator shall personally inspect and audit at least one Area unit each month and shall submit copies of completed audits to the pertinent Bureau and Area, OHB Detective Support Division Command office, and the LAPD Audit Unit. The coordinator may use Bureau staff to conduct such audits who themselves serve in a Bureau or Area gang-activity unit and are deployed in the field to monitor or reduce gang activity.</p>	<p>"By . . . 2006, the Department had achieved substantial compliance with the requirement of . . . written consideration of any complaint or adverse judicial finding for use of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, an unreasonable search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination or dishonesty, during the gang officer's assignment in the unit."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.77.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Sworn personnel assigned to a GED may be deselected if they commit an act or behavior that would have disqualified them from selection to GED. Deselection will be considered if it involves any of the sustained allegations or adverse judicial findings resulting in a determination of misconduct in the categories listed in Manual Section 3/763.77. The Letter of Transmittal for the involved complaint must include either a recommendation to deselect or justification for retention." See LAPD Manual 3/763.77.
<p>Effect of Sustained Complaint on Unit Member: During a supervisor's or non-supervisory officer's assignment tour in these units, a sustained complaint or adverse judicial finding for use of excessive force, a false arrest or charge, an unreasonable search or seizure, sexual harassment, discrimination, or dishonesty shall result in the officer's supervisor reviewing the incident and making a written determination as to whether the subject officer should remain in the unit.</p>		

Confidential Informants

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Informant Operations: The LAPD has developed and shall continue to implement procedures for the handling of informants, including, among other things, prohibiting personnel in uniform assignments from maintaining or using informants, obtaining supervisory approval to use informant after completion of an informant control package, assigning each informant a Confidential Informant (CI) number, maintaining and limiting access to the CI's control package, routinely checking the Department-wide undesirable informant file prior to acting on informant information, documenting meetings and significant contacts and information received from CI and results of investigation, admonishing CI not to violate any laws in gathering information, and requiring supervisors to meet with each CI at least once prior to the CI control package being submitted to the commanding officer.</p>	<p>"[T]he Department achieved substantial compliance with the utilization and handling of informants during the extension period and over the course of the original term and the extension successfully put into place various policies and procedures that established best police practices for the utilization and handling of informants."</p>	<p>See: Confidential Informant Manual, January 1, 2020 LAPD Manual 4/733.10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Department policy limits the use of informants to officers who are in Investigative assignments. Consequently, uniformed officers are not allowed to use or maintain informants. A uniformed officer who comes in contact with a potential informant shall refer that person to the appropriate investigative entity. Officers shall refer to the current Informant Manual for direction." See LAPD Manual 4/733.10.
<p>Informant Database: The LAPD shall establish a permanent Department-wide confidential database or listing of all LAPD confidential informants, except those listed by the Anti-Terrorist Division and those used in conjunction with another agency, containing the following information: Confidential Informant number, name, aliases, and date of birth.</p>	<p>"[T]he Monitor determined that the Department achieved substantial compliance with requirements related to the CI database, since the databases' information and the Informant packages were now both inclusive and accurate."</p>	<p>See: Confidential Informant Manual, January 1, 2020 LAPD Manual 4/734.</p> <p>"The Confidential Informant Tracking System Database (CITSD) has been created to centralize and better manage information regarding Department Informants." See LAPD Manual 4/734.</p>
<p>Informant Use Manual: The LAPD shall publish a confidential informant manual which further expands and defines the procedures for identifying and utilizing informants.</p>	<p>"By the end of 2008, the Monitor, AD and the OIG all concurred that the Department had achieved substantial compliance with all Consent Decree requirements relating to CI." Notably, "[t]he LAPD issued a revised Informant Manual in March 2008, which further outlines specific requirements regarding informants and helps to ensure adherence to these requirements, and also provides a best practices approach to the handling of informants that will carry the Department forward after the term of the Consent Decree extension expires."</p>	<p>See: Confidential Informant Manual, January 1, 2020</p>

Development of Program for Responding to Persons with Mental Illness

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Compile Information on Successful Programs: The Department shall: (a) conduct an in-depth evaluation of successful programs in other law enforcement agencies across the United States dealing with police contacts with persons who may be mentally ill, and (b) conduct an in-depth evaluation of LAPD training, policies, and procedures for dealing with persons who may be mentally ill, including detailed reviews of at least ten incidents since January 1, 1999 in which a person who appeared to be mentally ill was the subject of a Categorical Use of Force and at least 15 incidents since January 1, 1999 in which the LAPD mental health evaluation unit was contacted.</p>	<p>"The LAPD achieved success in reaching substantial compliance with all Consent Decree requirements during the initial term of the Decree. Specifically, the Department, through a contract with Lodestar Management Research, thoroughly researched best practices throughout the United States and responded to recommendations of the DOJ and the Monitor relative to proposals for new policies and procedures."</p>	<p>See Information provided on the Mental Evaluation Unit at: http://www.lapdonline.org/detective_bureau/content_basic_view/51704#:~:text=For%20more%20than%20four%20decades%2C%20the%20Los%20Angeles,law%20enforcement-mental%20health%20co-response%20operations%20in%20the%20nation</p> <p>In addition, see Policy Regarding Contact with Persons Suffering Mental Illness: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/20820/BPC_20-0189.pdf</p> <p>OIG Report on MEU: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_a47211ea1590469faae3e835b3702b37.pdf</p> <p>OIG Best Practices Report: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6e3971bb5f.pdf</p>
<p>Report Recommendations to Commission: The LAPD, based upon its analysis, shall prepare a report for the Police Commission detailing the results of its analysis and recommending appropriate changes in policies, procedures, and training methods regarding police contact with persons who may be mentally ill with the goal of de-escalating the potential for violent encounters with mentally ill persons. The recommendation shall include a proposal on potential methods for tracking calls and incidents dealing with persons who may appear to be mentally ill. The Police Commission shall forward its reports and actions regarding any appropriate new or modifications to existing policies, practices, or training methods regarding police contact with persons who may be mentally ill to the City Council and Mayor.</p>	<p>"The LAPD submitted a RFP in July 2001 seeking a contractor to evaluate successful programs in other jurisdictions and study the procedures and training in place at the LAPD. In December 2001, the LAPD selected Lodestar Management Research (Lodestar) to prepare a report of its findings, which was to be forwarded to the Chief of Police who would then make recommendations to the Police Commission and then forward the report to the City Council and the Mayor."</p>	<p>See Information provided on the Mental Evaluation Unit at: http://www.lapdonline.org/detective_bureau/content_basic_view/51704#:~:text=For%20more%20than%20four%20decades%2C%20the%20Los%20Angeles,law%20enforcement-mental%20health%20co-response%20operations%20in%20the%20nation</p> <p>In addition, see Policy Regarding Contact with Persons Suffering Mental Illness: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/120820/BPC_20-0189.pdf</p> <p>OIG Report on MEU: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_a47211ea1590469faae3e835b3702b37.pdf</p> <p>OIG Best Practices Report: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6e3971bb5f.pdf</p>

Development of Program for Responding to Persons with Mental Illness

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Audit of Incidents Involving Persons With Mental Illness: Within one year of the date of receipt by the Police Commission of the report, the Department shall complete an audit to evaluate LAPD handling of calls and incidents over the previous one year period involving persons who appear to be mentally ill. The audit and evaluation shall include any new policies, procedures, and training methods implemented pursuant to the Consent Decree and shall specify any additional modifications necessary in the Department's policies, procedures, or training to meet the objectives of the Consent Decree.</p>	<p>"The Department's Mental Illness Program Implementation Plan was completed in November 2003. It addressed and reported on the status of all the Department's Mental Illness Project recommendations approved by the Police Commission in 2002 and the Mental Illness Program Audit required under Consent Decree paragraph 113."</p>	<p>See information provided on the Mental Evaluation Unit at: http://www.lapdonline.org/detective_bureau/content_basic_view/51704#:~:text=For%20more%20than%20four%20decades%2C%20the%20Los%20Angeles,law%20enforcement-mental%20health%20co-response%20operations%20in%20the%20nation In addition, see Policy Regarding Contact with Persons Suffering Mental Illness: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacty.org/120820/BPC__20-0189.pdf OIG Report on MEU: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_a47211aa1590469faaa39835b3702b37.pdf OIG Best Practices Report: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d6240944d9e7e663971bb5f.pdf</p>

Field Training Officer Program

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>FTO Eligibility: The Department shall continue to implement formal eligibility criteria for Field Training Officers ("FTO"). The criteria require, <i>inter alia</i>, demonstrated analytical skills, demonstrated interpersonal and communication skills, cultural and community sensitivity, diversity, and commitment to police integrity. The criteria shall be expanded to require a positive evaluation of the officer based upon the officer's TEAMS II record.</p>	<p>"During the extension, the Monitor found the Department in compliance with requirements regarding formal eligibility criteria for FTOs during the quarters ending December 31, 2006. . . (and as) a result, the Department achieved substantial compliance with the requirements of [this paragraph]."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.85. • "Prior to applying for a FTO position, officers must have: Met the eligibility requirements established in the Field Training Manual; and, Demonstrated analytical skills, cultural and community sensitivity, diversity and commitment to police integrity that meet or exceed standards." See LAPD Manual 3/763.85.</p>
<p>Disqualification: Without limiting any other personnel authority available to the Department, FTOs may be removed during their tenure for acts or behaviors that would disqualify the officer from selection as an FTO.</p>	<p>"During the extension, the Monitor found the Department in compliance with requirements. . . regarding the FTO deselection [i.e., disqualification] during the quarters ending June 30, 2007 and June 30, 2008. . . (and as) a result, the Department achieved substantial compliance with the requirements of [this paragraph]."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.90. • "FIELD TRAINING OFFICER DESELECTION. Sworn employees assigned as FTOs may be deselected for acts or behaviors that would have disqualified them from selection as an FTO. Deselection of an FTO must be consistent with the Department's downgrade and/or administrative transfer procedures (Department Manual Sections 3/762.35 and 3/763.55). Deselection will be considered if it involves a sustained allegation in the categories listed in Manual Section 3/763.85. The Letter of Transmittal for that complaint must include either a recommendation to deselect or justification for retention." See LAPD Manual 3/763.90.</p>

Field Training Officer Program

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>FTO Training: The LAPD shall continue to implement a plan to ensure that FTOs receive adequate training, including training to be an instructor and training in LAPD policies and procedures, to enable them to carry out their duties. FTOs' annual personnel performance evaluations shall include their competency in successfully completing and implementing their FTO training. The LAPD shall provide regular and periodic re-training on these topics.</p>	<p>"During the extension, the Monitor found the Department in compliance with requirements. . . regarding the FTO training plan during the quarters ending September 30, 2007, March 31, 2008, and September 30, 2008. . . [and as] a result, the Department achieved substantial compliance with the requirements of [this paragraph]."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3763.85 & 11670.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o "It remains the responsibility of each FTO to maintain proficiency in the performance as an FTO including the requirements established for eligibility and in the Field Training Manual. The FTO must also remain in compliance with current requirements, including the successful completion of the Peace Officer Standards and Training mandated FTO Course and any required FTO recertification course(s). It is incumbent upon commanding officers to continually monitor the performance of their command's FTOs and their compliance with FTO training standards. . . The Department must ensure that FTOs receive adequate training, including training to be an instructor, and training in Department policies and procedures to enable them to carry out their duties. Training requirements are detailed in the Department's Field Training Manual." See LAPD Manual 3763.85. o "An officer's training continues after graduation through his assignment with training officers, roll call training, and supervision. It is the responsibility of all officers to teach those with whom they work the skills and knowledge necessary to perform the job at hand. Supervisory and commanding officers of all ranks have the responsibility not only to train subordinates to perform assigned tasks, but also to familiarize all subordinates with their supervisor's job as well, so that employees are prepared to assume additional responsibilities should the need arise." See LAPD Manual 11670.

Training Content

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Required Training: The LAPD shall continue to provide all LAPD recruits, officers, supervisors, and managers with regular and periodic training on police integrity. Such training shall include and address, <i>inter alia</i>: (a) the duty to report misconduct and facts relevant to such misconduct; (b) what constitutes retaliation for reporting misconduct, the prohibition against retaliation for reporting misconduct, and the protections available to officers from retaliation; (c) cultural diversity, which shall include training on interactions with persons of different races, ethnicities, religious groups, sexual orientations, persons of the opposite sex, and persons with disabilities, and also community policing; (d) the role of integrity and the proper completion of such reports; (e) Fourth Amendment and other constitutional requirements and the policy requirements governing police actions in conducting stops, searches, seizures, making arrests, and using force; and, (f) examples of ethical dilemmas faced by LAPD officers and, where practicable given the location, type, and duration of the training, interactive exercises for resolving ethical dilemmas shall be utilized.</p>	<p>"Prior to the extension, the Monitor found the Department in substantial compliance with all requirements in this section of the Decree [on Training Content] except for the requirements regarding training for civilian members of the BOR."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/763.85 & 1/670.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The Department has an obligation to provide a professional standard of law enforcement service to the community. In fulfilling that responsibility, it is essential that Department personnel be properly trained. This is true not only at the entrance level where officers must receive basic training prior to their assumption of police responsibilities, but it is a continuous process throughout their careers. Training is provided to accommodate Department needs and to actualize the interest and concern which the Department has for the self-improvement and personal development of its employees." See LAPD Manual 1/670. <p>In 2017, 9,188 were trained on implicit bias.</p> <p>2020 Course Training Statistics:</p> <p>MHIT (C208): 745</p> <p>Field Training Officer School (A206): 71</p> <p>Field Training Officer Update (A306): 153</p> <p>Supervisory Course (L308): 55</p> <p>Watch Commander Course (L309): 44</p> <p>Command and Control (T273): 3667</p> <p>PSL 1 (L150): 96</p> <p>Training for civilian members of the BOR also occurs on a regular basis. See LAPD Board of Rights Manual. Upon appointment, the Civilian Hearing Examiners are given 8 hours of training by the City Attorney, Internal Affairs Group, Advocates Section, and Police Commission staff. Periodically, the Civilian Hearing Examiners are provided 4 additional hours of training.</p>
<p>Training for Board of Rights members: The Department shall train all members of the public scheduled to serve on the Board of Rights in police practices and procedures.</p>	<p>"With the Monitor's participation, Police Commission staff developed lesson plans for civilian BOR training to meet the requirements regarding the training of Board members. . . . (and as) a result, the Department achieved substantial compliance with the BOR-related training requirements during the extension."</p>	<p>LAPD Board of Rights Manual.</p>
<p>Tuition Reimbursement: The City may establish a plan to annually provide tuition reimbursement for continuing education for a reasonable number of officers in subjects that will promote police integrity and professionalism. Such educational programs shall be attended while officers are off-duty.</p>	<p>"Although considered a permissive requirement, the Monitor found the LAPD in compliance with the requirement to establish a plan to annually provide tuition reimbursement for continuing education in subjects that promote police integrity and professionalism, as it established a tuition reimbursement program."</p>	<p>Office of Support Services / Training Division Notice "College Tuition Reimbursement Program," July 3, 2007. The Revolving Training Fund provides \$1.5 million per year in on-duty training reimbursement (city budgeted).</p>

Training Content

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Procedures for Suggesting Improvements to Training: The LAPD shall establish procedures for supervisors and officers of the LAPD to communicate to the LAPD Training Group any suggestions they may have for improving the standardized training provided to LAPD officers and to make written referrals to the appropriate LAPD official regarding suggestions about LAPD policies or tactics.</p>	<p>"As required by the Consent Decree, the Department implemented several procedures for communicating suggestions to the Training Group. The Department was receptive to suggestions and willing to develop training based on actual needs and, in fact, integrated seven suggestions into the training curriculum. In February 2002, the Continuing Education Division, along with the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, developed a revised Basic Supervisory School as a result of course evaluations and student interviews. The training that resulted required each Sergeant candidate to participate in two one-day ride-alongs with an experienced Sergeant."</p>	<p>In 2019, Chief Moore had "Single Purpose Innovation Groups" meet on a variety of topics. The work of those groups led to dozens of training recommendations. See: Department Groups focused on opportunities to improve services. Police Training and Education (PTE) handles the Professional Advisory Committee (PAC).</p>

Supervisory Training

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Supervisory Training Generally: The LAPD shall provide all officers promoted to supervisory positions, up to and including the rank of Captain, with training to perform the duties and responsibilities of such positions. Training should be provided before they assume their new supervisory positions, except for those officers promoted to the rank of Captain, who shall have at least commenced their Command Development training before they assume their new positions.</p>	<p>"During the quarter ending December 31, 2003, the Monitor found the Department in compliance with this requirement [to provide supervisory training pre-supervisory duty assumption] as 96% of promoted members received requisite training prior to promotion. The Monitor then found the Department in non-compliance with the requirement during the quarter ending September 30, 2004, and in compliance [once again] during the quarter ending September 30, 2005."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 1/670.40. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Once the selection process has resulted in promotion, the Department provides training to prepare newly appointed supervisors and commanding officers for their added responsibilities. Dependent upon the level of supervision or management involved, an attempt is made to familiarize individuals with problems which they may face and to assist them in developing suitable responses to those problems." See LAPD Manual 1/670.40 Probationary Sergeant Performance Checklist (Form 01.8704) is required for all newly promoted Sergeants. This tracks training and performance across multiple categories. See: Checklist with various areas for probationary sergeants to complete.</p>
<p>Required Regular Training for Oversight Functions: The LAPD shall provide regular and periodic supervisory training on reviewing the reports addressed in the Consent Decree, incident control, and ethical decision-making.</p>	<p>"The Monitor found the Department in compliance with the requirement to provide regular and periodic supervisory training on reviewing the reports addressed in the Decree, incident control and ethical decision-making for the first time during the quarter ending September 30, 2003, as a sufficient number of supervisors had received the appropriate training on a regular and periodic basis. The Monitor found the LAPD remained in compliance with this requirement during subsequent assessments conducted during the remainder of the initial term of the Decree."</p>	<p>Standardized Quarterly Supervisor Training Program is currently in place. See generally LAPD Manual 1/670.</p>

Supervisory Training

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Training In Conducting Administrative Investigations: The LAPD shall ensure that any supervisor who performs, or is expected to perform, administrative investigations, including chain of command investigations of uses of force and complaints, receives training on conducting such investigations.</p>	<p>"The Monitor found the Department in compliance with Investigatory training requirements for supervisors for the first time during the quarters ending June 30, 2004, and then again during the quarter ending September 30, 2005. In both instances, the Monitor found that a sufficient number of supervisors received the appropriate training."</p>	<p>Human Resources Bureau Notice, "Attendance at Basic Supervisor School, Watch Commander School and Command Development Program-Revised," approved by the Police Commission July 10, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, "Department Course Content Revisions," approved by the Police Commission July 24, 2001; Human Resources Bureau Notice, "Administrative Investigation Training Requirements-Revised" approved by the Police Commission September 18, 2001.</p> <p>The content of Basic Supervisor School, Watch Commander School, and Command Development are continually being reviewed and refreshed.</p>

Integrity Audits

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>The Annual Audit Plan: Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the Chief of Police shall submit to the Police Commission, with a copy to the Inspector General, a listing of all scheduled audits of the LAPD to be conducted by the LAPD in the upcoming fiscal year, other than sting audits (the "Annual Audit Plan"). The Annual Audit Plan shall include all specified audits required to be conducted by the LAPD, and any other audits required by the Consent Decree. The Police Commission shall review this Annual Audit Plan, and, following consultation with the Chief of Police, shall make appropriate modifications and approve it. The Chief of Police shall report to the Commission quarterly, with a copy to the Inspector General, on the status of audits listed in the Annual Audit Plan, including any significant results of such audits conducted by the LAPD. The Department shall create and continue to have an audit unit within the office of the Chief of Police (the "Audit Unit") with centralized responsibility for developing the Annual Audit Plan, coordinating and scheduling audits contemplated by the Annual Audit Plan and ensuring timely completion of audits, and conducting audits as directed by the Chief of Police. Each audit conducted by the Department shall be documented in a report that provides the audit's methodology, data sources, analysis of the data, and conclusions.</p>	<p>"After the inception of the Consent Decree, the Department formally established an audit unit (AD) on July 6, 2001." By 2008, the audit unit (AD) met [certain] other requirements, including preparing annual audit plans and quarterly status reports for the Chief to provide to the Police Commission."</p>	<p>An Audit Plan is presented annually to the Board of Police Commissioners, which modifies and/or approves the plan each year. See, e.g., http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/audit-div.pdf</p>

Audits by the LAPD

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Reporting of Sting Audits: Sting audits shall not be reported in the Quarterly Audit Report. Rather, the results of all sting audits shall be reported to the Police Commission and the Inspector General by the Chief of Police within two weeks of the Chief's receipt of each sting audit report.</p>	<p>"In general, the Monitor and OIG were in agreement on the overall implementation, execution and scope of the EES audits [and their compliance]."</p> <p>"At the onset of the Consent Decree, the LAPD established what is now commonly known as the [Ethics Enforcement Section or] EES. Within the LAPD's organizational structure, this unit reports directly to the Deputy Chief of the LAPD's PSB. The EES was tasked with conducting both random and targeted 'sting audits.' Random audits assess officer conduct without any specific officer in mind whereas targeted [sting] audits are directed at officers identified through analysis, research or referrals considered potentially at risk."</p>	<p>As noted by the Office of the Inspector General in its audit of the Ethics Enforcement Section (EES):</p> <p>The use of ethics enforcement tests, formerly known as "sting audits," was one of the reforms implemented through the 2001 Federal Consent Decree. The consent decree required the Department to develop and initiate a plan for conducting "regular, targeted, and random integrity audit checks [...] to identify and investigate officers engaging in at-risk behavior," as well as to identify and investigate officers "who discourage the filing of a complaint or fail to report misconduct or complaints."</p> <p>The EES is a component of Special Operations Division (SOD). As stated in its quarterly reports: The mission of EES is to safeguard the integrity of law enforcement operations within LAPD. In accordance with this mission, EES works closely with Internal Affairs Group and other Department managers to identify at-risk personnel and behaviors. Once identified, EES develops proactive strategies to test and curtail these behaviors.</p> <p>EES objectives fall into three primary categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To develop tests that assess an employee's conduct when they are "placed into a situation with the potential for at-risk behavior;" • To serve as a resource for Department personnel who are attempting to identify or investigate an employee involved in potential at-risk behavior; and, • To "create a sense of omnipresence" throughout the organization to ensure that incidents are handled ethically and legally and in compliance with Department policy. <p>The OIG report can be found here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_13b773360db14f7ee091a4ae0c8c159c.pdf</p> <p>See also a report from 2013: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_19ae9ee387f24c4bbe4d14d3fd142ea.pdf</p>

Audits by the LAPD

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Periodic Audits of Stratified Random Samples of Police Conduct LAPD shall conduct regular, periodic audits of stratified random samples of (1) warrant applications and affidavits used to support warrant applications; (2) arrest, booking, and charging reports; (3) use of force reports; (4) all motor vehicle stops and pedestrian stops that are required to be documented in the manner specified in the Consent Decree; and, (5) confidential informant control packages. The review of these documents shall entail, at a minimum, a review for completeness of the information contained therein and an authenticity review to include an examination for "canned" language. Inconsistent information, lack of articulation of the legal basis for the applicable action, or other indicia that the information in the document is not authentic or correct. The review shall also assess the information in the documents to determine whether the underlying action was appropriate, legal, and in conformance with LAPD procedures. To the extent possible from a review of such samples, the audit shall also evaluate the supervisory oversight of the applicable incident and any post-incident review.</p>	<p>"In general, the Monitor and OIG were in agreement on the overall implementation, execution and scope of the EES audits [and their compliance]." "At the onset of the Consent Decree, the LAPD established what is now commonly known as the [Ethics Enforcement Section or] EES. Within the LAPD's organizational structure, this unit reports directly to the Deputy Chief of the LAPD's PSB. The EES was tasked with conducting both random and targeted "sting audits." Random audits assess officer conduct without any specific officer in mind whereas targeted [sting] audits are directed at officers identified through analysis, research or referrals considered potentially at risk."</p>	<p>As noted by the Office of the Inspector General in its audit of the Ethics Enforcement Section (EES): The use of ethics enforcement tests, formerly known as "sting audits," was one of the reforms implemented through the 2001 Federal Consent Decree. The consent decree required the Department to develop and initiate a plan for conducting "regular, targeted, and random integrity audit checks [...] to identify and investigate officers engaging in at-risk behavior," as well as to identify and investigate officers "who discourage the filing of a complaint or fail to report misconduct or complaints." The EES is a component of Special Operations Division (SOD). As stated in its quarterly reports: The mission of EES is to safeguard the integrity of law enforcement operations within LAPD. In accordance with this mission, EES works closely with Internal Affairs Group and other Department managers to identify at-risk personnel and behaviors. Once identified, EES develops proactive strategies to test and curtail these behaviors. EES objectives fall into three primary categories: • To develop tests that assess an employee's conduct when they are "placed into a situation with the potential for at-risk behavior." • To serve as a resource for Department personnel who are attempting to identify or investigate an employee involved in potential at-risk behavior; and, • To "create a sense of omnipresence" throughout the organization to ensure that incidents are handled ethically and legally and in compliance with Department policy. The OIG report can be found here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_13bb73360db1477ea091e4ae0c8c159c.pdf See also a report from 2013: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376cfbb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_19ae9ee387724c4bbead4d14d3fcd142ea.pdf</p>

Audits by the LAPD

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Periodic Audits of Use of Force and Administrative Investigations: The LAPD shall conduct regular, periodic audits of random samples of: (i) all Categorical Use of Force Investigations; (ii) all Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations; and, (iii) all Complaint Form 1.28 Investigations. These audits shall assess: (a) the timeliness of completing the investigations; (b) the completeness of the investigation file, including whether the file contains all appropriate evidence and documentation, or, if evidence is missing, an explanation of why the evidence is missing; (c) a comparison of the officer, complainant, and witness statements with the Investigator's summaries thereof, where applicable; (d) the adequacy of the investigation, including the application of the applicable standards; and, (e) the appropriateness of IAGs determinations.</p>	<p>"[B]y June 2008, the Monitor concluded that...[t]o date, but for subparagraph 131a [on periodic audits of Gang Units' work product], AD has achieved substantial compliance with each of the Consent Decree paragraphs that require AD to conduct an audit." More specifically, "[t]here were five audits that the Monitor concluded were substantially compliant by June 2006: the ABC Reports Audit, NCUOF Reports Audit, CUOF Systems Audit, Complaint Form 1.28 Systems Audit and GED Selection Criteria Audit." By 2009, the Monitor found the following audits in substantial compliance: the Warrant Applications and Supporting Affidavits Audit, Confidential Informant Control Package Audit, CUOF Investigations Audit, and Complaint Form 1.29 Investigations Audit. By 2009, the Monitor still made no final determination of compliance as to the Motor Vehicle and Pedestrian Stops Audit and the GED Work Product Assessment Summaries Audit.</p>	<p>The Department periodically conducts audits of these topics. A few links to audits recently completed: Categorical Use of Force Investigations: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/050217/BPC__17-0161.pdf Non-Categorical Use of Force Investigations: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/030519/BPC__19-0071.pdf Complaint Form 1.28 Investigations: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/091118/BPC__18-0296.pdf</p>
<p>Annual Report to the Commission: The LAPD shall annually report to the Commission, with a copy to the Inspector General, the type of complaint allegations it receives and the disposition (including sustained rate) and discipline or lack of discipline resulting from each type of allegation. This report shall include both the allegations received and any collateral misconduct discovered during the investigation. This report shall list the above information for each type of allegation as well as summarize aggregate information by geographic division (department, bureau, area, and district), officer rank, and type of assignment.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>The Department presents an annual report to the Board of Police Commissioners. The 2019 audit can be found here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102020/BPC__20-0139.pdf In addition, the Department has published all use of force information since 2016, with the Use of Force Year End Report: Use of Force Data Reports.</p>

Audits by the LAPD

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Periodic Audits of the Work Product of Gang Units: The LAPD shall conduct regular periodic audits of the work product of all LAPD gang units. These audits shall be conducted by OHB Detective Support Division. Each such audit shall include:</p> <p>(a) auditing a random sample of the work of the unit as a whole and further auditing the work of any individual officers whose work product the auditor has observed contains indicia of untruthfulness, other forms of misconduct, or otherwise merits further review; (b) assessing compliance with the selection criteria for the units; (c) an audit of a random sampling of police conduct, as discussed above; (d) auditing the use of confidential informants by such units to assess compliance with policies governing Cis; (e) auditing the roles and conduct of supervisors of these units; (f) reviewing the incidents requiring supervisory review, assessing the supervisor's response, and examining the relationships of particular officers working together or under particular supervisors in such incidents to determine whether additional investigation is needed to identify at-risk practices; and, (g) drawing conclusions regarding the adherence of the unit to the law, LAPD policies and procedures, and the Consent Decree and shall recommend a course of action to correct any deficiencies found.</p>	<p>"[By June 2008, the Monitor concluded that . . .]to date, but for subparagraph 13(a) on periodic audits of Gang Units' work product, AD has achieved substantial compliance with each of the Consent Decree paragraphs that require AD to conduct an audit."</p>	<p>Periodic Audits of the Work Product of Gang Units: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2add23_7a94219ec43340a484805c8be1718bfapdf</p>
<p>Audit of Random Samples of Financial Disclosures: The LAPD shall require regular and periodic financial disclosures by all LAPD officers and other LAPD employees who routinely handle valuable contraband or cash. The LAPD shall periodically audit a random sample of such disclosures to ensure their accuracy. When necessary, the LAPD shall require the necessary waivers from such officers.</p>	<p>"[T]he Financial Disclosure Audit was not completed and financial disclosure is subject to the Transition Agreement."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/381.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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, to the Financial Disclosure Coordinator (FDC), Audit Division, within ten calendar days of being selected and prior to assignment to or for the retention of an existing position within any assignment or loan to: Gang Impact Team (GIT); Gang Enforcement Detail (GED); Narcotic Enforcement Detail (NED) Positions; Community Law Enforcement and Recovery (CLEAR) Unit; or Gang and Narcotics Division (GND). Any sworn personnel whose primary duty involves contact with or investigation of gang and/or narcotics." See LAPD Manual 3/381.
<p>Audit of Training: The Department shall audit police officer and supervisory officer training, using independent consultants who have substantial experience in the area of police training. The audit shall assess: ways in which LAPD training could be improved (i) to reduce incidents of excessive use of force, false arrests, and illegal searches and seizures, and (ii) by making greater use of community-oriented policing training models.</p>	<p>"The Department hired RAND as the independent consultant to complete the training audit. After evaluating RAND's review, the Monitor concluded that RAND's report was not specific enough to the LAPD, despite comments from both the Monitor and the LAPD. However, subsequent to this, the Monitor worked with the LAPD to define the training requirements and found the LAPD in compliance with Consent Decree requirements in December 2004."</p>	<p>RAND Audit of Training Link: https://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/boi_rand_03_03_31.pdf</p>

Audits by the LAPD

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Audit of Uses of Force Resulting in Skeletal Fractures: The Department shall complete a review and audit of all uses of force resulting in skeletal fractures known to the LAPD. The audit shall recommend potential reforms to Department policies and procedures with the goal of minimizing and promptly treating such fractures, including the feasibility and desirability of including uses of force resulting in fractures within the definition of a Categorical Use of Force, as appropriate.</p>	<p>"In September 2005, the Monitor concluded that the intent of this paragraph [in the Consent Decree] was to determine whether sufficient scrutiny was provided by the Department of uses of force involving skeletal fractures. The Monitor concluded that with the introduction of Special Order No. 13 [on Non-Categorical UOF Reporting - Revised] and the higher level of scrutiny it requires, the intent of this paragraph was met."</p>	<p>In addition, the Department has published all use of force information since 2016, with the Use of Force Year End Report: <i>Use of Force Data Reports</i>, which provides information on all types of uses of force. Link for 2019 Report: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/2019_uof_review.pdf</p>

Inspector General Audits

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>IG Review of Audits: The Inspector General shall be provided with copies of all reports of specified audits prepared by the LAPD within one week of the completion thereof and with copies of all sting audits. The IG shall evaluate all such audits to assess their quality, completeness, and findings. Upon request from the IG, the LAPD shall forward any other LAPD audit report requested to the IG within one week of such request, and the IG, at his/her discretion or upon direction from the Commission, may evaluate these audits. The IG shall deliver its evaluations in writing to the Police Commission.</p>	<p>"The OIG achieved compliance with both the timeliness and quality criteria of its requirement to review the Department's audits in September 2005." "By June 2006, the Monitor concluded that the OIG had developed a professional audit team that included police performance auditors and special investigators with the expertise to ensure that the OIG meets its mandate."</p>	<p>Since the completion of the Consent Decree, and with the concurrence of the Board of Police Commissioners, the OIG has focused on conducting original audits and reviews rather than on evaluating the Department's audits. Many of the OIG's audits and reviews can be found here: https://www.oig.lacity.org/significant-reports</p>
<p>IG Review of Categorical Use of Force Investigations: The Inspector General shall continue to review all Categorical Use of Force Investigations. The IG also shall conduct a regular, periodic audit and review of a stratified random sample of: (i) all Non-Categorical Uses of Force, and (ii) Complaint Form 1.28 Investigations. Both of these types of reviews shall assess the quality, completeness, and findings of the investigations and shall include determinations of whether the investigations were completed in a timely manner, summarized and transcribed statements accurately match the recorded statements, all available evidence was collected and analyzed, and the investigation was properly adjudicated. The IG shall promptly report its findings from these reviews in writing to the Commission.</p>	<p>"The OIG completed its first compliant review of complaint investigations in March 2006." "Since that time, the Monitor concurred with most of the OIG's findings and concluded that the OIG continued to submit quality reviews of CUOF incidents, NCUOF incidents and complaints. . . ."</p>	<p>The OIG conducts detailed reviews of every Categorical Use of Force investigation and reports its findings to the Police Commission. The OIG also periodically conducts audits and reviews of Non-Categorical Use of Force investigations, as well as Complaint Form 1.28 investigations. For example, see the following audits and reviews: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7b0b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23__ca056c07c33f4241bb6d01c2778d10b4b.pdf https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7b0b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_8e9d766068c54b3cb7bc3568b9ae54f6.pdf</p>
<p>TEAMS II Audit: On a regular basis, the Inspector General shall audit the quality and timeliness of the LAPD's use of TEAMS II to perform its required tasks.</p>	<p>"The OIG submitted its TEAMS II Phase I audit in November 2007, its Phase II audit in June 2008 and another Phase I audit in October 2008. The Monitor concluded that each of these audits were compliant, and the Monitor provided input to the OIG regarding areas in which the OIG could improve its reviews."</p>	<p>For example, see the following audit: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7b0b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23__5f7b5a0981414ed0b5b2856319f683cc.pdf</p>

Inspector General Audits

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Use of TEAMS II to Conduct Audits: The Inspector General shall periodically use TEAMS II to conduct audits of the LAPD and to review LAPD unit-specific and officer-specific audits conducted by the LAPD. Such audits and reviews shall include procedures that: (a) examine and identify officers demonstrating at-risk behavior as determined by their history of (i) administrative investigations, (ii) misconduct complaints, (iii) discipline, (iv) uses of lethal and non-lethal force, (v) criminal or civil charges or lawsuits, (vi) searches and seizures, (vii) racial bias, (viii) improper arrests or, any other matter requested by the Police Commission or, subject to Charter section 573, any other improper conduct or at-risk behavior the IG has reason to believe exists, and (b) examine and identify at-risk practices or procedures as determined by trends within a unit or between and among units using the same criteria.</p>	<p>"The Monitor withheld a determination of compliance with requirements for the OIG to use TEAMS II to conduct and review audits in September 2008." "In December 2008, the Monitor found the OIG in compliance with the requirement to examine and identify officers with at-risk behavior, but withheld a determination of compliance with the requirement to examine and identify trends." "Going forward, the OIG and Department will need to implement this strategy and the DOJ will need to confirm that the OIG has conducted sufficient review of at-risk practices or trends within units or between units. The Monitor is of the opinion that if the OIG implements this strategy, it will meet these requirements."</p>	<p>The OIG regularly conducts audits and other reviews focused on at-risk behaviors and trends across the Department. These audits and reviews include, but are not limited to, the topics of use of force, complaints of misconduct, litigation, searches and seizures, and other matters requested by the Police Commission. The OIGs work in these areas frequently involves using TEAMS II in a variety of ways to gather and analyze relevant information.</p>

Inspector General Audits

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Tracking Retaliation Complaints & Developing Investigation Protocols: The Inspector General may receive complaints from LAPD employees alleging retaliation for reporting possible misconduct or at-risk behavior. The IG shall record and track the allegations in such complaints. If the IG determines that such complaints indicate possible retaliation in the Department's handling of complaints, the IG shall conduct an investigation and forward its findings to the Commission. The Commission shall work with the IG to develop and implement retaliation complaint investigation protocols that will protect, to the maximum extent permitted by law, the confidentiality of the identity of the person reporting retaliation to the IG.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>See LAPD Manual 1/273: 273. PROTECTION FROM RETALIATION FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL. It is the policy of the Department that employees are free to contact the Inspector General or respond to queries from the Inspector General without having to fear that their employment might be adversely affected. An employee's contact with the Inspector General may play no role in any future employment action towards the individual by the Department. Retaliation by adverse employment action or harassment against employees who provide information to the Inspector General is an intolerable violation of Department policy and undermines the effectiveness of oversight efforts of the Inspector General by threatening the continued flow of information. However, the protections of this section shall not apply when the contact was made or the information was disclosed with knowledge that it was false or with willful disregard for its truth or falsity. The Board, the Inspector General, and all Department supervisors shall be vigilant in protecting from reprisal or threat of reprisal any individual who discloses any information to the Inspector General.</p> <p>In the event the Inspector General concludes that there is reason to believe retaliation against an individual has occurred, the Inspector General shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct an investigation and forward the findings to the Police Commission upon completion; and, • Promptly forward a personnel complaint (except a complaint of misconduct regarding the Chief of Police) to the Commanding Officer, Internal Affairs Group or promptly request the Board to make a determination on whether a notice to the Internal Affairs Group should be delayed. <p>See: Organization and Functions of the LAPD.</p>

Operations of the Police Commission & the Inspector General

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Commission and IG Review of Categorical Uses of Force: The Commission and Inspector General shall continue to review and evaluate all Categorical Uses of Force. The Commission shall determine whether the officer's conduct conforms with LAPD policies, procedures, and the requirements of this Agreement, and so inform the Chief of Police. The Commission shall annually issue a publicly available report detailing its findings regarding these incidents.</p>	<p>"During most reviews conducted during the Decree, the Commission's Annual CUOF Report was found to address most Consent Decree requirements with regards to the publication of the report; however, there were delays in the publications of the 2002 and 2003 Annual Reports due to staffing problems of the OIG. Although these reports were of a quality nature once published, the delays resulted in a determination of non-compliance. As a result the Monitor continued to audit this requirement during the extension. The Monitor found that subsequent Annual Reports were in compliance with requirements regarding timing and content. As a result, the Monitor concluded that the Department was in substantial compliance with Decree requirements by the quarter ending March 31, 2008."</p>	<p>The Commission and Inspector General continue to review and evaluate all Categorical Uses of Force.</p> <p>The Commission determines whether an officer's conduct conforms with LAPD policies, procedures, and the requirements of this Agreement, and so informs the Chief of Police. The Commission issues a publicly available report detailing its findings regarding these incidents shortly after its decision. Those reports can be found at: summaries of its Categorical Use of Force decisions.</p> <p>See also: LAPD Manual 3/792.10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "PROCEDURE. Categorical Use of Force Adjudication Findings. Tactics, drawing and exhibiting a firearm, and use of force shall be evaluated during the CUOF adjudication process. The Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) shall convene and evaluate the CUOF incident. The Use of Force Review Board shall make recommendations to the COP. The Chief of Police shall evaluate the CUOF incident and report his/her recommendations to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC). The Board of Police Commissioners will evaluate the CUOF incident and make findings consistent with [section 1/792.10 of the LAPD Manual]." See LAPD Manual 1/792.10. * "Tactics, drawing and exhibiting a firearm, and use of force shall be evaluated during the CUOF adjudication process. The Use of Force Review Board (UOFRB) shall convene and evaluate the CUOF incident. The Use of Force Review Board shall make recommendations to the COP. The Chief of Police shall evaluate the CUOF incident and report his/her recommendations to the Board of Police Commissioners (BOPC)." See LAPD Manual 3/981.

Operations of the Police Commission & the Inspector General

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Commission Review of Audits: The Commission shall review the specified audit reports, the sting audit reports, and the audits required by the Consent Decree to determine whether any changes or modifications in LAPD policies are necessary. The Commission shall consider the results of such audits in its annual evaluation of the Chief of Police. The Commission shall exercise its authority to review and approve all new LAPD policies and procedures or changes to existing LAPD policies and procedures that are made to address the requirements of the Consent Decree. Review and approval of procedures, or changes to existing procedures by the Chief of Police affecting only procedure (and not policy), may be obtained on a ratification basis by placement of such item on the Commission agenda within 14 days of the date of the action by the Chief, and the Commission must approve, disapprove, or require modification of such item within 14 days of receipt. All new policies, or changes to existing policies, must be reviewed and approved by the Commission prior to implementation.</p>	<p>"[I]n July 2008 the Monitor concluded that the Police Commission was effectively performing its oversight role relating to the recommendations from the audits and the Department was in substantial compliance with these requirements. . . ."</p> <p>"[I]n June 2006, the Monitor concluded the Commission was in substantial compliance with this requirement as to Commission review and approval of new/changed policies and procedures."</p>	<p>The Commission approves all audit plans and reviews all audits. The Commission continues to set policy for the department.</p> <p>For example, in 2020, the Police Commission passed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new Use of Force policy, which can be found here: UOF policy; • New In-Custody Death Adjudication Protocols; and, • Banned the use of the Carotid Restraint Control Hold (which was subsequently banned throughout the State of California).
<p>Annual Review of Chief of Police: Under the Charter, the Commission is required to conduct an annual review of the Chief of Police. Such a review is intended to be an overall assessment of the Police Chief's performance as the chief administrative officer of the LAPD, including as it relates to satisfaction of universal performance goals applicable to chief administrative officers, budgeting goals, and other goals determined by the Commission. In conducting such review, the Commission shall also consider the Police Chief's responses to use of force incidents and complaints of officer misconduct, assessment and imposition of discipline, management of gang units, and results of audits.</p>	<p>"[T]he Monitor concluded that the Department achieved substantial compliance with these requirements [requiring an annual review of the Chief of Police] prior to the extension of the Decree. . . ."</p> <p>"[I]n June 2006, the Monitor concluded the Commission was in substantial compliance with this requirement [of consideration of audit results in evaluation of the Chief of Police]. . . ."</p>	<p>Pursuant to the Los Angeles City Charter, Section 571(b)(2), the Board of Police Commissioners is to:</p> <p>(2) evaluate the Chief of Police annually, set or adjust the compensation for the Chief of Police within the salary guidelines established by Council after recommendations concerning those guidelines have been made to the Council by the Director of the Office of Administrative and Research Services; and forward a copy of the evaluation and salary determination to the Mayor and Council for information.</p> <p>The Police Commission conducts an annual review of the Chief of Police.</p>
<p>Misconduct Complaints Against the Chief of Police: The Commission shall investigate all misconduct complaints against the Chief of Police and may use its staff, the Inspector General, or authorized contractors to conduct such investigations.</p>	<p>"At the end of the initial term of the Consent Decree, the Monitor found the Department in substantial compliance with these requirements [regarding the Commission's investigation of misconduct complaints against the Chief of Police]."</p>	<p>The Commission investigates all misconduct complaints against the Chief of Police and uses the Inspector General to conduct such investigations.</p>

Operations of the Police Commission & the Inspector General

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Budget Approval: The Commission shall continue to review and approve the LAPD's budget requests.</p>	<p>"The Monitor found during 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005 that the Police Commission reviewed and approved LAPD budget requests before submission to the City. Each year, the Monitor noted the requested amount, the size of the increase from the prior year and date the approved budget request was forwarded to the City. As a result, the Monitor concluded that the Department achieved substantial compliance with this requirement prior to the extension of the Decree, and the Monitor did not actively assess compliance during the extension period."</p>	<p>City Charter Sections 511 & 574. Pursuant to City Charter Section 547 each year the Chief of Police: (e) recommend(s) to the Board of Police Commissioners prior to the beginning of each fiscal year an annual departmental budget covering the anticipated revenues and expenditures of the department, except the anticipated revenues and expenditures under the control of the Executive Director, and conforming so far as practicable to the forms and dates provided in the Charter for the general City budget. The Commission reviews and approves the LAPD's budget requests, but all budgets are approved by the Los Angeles City Council.</p>
<p>IG Notification of Categorical Uses of Force: The Inspector General shall be notified in a timely manner of all Categorical Uses of Force and be entitled to be present as an observer on all Categorical Use of Force "roll outs." The IG shall report to the Commission in the event that the IGs observations at the scene of an incident raise issues regarding conformance with LAPD policies and procedures.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>The Inspector General is notified in a timely manner of all Categorical Uses of Force and is present as an observer at all Categorical Use of Force "roll outs." The IG reports to the Commission in the event that the IGs observations at the scene of an incident raise issues regarding conformance with LAPD policies and procedures.</p>
<p>IG Discretion to Attend Use of Force Review Board Meetings: The Inspector General may attend any Use of Force Review Board meeting. The Inspector General may interview any participant in such hearing after the conclusion of the hearing.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>2/0925 USE OF FORCE REVIEW BOARD – RESPONSIBILITIES provides that: Office of the Inspector General. A representative from the Office of the Inspector General may attend any Use of Force Review Board hearing and interview any hearing participant. The Office of the Inspector General does, in fact, attend Use of Force Review Board meetings.</p>
<p>LAPD Responsiveness to IG Requests: The LAPD shall promptly provide the Inspector General with any documents or other information requested by the IG. The IG shall develop and provide the LAPD with a list of reports, complete with time frames and frequency of their production, that the LAPD shall provide to the IG on a specified schedule in order for the IG to fulfill its responsibilities.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/895: When the Inspector General or any member of the Office of the Inspector General contacts a Department employee requesting access to a Department document(s), the employee shall: Comply with any and all requests for access to the document(s); Document any record(s) inspected by or provided to the Inspector General according to standard procedure for the requested record(s), such as a notation in a chronological log or entry on a Sign-Out Card, Form 15.31.00; and, Notify a supervisor as soon as practicable.</p>

Operations of the Police Commission & the Inspector General

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>IG Confidentiality: The Inspector General shall accept complaints from LAPD officers regarding matters which the IG has authority to investigate, and the IG shall not disclose the identity of an individual without the consent of the employee from whom a complaint or information has been received, unless such disclosure is unavoidable in order to effectively investigate an allegation or is otherwise required by law or the Los Angeles Office of the City Attorney; provided, however, that the IG shall disclose the identity of such individual to the Commission, upon request.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>See: Organization and Functions of the LAPD.</p>
<p>Complaint Intake Information: The LAPD shall continue to provide the Inspector General with all complaint intake information, including the assignment for investigation, within one week after its receipt by IAG. The IG shall review such information to ensure that complaints are being received in a manner that complies with LAPD policies and procedures.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/816.05. Within one week of receiving the complaint, Internal Affairs Group shall provide the Office of the Inspector General with all complaint information including the entity assigned to investigate the complaint.</p>
<p>Keep Commission Informed of Pending Investigations and Audits: The Inspector General shall keep the Commission informed of the status of all pending investigations and audits to be performed by the IG.</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>The Inspector General keeps the Commission informed of the status of all pending investigations and audits to be performed by the IG.</p>

Community Outreach and Public Information		
2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Community Outreach Program Generally: The Department shall conduct a Community Outreach and Public Information program for each LAPD geographic area. The program shall require the following: (a) at least one open meeting per quarter in each of the 18 geographic Areas for the first year of the Agreement and one meeting in each Area annually, thereafter, to inform the public about the provisions of this Agreement and the various methods of filing a complaint against an officer. At least one week before such meetings, the City shall publish notice of the meeting (i) in public areas; (ii) in at least one newspaper covering the City of Los Angeles; (iii) in one or more local community newspaper(s) that services the Area, taking into account the diversity in language and ethnicity of the area's residents; (iv) on the City and LAPD website; and (v) in the primary languages spoken by the communities located in such area, and (b) the open public meetings described above shall include presentations and information on the LAPD and LAPD operations, as presentations and information are designed to enhance interaction between officers and community members in daily policing activities.</p>	<p>"[B]y the first quarter of 2003, all of the requirements of the Decree [as to Community Outreach], including the posting of all required information on the Department's website were in compliance."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/240.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A community meeting is defined as any formal meeting with members of the community, where there are discussions regarding the quality of life, crime trends, or other topics that affect the community or the Department. Community meetings include both Department and non-Department sponsored meetings (i.e. local schools, business groups, clergy, neighborhood groups, etc.). See LAPD Manual 3/240. • "Community Outreach and Development Division, under the Director, Office of Constitutional Policing and Policies, is designated as the entity responsible for coordinating community meetings and shall be responsible for: Consolidating Area community meeting schedules into a master calendar, initially by month in which the meetings are scheduled and then with the date, time, and location of each meeting, as the dates are made available; Maintaining liaison with bureaus for updates on revisions to master calendar (e.g., date, change, location change, etc.); and, Forwarding the master calendar of community meetings to the CO, Emergency Services Division, for inclusion in the Department Special Events Calendar no later than the 10th of February, May, August and November of each year for meetings to be held during the upcoming quarter." See LAPD Manual 3/240.25.
<p>Semi-Annual Public Reports: The LAPD shall prepare and publish on its website semi-annual public reports, which include aggregate statistics broken down by each LAPD geographic area and for the Operations Headquarters Bureau and broken down by the race/ethnicity/national origin of the citizens involved, for arrests and uses of force. Such reports shall include a brief description of each of the following that was completed during that period: (i) report of a specified audit completed and any significant actions taken as a result of such audits or reports; (ii) a summary of all discipline imposed during the period reported by type of misconduct, broken down by type of discipline, bureau, and rank; and, (iii) any new policies or changes in policies made by the Department.</p>	<p>"[B]y the first quarter of 2003, all of the requirements of the Decree [as to Community Outreach], including the posting of all required information on the Department's website were in compliance."</p> <p>"On October 2, 2001, the first semiannual LAPD report was published on the Department's website, documenting the time period January 1 through June 1, 2001."</p>	<p>Referenced in OIG Best Practices Report. OIG Best Practices Report: https://a27e0481-e3cd0-44b8-8142-1976cfb66e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_66104e440d624094ade9e7eba3971bb5f.pdf</p>

Community Outreach and Public Information

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Community Advisory Groups: The LAPD shall continue to utilize community advisory groups in each geographic Area and to meet quarterly with the community they serve. The Department shall establish a media advisory working group to facilitate information dissemination to the predominant ethnicities and cultures in Los Angeles.</p>	<p>"[B]y the first quarter of 2003, all of the requirements of the Decree [as to Community Outreach], including the posting of all required information on the Department's website were in compliance." "Significantly, before the end of the first quarter of the Decree (September 30, 2003), all 18 LAPD geographic Areas scheduled and held their first Consent Decree-required community meetings. In which they presented all required information. The Department continued to hold the required community meetings during the remainder of the original term of the Decree."</p>	<p>LAPD Manual 3/240.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, shall ensure the information contained in the Area Community Meeting Summary form is compiled and summarized in a quarterly report for distribution." See LAPD Manual 3/240.25. • "Media Relations and Community Affairs Group shall be responsible for ensuring that each meeting is posted on the Department's website at least two weeks prior to the meeting by the MCG Online Unit." See LAPD Manual 3/240.25. • "Information Technology Division shall be responsible for posting each meeting on the City's website as the information is received from each Area." See LAPD Manual 3/240.25.

File Retention

2001 Action Item	2009 Final Independent Report	2020 Status
<p>Retention of Investigator Files and Training Records: The Department shall maintain all Complaint Form 128 Investigation files for at least ten years from the date of the incident. The City and the Department shall maintain an officer's training records during the officer's employment with the LAPD and for three years thereafter (unless required to be maintained for a longer period of applicable law).</p>	<p>Not addressed.</p>	<p>See: City Administrative Code; and Organization and Functions of the LAPD.</p>

Review of Past LAPD Reform Report Recommendations

This chart summarizes the findings and recommendations provided in the Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, issued in May 2015, which can be found here: https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf.

The Board of Police Commissioners adopted the report and the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) issued 2 subsequent reports, one in 2017 and one in 2019, on the status of the LAPD incorporating selected recommendations from the 21st Century Policing report. The OIG reports can be found as follows:

- The Follow-up Review of National Best Practices (2019), https://a27e0481-e3cd0-44b8-8142-1376c7bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_55e6bfb0cb5124b879f612eeb877a0da8.pdf
 - Review of National Best Practices (2017): https://a27e0481-e3cd0-44b8-8142-1376c7bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6e3971b5f.pdf
- To the extent there is an update beyond what is noted in the OIG Reports, it is noted in the table below as a "2020 Update."

21st Century Policing Report—2015		
Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
Pillar One: Building Trust and Legitimacy		
Guardian Mindset & Procedural Justice	Guardian Mindset & Procedural Justice as Guiding Principle: Embrace a guardian mindset to build public trust and legitimacy. Toward that end, adopt procedural justice as the guiding principle for internal and external policies and practices to guide their interactions with the citizens they serve. Law enforcement cannot build community trust if it is seen as an occupying force coming in from outside to rule and control the community.	The 2017 OIG Report "The LAPD has long incorporated principles such as guardianship, service, and respect for the dignity of others into its motto — 'To Protect and To Serve' — and its official Core Values, which include, for example, 'Service to Our Communities' and 'Respect for People.'" (2017) "In the summer of 2015, the Department sent all officers through a 5-hour training called 'Public Trust and the Preservation of Life' that centered on many of the concepts referenced by the Task Force, including the guardian vs. warrior mentality." (2017) 2017 Recommendation: "The Department should continue to look at ways to incorporate procedural justice into all aspects of Department process and practice, including development of policies and procedures, evaluation of officers' performance, and the provision of information to the public." "The Department should continue to ensure that these policy requirements, which are in line with procedural justice principles, are well understood and consistently practiced by officers in the field." The 2019 OIG Report "Since the publication of the OIG's initial report, the Department has taken a number of important steps to institutionalize and explain the concept of procedural justice across the organization and to hold officers accountable for following its principles." (2019)

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Guardian Mindset & Procedural Justice</p>	<p>Publicly Acknowledge Past Injustices: Acknowledge the role of policing in past and present injustice and discrimination and how it is a hurdle to the promotion of community trust.</p>	<p>Some of the steps that have been taken so far include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development of an ongoing, high-level working group on procedural justice. This group includes leadership from the Chief of Staff, Office of Operations, Office of Special Operations, Office of Support Services, and Office of Constitutional Policing and Policy, as well as the OIG. The Department-wide distribution of a Leadership Brief on the topic of procedural justice. The Brief includes a message from the Chief, which emphasizes the importance of leadership in this area, and notes that questions on this topic will likely be included as part of the promotional process for officers. As a follow-up to this project, the Department is also working on a training bulletin that will provide "action-based approaches" to implementing procedural justice during public contacts. The continued incorporation of procedural justice concepts and associated expectations into employee training courses. These include, for example, Leadership Enhancement and Development Sessions (LEADS) for command staff and the recent "Best Practices in Proactive Enforcement" training sessions for Gang Enforcement Detail and Metropolitan Division personnel, as well as a separate training for supervisors from those two units. As noted in the OIG's original report, the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) has also incorporated procedural justice into a number of academy training modules, called Learning Domains. This topic had already been built into the LAPD's Police Sciences and Leadership (PSL) program as well as its training for Field Training Officers (FTOs). These programs are discussed in greater detail later in the report. The implementation of a procedural justice assessment as part of revised procedures for Watch Commander review and approval of certain types of arrests. The addition of this component – which encompasses arrests for interfering, resisting, or assaulting an officer – was one of the OIG recommendations adopted by the Commission following the OIG's review of arrests for Penal Code Section 148(a)(1). The Department is developing a process to facilitate the ongoing review of, and feedback to, officers on procedural justice issues. The process will also allow supervisors to select relevant videos that might be useful for training purposes. These developments are currently on hold pending a union meet-and-confer process, but they are expected to be implemented in the future. This pilot project was implemented in December 2019. <p>The distribution of laminated cards remind members of the public of their rights and obligations with regard to filming in public. The cards also inform officers of the legal and policy parameters regarding this topic. (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>In addition, since publication of the OIG reports, the Department has issued an April 2020 training bulletin on procedural justice – contacts with the public, which can be found here: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/procedural_justice.pdf.</p> <p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department should ensure that historical documents and reports regarding the LAPD, such as reports on the Consent Decree, Christopher Commission, and Rampart Incident, are available on the Department's website [Note: this has been completed – see http://www.lapdonline.org/home/content_basic_view/65991] and that discussion of LAPD's past is included in Department trainings where appropriate."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>2019 Recommendation: "The OIG's initial report noted that training courses, such as the recent Department-wide "Public Trust and the Preservation of Life" course, included a block on the history of the LAPD. The OIG recommends that the Department continue to include a discussion of such issues in future trainings where appropriate."</p> <p>In addition, the two reports discuss trainings, such as the Police Sciences and Leadership (PSL) Program, Implicit Bias, and Procedural Justice. PSL I takes place at the conclusion of an officer's one-year probationary period. PSL II is designed to take place after the 3rd year of an officer's tenure, and it uses extensive role-playing scenarios to build officers' skills in effective communication, procedural justice, de-escalation, use of force, and advanced tactics.</p>

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Culture of Transparency & Accountability</p>	<p>Make Policies and Stop Information Available on Website: Establish a culture of transparency and accountability. Make all department policies available for public review and regularly post on the department's website information about stops, summonses, arrests, reported crime, and other law enforcement data aggregated by demographics.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"The LAPD already maintains a comprehensive website, www.lapdonline.org, that provides a great deal of information about the Department's structure and operations. The website contains a link to the Department's full Manual of Policies and Procedures (Manual), which is divided into six volumes and contains the bulk of the LAPD's official policies. In reviewing the online manual, however, the OIG found that, while it is fully indexed, it can be difficult to locate relevant policies, some of which are spread across several sections or volumes. For example, the Department's policy on the use of force is located on a different volume than those policies describing the investigation of use of force incidents. The OIG also found that, at the time of this writing, the online manual does not clearly indicate when policies were established or changed, and has not been updated to include policy revisions made since 2015. The OIG also notes that while the Manual is the repository for official LAPD policy, the entire body of Department policy and procedure is distributed among a variety of notices, directives, bulletins, and orders, some of which may not be fully incorporated into the manual itself. For example, while the Manual contains the Department's overarching use of force policy, as well its overall policies on the use of deadly and less-lethal force, it does not contain specific standards for the use of each force option, such as the TASER or other less-lethal weapons. These standards are incorporated into a series of "Use of Force-Tactics Directives," which include circumstances under which each option may be used, as well as additional information, tactical guidance, and specific procedures for deployment. While these documents are often excerpted in public reports analyzing individual uses of serious force, they are not currently published on the Department's website." (2017)</p> <p>Note: As described below all Use of Force Directives are public information as a result of SB 978, which took effect 1/1/2020 and can be found at: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/svvgamurKRHWqULV8Ww3Gb-ujSTOU_Dx.</p> <p>"The Department compiles several statistical reports about its activities and operations, which are made available to the public online. Reports published by the LAPD have included, for example, The Semi-Annual Public Report; The Quarterly Discipline Report; and The Annual Use of Force Report. These reports can be found on the web page for the Office of Constitutional Policing and Policy, which also includes a number of reports stemming from the Consent Decree, including various statistical analyses that have been conducted or commissioned by the Department in recent years. In reviewing the page, the OIG noted that some reports appear to have been discontinued or are no longer being posted." (2017)</p> <p>"Along with its published reports, the Department has recently made significant strides in making raw data, which can be directly downloaded and analyzed, available to the public through the City's Open Data website. The LAPD was also one of the first departments to sign on to the White House Police Data Initiative (PDI), which is committed to using open data to improve police-community relationships. The PDI has a website that collects data sets from a number of departments, including the LAPD. As of this writing, the Department has begun publishing the raw data about the following activities: Crime reports and traffic collisions; Custodial arrests; Calls for service; and Motor vehicle and pedestrian stops. The Department does not currently publish detailed statistics or data about citations by race or ethnicity, which may be useful as contextual data for pedestrian stops or other activity. It also does not currently publish use of force or assault-on-officer data in an "open data" format, but is working on plans to expand the current data sets to include, among other information, data on all uses of force." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should resume online publication of statistical data on stops, arrests, complaints, and other activity. It should also continue to expand its open data access and update its Police Data Initiative datasets." "The Department should update and keep current the online version of the Manual of Policies and Procedures, along with an online Index of Special Orders by date to show when policies have been changed. The Department should post an up-to-date index of policies and directives that are of interest to the public, including but not limited to policies on: the use of force; use of specific force options: de-escalation, the Intake, investigation, and adjudication of personnel complaints; use of body-worn and in-car video cameras and footage; and biased policing."</p> <p>"The Department should continue to expand and use, where relevant, processes to solicit, gather, and consider feedback from members of the public prior to making significant policy changes."</p>

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Culture of Transparency & Accountability</p>		<p>The 2019 OIG Report:</p> <p>"In response to the OIG's recommendations, the Department created a new page on its website titled "Policies and Procedures" (linked on the homepage). This page links to the full Manual and provides links to all Special Orders, Administrative Orders, and Operations Orders dating back to 2015. This feature allows members of the public to check for new and revised policies and to see when these changes were made. The Department also identified and addressed a technical issue that was preventing the Manual from being updated regularly." (2019)</p> <p>"The OIG has found that while the online Manual is fully indexed, it can be difficult to locate some policies, which may be spread across several sections or volumes. To make it easier for members of the public to find items of interest, the Department has also created separate postings that include its use of force policy, as well as policies on the use of body-worn and in-car video." (2019).</p> <p>"The Department maintains a separate page that provides information on the complaint process, which is also linked to the homepage. The OIG expects that, once revised, the updated biased policing policy will also be posted on this page." (2019).</p> <p>"One aspect of Departmental transparency that has yet to be addressed concerns certain LAPD use of force directives. As noted in the OIG's Initial report, while the Manual contains the Department's overarching use of force policy, as well its overall policies on the use of deadly and less-lethal force, it does not contain specific standards for the use of each force option, such as the TASER or other less-lethal weapons. These standards are incorporated into a series of "Use of Force – Tactics Directives," which include descriptions of the circumstances under which each option may be used, as well as additional information about each weapon, tactical guidance, and specific procedures for deployment." (2019)</p> <p>"These documents have not yet been posted by the Department, reportedly due to concerns about their sensitive nature. According to recent discussions, however, the Department does expect to publish these items in order to comply with SB 978 – a process expected to be completed prior to the end of 2019." [Note: This has been completed – see https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/sv9amurkHRWHqULV8Ww3Gb-UjstOU_DxJ] (2019)</p> <p>"In its initial report, the OIG noted that the publication of some reports by the Department had been discontinued. These reports are noted below, along with actions that were taken by the Department in response to the OIG's recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Semi-Annual Public Report. This included summary statistics on motor vehicle and pedestrian stops, as well as arrests, which were disaggregated by geographic area and ethnic/racial descent. Following the OIG's report, the Department began publishing a monthly "Public Contacts Snapshot," which includes general monthly Department totals for the number of stops/detentions, calls for service, arrests, and uses of force. The new report does not provide demographic breakdowns of the data, however. In conversations with the OIG, the Department agreed to provide breakdowns for stops and arrests annually, though it has not yet begun to do so. The Department also recently embarked on a comprehensive stop-data analysis project (see Section D-4), the results of which will be published upon completion of the project. [Note: the California Policy Lab report can be found here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/activity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf] • Quarterly Discipline Report (QDR). This report, which provides detailed data about LAPD's internal disciplinary program, was still being compiled but was no longer being posted on the Department's website. The Department has now resumed the publication of an annual version of this report. It has also developed a monthly "Disciplinary Penalties" report, which provides monthly statistics and information regarding complaints closed each month." (2019) <p>With respect to the provision of other data for use by members of the public, the Department has also established the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Data. The Department has continued to expand the information being shared on the City's Open Data website, which now includes raw data on LAPD crime reports, calls for service, arrests, stops/detentions, and traffic collisions. (The Police Data Initiative site, which was referenced in the OIG's Initial report, has been updated to link directly back to the City site.) In reviewing the Department's open dataset related to stops/detentions, the OIG noted that the fields currently in use have not been expanded to include the additional stop data being collected pursuant to California AB 953 ... As the majority of this data is considered to be a public record, the OIG recommends that the Department continue to work to ensure that the full dataset is posted online.

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Culture of Transparency & Accountability</p>	<p>Communicate About Serious Incidents: When serious incidents occur, including alleged police misconduct, communicate with citizens and the media swiftly, openly, and neutrally, respecting areas where the law requires confidentiality. One way to promote neutrality is to ensure that agencies and their members do not release background information on involved parties.</p>	<p>Public Records Requests: The Department has also begun sharing copies of all data and other information it releases as part of a California Public Records Act request on its NextRequest website. This website utilizes a user-friendly interface that provides access to data that is already publicly available or that has previously been released to a public requestor. To date, the website lists over 4,700 public requests.” (2019)</p> <p>Use of Force Reports: The Department has published all use of force information since 2016, with the Use of Force Year End Report. Use of Force Data Reports: 2020 Update: Stop Data Reports have been published: OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-83d0-44b8-8142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/f02dd23_d3e887380225a7acb55f3ad9add7a1dcb.pdf In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0165.pdf The California State Racial Identity Profiling Act Report for 2020 can be found here: https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf</p> <p>The 2017 OIG Report: “The LAPD and Police Commission currently release various types of information about serious incidents, such as officer-involved shootings or in-custody deaths, to the public and the media throughout the course of the investigation. As the result of a recent report by the OIG, the Department presented a new media protocol to the Commission in January 2017. Although not presently codified in writing, this new system will result in the release of a great deal of additional information about each incident...” (2017). 2020 Update: A CRITICAL INCIDENT VIDEO RELEASE POLICY was established in 2018, and the Board of Police Commissioners updated the CRITICAL INCIDENT VIDEO RELEASE POLICY – REVISED, on 8/28/2020, which can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/082520/BPC_20-0107.pdf See also: LAPD Manual 1/420.55</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
Internal Legitimacy	<p>Involve Employees In Developing Policies: Promote legitimacy internally within the organization by applying the principles of procedural justice. Involve employees in the process of developing policies and procedures. Internal procedural justice begins with the clear articulation of organizational core values and the transparent creation and fair application of an organization's policies, protocols, and decision-making processes. Even though the approach to implementing procedural justice is "top down," the method should include all employees to best reach a shared vision and mission.</p>	<p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"The Department also has various processes to obtain employee input on Department policies and procedures, including the circulation of draft policies to relevant Department personnel and the convening of the Tactics Training Review Committee. Most recently, the Department has utilized ten "Special Purpose Innovation Groups" (SPIGs), as described under Section A-4. These SPIGs, which incorporated the involvement of Commissioners, union representatives, and employees of all ranks, met over a period of three months to analyze issues and make improvements. In total, the SPIGs developed 135 recommendations, spanning 14 areas of the Department, which are currently in the process of being reviewed and implemented, where approved." (2019)</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Internal Legitimacy</p>	<p>Internal Discipline Process: Leadership should examine opportunities to incorporate procedural justice into the internal discipline process, placing additional importance on values adherence rather than adherence to rules. Union leadership should be partners in this process.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>“Subsequent changes [following scrutiny and analysis after the Dorner incident] implemented by the Department included the creation of a discipline matrix to provide greater consistency and transparency in the system, the development of a process to analyze grievances received by officers, and the introduction of a specialized conflict resolution training program for Department supervisors and command staff. Despite these efforts in progress, however, officers have continued to express frustration with the disciplinary process. Criticism of the LAPD discipline system has also played out externally, including a number of lawsuits alleging retaliation.” (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: “The Department should conduct an in-depth evaluation of the disciplinary system, to include an employee survey, and identify ways to improve procedural justice internally.”</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>“In July 2018, the Department implemented an “All-Employee Survey” that asked for employee opinions and experiences in a number of areas, including discipline. The survey asked employees to rank the top three priorities (from a list of ten) that they wanted the Department to address and found that, for sworn officers, the topic of personnel complaints was the highest-rated issue. Comments related to this issue indicated that some officers viewed the system for investigating and adjudicating these complaints to be unfair and arbitrary.” (2019)</p> <p>“Following the survey, the Chief of Police designed a series of Single Purpose Innovation Groups (SPIGs) to focus on conducting comprehensive evaluations of various areas of the Department. Ten SPIGs looked at 14 topics over a period of three months, with the goal of developing long- and short-term recommendations related to innovation, fairness, efficiency, and effectiveness. The Discipline SPIG submitted to the Chief of Police a series of recommendations related to increasing fairness and procedural justice across the disciplinary system. Among other topics, these recommendations suggested changes to streamline the disciplinary process, reduce redundancy, address frivolous complaints and minor misconduct, and track disciplinary rationales and penalties to ensure fairness and equity across the Department. These were forwarded to Professional Standards Bureau for consideration and implementation, where appropriate.” (2019)</p> <p>“In May 2019, Professional Standards Bureau distributed a response stating that “while some recommendations require[d] additional work and evaluation, other recommendations [were] already implemented or soon to be implemented.” Some of the recommendations that had already been implemented included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines regarding minor misconduct identified during a review of body-worn or in-car video. • The implementation of a revised Penalty Guide. • The posting of reference materials and exemplars related to personnel complaints.” (2019) <p>“The Department recently distributed its 2019 All-Employee Survey, which will be used to assess progress and build on previous research. The OIG will continue to monitor this process as well as any recommendations that come out of the SPIGs related to the disciplinary system.” (2019)</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>External Legitimacy</p>	<p>Involve Community In Developing Policies: In order to achieve external legitimacy, law enforcement agencies should involve the community in the process of developing and evaluating policies and procedures.</p> <p>Residency Incentive Programs: Institute residency incentive programs such as Resident Officer Programs, where officers are provided housing in public housing neighborhoods as long as they fulfill public safety duties within the neighborhood that have been agreed to by housing authority.</p> <p>Positive Nonenforcement Interactions: Create opportunities in schools and communities for positive nonenforcement interactions with police. Publicize the beneficial outcomes and images of positive, trust-building partnerships and initiatives.</p>	<p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>“[T]he Department and the Commission have continued to expand and utilize various methods to solicit feedback on issues that are of interest to the public. Some examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a revised set of procedures on immigration enforcement. As part of this process, the Department met with a number of community organizations to discuss drafts and possible revisions. According to the Department, it continues to collaborate with community organizations to make further improvements to these procedures. • Development and implementation of the video release policy for critical incidents. The Commission engaged the NYU School of Law’s Policing Project to seek feedback – through the use of focus groups and a citywide survey – on the views of members of the public with respect to how the policy should be structured. <p>Convening of special meetings. Over the past several years, the Commission has held special meetings on the topics of biased policing, homelessness, and data-driven policing strategies, during which community groups were invited to make presentations. Following the OIG’s review of the latter topic, the Commission also held a two-week feedback period during which it solicited comments from members of the public.” (2019)</p> <p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>In the past, discussions of a residency incentive program took place within the Los Angeles City Council. In terms of offering low interest loans for officers to reside in the City. The program was not implemented.</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report: “... the Department is working to identify metrics to measure and incentivize community engagement by officers that occurs in a non-enforcement capacity. Research has shown that positive interactions with unfamiliar or stereotyped communities can help to minimize biases, particularly those developed over repeated negative interactions.”</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Department has seen success with the Cadet Program which is a community-based program that aims to empower youth ages 13-17 years old and maximize their personal and scholastic potential through the emphasis of the programs’ four cornerstones: Leadership, Academic Excellence, Ethical and Wise Decision making and community stewardship. Images of Cadets achievements and partnerships are shared online to encourage positive interactions with the Department. (2020)</p> <p>Cadet Manual: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/2017_Youth_Programs_manual.pdf</p> <p>See also: LAPD Manual 3/245.50.</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>External Legitimacy</p>	<p>Review Physical Technique Policies Towards Vulnerable Populations: Use of physical control equipment and techniques against vulnerable populations—including children, elderly persons, pregnant women, people with physical and mental disabilities, limited English proficiency, and others—should be used as a last resort. Carefully consider and review policies towards these populations and adopt policies if none are in place.</p>	<p>2020 Update: In July 2020, the Board of Police Commissioners passed a new Use of Force Policy that was published August 26, 2020, and contains a definition for Vulnerable Populations. "Vulnerable populations include, but are not limited to, children, elderly persons, people who are pregnant, and people with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities." See http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/SO%2023.pdf</p> <p>Reviewed by the Inspector General in a report entitled "Overview of Less-Lethal Force Tools and Deployment," February 2017, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-e3d0-44b8-8142-1376cb6b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_486a28073da894a2aa412c01014b500b4.pdf</p> <p>Recommendation 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review national guidelines and standards related to the use of less-lethal weapons to determine whether revisions or enhancements to current LAPD policy may be appropriate. These national guidelines and standards include those issued by the U.S. Department of Justice, President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, and Police Executive Research Forum (PERF). Some examples of the recommendations from these entities include policies limiting the use of TASERS on vulnerable populations (e.g., young children, elderly people) and handcuffed individuals; restricting the concurrent use of multiple TASERS; limiting multiple activations or extended exposures (more than 15 seconds) from a single TASER; etc. <p>https://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/022817/BPC__17-0057.pdf</p> <p>In 2020, the Department began a pilot project to evaluate the Bolawrap tool and its potential effectiveness.</p> <p>2020 Update: See: Office of the Inspector General, "Review of Stops Conducted by the Los Angeles Police Department in 2019," which can be found here: https://a27e0481-e3d0-44b8-8142-1376cb6b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_d3e88738022547acbb55f3ad9d7a1dcb.pdf</p> <p>Recommendation A-2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Consider the Effects of Crime Fighting Strategies on Community Trust and Legitimacy. Evaluate, on an ongoing basis, the effectiveness of the Department's crime strategies, including the impact on community members and potential for collateral damage on community trust and legitimacy. Such evaluation should combine public feedback with the Department's own evidence-based analysis of the efficacy of its stop practices in identifying and addressing crime." <p>https://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102720/BPC__20-0162.pdf</p>
	<p>Consider Damage to Public Trust When Implementing Crime Fighting Strategies: When implementing crime fighting strategies, consider potential damage to public trust, and research conducted to evaluate effectiveness of crime fighting strategies should specifically look at potential for collateral damage on community trust and legitimacy.</p>	

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>External Legitimacy</p>	<p>Conduct Annual Community Surveys on Trust: Track the level of trust in police by communities, just as changes in crime is measured. Partner with local universities to conduct surveys that measure the effectiveness of specific policing strategies, assess any negative impact they have on a community's view of police, and gain the community's input.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"In February of 2016, the LAPD conducted the first of what is hoped to be a series of annual surveys of Los Angeles residents. A survey firm contracted by the Department conducted 2,004 phone interviews asking residents for their perceptions about public safety, police effectiveness, satisfaction with the police, and police fairness and integrity. The questions were developed, in collaboration with the Department, by Justice & Security Strategies, an outside research firm hired by the Department that was also responsible for compiling and analyzing the resulting data."</p> <p>"A report detailing the findings of the survey was included in the Department's November 15, 2015 report on biased policing. According to the report, the survey indicated relatively high overall approval levels in some areas, along with some areas with significant challenges, such as use of force and stops. The survey also identified significant variations among groups in their perceptions of the police. The Department is currently in the process of interpreting these survey results to determine the reason for these gaps in trust among communities. One planned step is to hold Area-level dialogues with community members through existing channels, such as focus groups, Community-Police Advisory Boards (CPABs), and Days of Dialogue, to more fully explore the reasons community members hold the opinions that they reported." (2017)</p> <p>"Another component of the analysis of the community attitudes will involve the collection of longitudinal data to assess how community perceptions move in conjunction with changes in other data, new initiatives to address crime or community relations, or revisions in LAPD policy. While the first survey was funded by federal grant money, the Department has requested funds in the coming year's budget to conduct a follow-up survey." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should continue to conduct the community survey on an annual basis, and publish and analyze the results, including year-to-year changes. The Department should also consider adding additional questions regarding the factors affecting respondents' answers."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"Over the past year, the Department has been exploring ways to expand its methods for collecting information about public sentiment. In recent weeks, it selected the Thomas and Dorothy Leavay Center for the Study of Los Angeles (StudyLA) at Loyola Marymount University to conduct a multi-faceted public sentiment survey. Anticipated components of this survey will include focus groups, questions in the annual LA Public Opinion Survey, a standalone survey, and presentations to LAPD command staff and community members regarding findings. This project is pending final approval by the City and is expected to begin in the next two months." (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>A community survey completed by Loyola Marymount University was presented to the Board of Police Commissioners on December 8, 2020, and can be found here: https://academics.lmu.edu/study/aj/projects/standstudies/losangelespublicopinionsurvey/</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>External Legitimacy</p>	<p>Diverse Workforce: Strive to create a workforce that contains a broad range of diversity including race, gender, language, life experience, and cultural background to improve understanding and effectiveness in dealing with all communities. Explore more flexible staffing models. A critical factor in managing bias is seeking candidates who are likely to police in an unbiased manner. Seek candidates who have had positive interactions with people of various cultures and backgrounds.</p>	<p>LAPD Sworn Staffing (as of 11/22/20):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hispanic: 49.7% • White: 29.6% • Black: 9.4% • Asian Pacific Islander: 7.9% • Filipino: 2.7% • American Indian: .34% • Other: .36% • Male: 81.7% • Female: 18.3% <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Diversity Inclusion Task Force continues to work on this issue. The gender and ethnic diversity of the LAPD can be tracked in the Sworn Personnel by Rank, Gender, and Ethnicity Report (SPRGE) which is updated every deployment period, and can be found here: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/PR91%20Oct2020.pdf</p> <p>Recruitment efforts can be found here: https://www.joinlapd.com/qualifications</p> <p>In September 2020, the recruit class was described as the “most diversified recruit class in LAPD history.” It was comprised of</p> <p>Females: 27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American-2 • Hispanic -20 • Asian-2 • Caucasian-2 • Filipino-1 <p>Males: 21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American-13 • Hispanic -6 • Asian-0 • Caucasian-2 • Filipino-0 <p>Details of this class can be found at: https://www.lapdonline.org/home/news__view/66929</p> <p>See also: The current overall composition of the LAPD can be found at: Department Demographics for sworn and civilian personnel. On Page 32 of the Los Angeles Police Department’s Strategic Plan, the department cited as its ongoing recruitment goals:</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation																													
<p>External Legitimacy</p>	<p>Build Relationships with Immigrant Communities: Build relationships based on trust with immigrant communities. Decouple federal immigration enforcement from routine local policing for civil enforcement and nonserious crime. Ensure reasonable and equitable language access for all persons who have encounters with police or who enter the criminal justice system.</p>	<p>Initiative A: Strengthen Recruitment Efforts to Increase Diversity Among Ranks</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>KEY ACTIVITY</th> <th>MILESTONE 2019–2020</th> <th>MILESTONE 2020–2021</th> <th>ENTITY LEAD</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Improve recruitment process for police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieve a 90-day application process from test to hire for recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate and adjust hiring process for greater efficiency. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Expand hiring of female police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and conduct annual law enforcement career workshops at universities. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand law enforcement career workshops to additional university locations. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Expand hiring of African-American police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 195 female officers representing 35% of all new recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase female police officer hiring to 40% of all new recruits. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Expand hiring of Asian-Pacific Islander (API) police officers.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 100 African-American police officers representing 18% of all new recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase African-American police officer hiring to 22% of all new recruits. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Enhance marketing and advertisement strategy for recruitment.</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 45 API police officers representing 8% of all new recruits. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase API police officer hiring to 10% of all new recruits. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement new recruitment campaign. </td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and assess effectiveness of campaign. </td> <td>OSS</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>The OIG found: “found that the LAPD has fully or partially implemented the majority of these recommendations in some form and that in many cases, these were long-standing Department practices. Some of these practices include, for example, the establishment of community policing partnerships, ongoing civilian oversight, specialized processes for the investigation and evaluation of serious use of force incidents, publishing of data and information about the LAPD’s activities, and the decoupling of local policing for non-serious crime from federal immigration enforcement.”</p> <p>See also: Administrative Order on Enforcement of US Immigration Laws: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/2018%20admin%20order15.pdf</p> <p>On November 12, 2020, the Training Bulletin update for FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETERS AND RESOURCES was published.</p>	KEY ACTIVITY	MILESTONE 2019–2020	MILESTONE 2020–2021	ENTITY LEAD	1. Improve recruitment process for police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieve a 90-day application process from test to hire for recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate and adjust hiring process for greater efficiency. 	OSS	2. Expand hiring of female police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and conduct annual law enforcement career workshops at universities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand law enforcement career workshops to additional university locations. 	OSS	3. Expand hiring of African-American police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 195 female officers representing 35% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase female police officer hiring to 40% of all new recruits. 	OSS	4. Expand hiring of Asian-Pacific Islander (API) police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 100 African-American police officers representing 18% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase African-American police officer hiring to 22% of all new recruits. 	OSS	5. Enhance marketing and advertisement strategy for recruitment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 45 API police officers representing 8% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase API police officer hiring to 10% of all new recruits. 	OSS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement new recruitment campaign. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and assess effectiveness of campaign. 	OSS
KEY ACTIVITY	MILESTONE 2019–2020	MILESTONE 2020–2021	ENTITY LEAD																											
1. Improve recruitment process for police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieve a 90-day application process from test to hire for recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate and adjust hiring process for greater efficiency. 	OSS																											
2. Expand hiring of female police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and conduct annual law enforcement career workshops at universities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand law enforcement career workshops to additional university locations. 	OSS																											
3. Expand hiring of African-American police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 195 female officers representing 35% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase female police officer hiring to 40% of all new recruits. 	OSS																											
4. Expand hiring of Asian-Pacific Islander (API) police officers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 100 African-American police officers representing 18% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase African-American police officer hiring to 22% of all new recruits. 	OSS																											
5. Enhance marketing and advertisement strategy for recruitment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire 45 API police officers representing 8% of all new recruits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase API police officer hiring to 10% of all new recruits. 	OSS																											
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement new recruitment campaign. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor and assess effectiveness of campaign. 	OSS																											

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Pillar Two: Policy & Oversight</p> <p>Collaborate With Community</p>	<p>Collaborate with Communities to Reduce Crime Through Needed Resources: Collaborate with community members to develop policies and strategies in communities and neighborhoods disproportionately affected by crime for deploying resources that aim to reduce crime by improving relationships, greater community engagement, and cooperation.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>In 2020, the Chief of Police created the Community Safety Partnership Bureau (CSPB), following a study prepared by UCLA on the effectiveness of the CSP program. The UCLA Report can be found at: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/051220/CSP%20Evaluation%20Report_2020_FINAL.pdf</p> <p>The LAPD website describes the CSP program and the new bureau as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CSP Bureau fully integrates community voice into its structure. Rather than having a structure built entirely of sworn personnel, the top leadership of the CSP Bureau will consist of a sworn Deputy Chief partnered with a civilian commander (Police Administrator II). The civilian commander will oversee a Regional Advisory Council comprised of leaders within community-based organizations, representatives from City Council offices, and CSP funding partners. The commander and their council will collectively head a Safety Strategy and Innovation Center that develops community-responsive, site-specific plans for existing CSP sites, looks for opportunities for CSP site expansion across the city, and coordinates with other LAPD entities to ensure the CSP model is being integrated throughout all Department's operations. • The CSP Bureau will provide the breadth of leadership necessary to address the various evaluation recommendations. The addition of regional, mid-level supervision will enhance the oversight of administrative and operational functions, while the newly created captain positions will coordinate with both community stakeholders and Department commanding officers to create problem-solving strategies that can be implemented beyond the confines of CSP sites. • By creating a bureau structure to oversee CSP operations, the LAPD is establishing the support systems vital to allowing existing CSP personnel to build on their current successes. The bureau will relieve them of the need to split their attentions between community engagement and administrative functions. They will instead be able to return their full energy and focus to the relationships with community members that have allowed the program to take hold and create dramatic shifts in safety. • Emeda Tingitides was selected to be the Deputy Chief overseeing the CSP Bureau. • One of the most significant mandates the CSP Bureau will fulfill is developing strategies to fully implement and institutionalize the CSP model across all aspects of the LAPD. The CSP model's effectiveness is not limited to the stakeholders within tightly defined neighborhood partnering with ten officers and a supervisor. The model's tenets have a place across all of Department operations, and developing a strategy for the Departmentwide integration of these tenets will be taken on by the bureau's leadership and Regional Advisory Council. This complete embrace of policing built on relationships and the pursuit of long-term solutions rather than ongoing enforcement plans will serve as the foundation of the reimagined Los Angeles Police Department. <p>See also: Office of the Inspector General Reports, which discuss Community Engagement:</p> <p>https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c1b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_68104e440d624094ad9e7e6a3971bb5f.pdf</p> <p>https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c1b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd23_55abf0cbb5124b873f612eeb877a0ad8.pdf</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Use of Force Policies</p>	<p>Comprehensive Policies: Have comprehensive policies on the use of force that include training, investigations, prosecutions, data collection, and information sharing. These policies must be clear, concise, and openly available for public inspection.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"The OIG found that the Department has already implemented or begun to implement the majority of the recommendations relating to the use of force . . . For example, [e]stablishment of a review and adjudication process that looks beyond the use of force itself to evaluate tactics, training, supervisory concerns, or other policy issues. This structure incorporates multiple levels of review at the sworn level and designates final authority for the adjudication of serious uses of force to the civilian Police Commission; a requirement that officers intervene to prevent others from using excessive force; a prohibition on shooting at moving vehicles under most circumstances; using distance, time, and cover, rather than outdated concepts such as the 21-foot rule; and requiring that all police incidents resulting in death or hospitalization be reviewed by specially trained personnel." (2017)</p> <p>"There are [] several recommendations which the Department has recently taken steps to implement, such as . . . [p]roviding a prompt supervisory response to critical incidents to reduce the likelihood of unnecessary force." (2017)</p> <p>"Although the Department has detailed written provisions for the investigation and adjudication of use of force cases, as well as an overarching policy on when force may be used, it does not currently have written policies on training, data collection, prosecution, and information sharing. The Department does, however, have protocols and systems for each of these, as described throughout these reports. The Department may want to consider whether the current written policy should be supplemented with information on these issues." (2017)</p> <p>"[T]he Department does make available its overarching policy on the use of force in general, and deadly force and non-lethal control devices in particular. It does not, however, currently publish all the relevant tactical directives on when specific types of force should be used or on related issues, such as de-escalation. These documents are often cited in public reports on individual cases, but are not collected in one public place. In keeping with the Task Force recommendations and general practice of other agencies, the Department should consider making these available to the public as well." [Note: This is completed – see https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/5vgamurKtRHWqULV8Wv3GB-ujrOU_DxJ] (2017)</p> <p>"As of this writing, the Department has partially carried out the recommendations adopted by the Commission at that time, but there are some areas, such as those relating to revision of written policies and the development of an officer statement form, that have not yet been fully implemented. The Department has taken steps to address these issues, resulting in draft versions of new policies and forms reviewed by the OIG, but these have not yet been finalized and presented to the Commission for approval. Completing this process would allow the Department to move forward in making the improvements identified by the OIG." (2017)</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Use of Force Policies</p>	<p>Training Must Emphasize De-Escalation: Policies for training on use of force should emphasize de-escalation and alternatives to arrest or summons in situations where appropriate. Policies should also include, at a minimum, annual training that includes shoot/don't shoot scenarios and the use of less than lethal technologies.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"There are [] several recommendations which the Department has recently taken steps to implement, such as the following: adopting de-escalation as a formal agency policy and ensuring that officer training emphasizes de-escalation and effective communication [and] [d]iscouraging force against those who pose a danger only to themselves." (2017)</p> <p>"In reviewing LAPD policy, the OIG also notes that the Department has not yet fully implemented policy revisions and other recommendations relating to the investigation and adjudication of less-serious uses of force, known as Non-Categorical Use of Force (NCUOF) incidents. These recommendations were adopted by the Commission in 2013 as the result of two OIG reports that evaluated the LAPD's policies and practices relating to those types of incidents. At that time, the OIG found that some areas of the NCUOF investigative process – including "documentation of individual statements, identification and resolution of material conflicts, and written evaluation of the force used" – could be improved and recommended changes to bring about "more transparent and robust evaluations" of those incidents. The OIG also found issues with the investigation of related complaints of excessive or unauthorized force." (2017)</p> <p>"In its reports on NCUOF investigations, the OIG also noted the difficulty of fully auditing the large number of cases where recorded interviews of civilian subjects or witnesses were not required, based on the current policy. At that time, the Department indicated that it had concerns about its capacity to store additional recordings, and the OIG observed that the "introduction of on-body cameras [should] mitigate this issue by facilitating the routine recording of interviews." The OIG further recommended that the Commission evaluate how those devices should be used during the investigative process. Given the ongoing implementation of body cameras and the attendant storage capacity increase, the Commission may want to take this issue under consideration once more. These and other issues will also be tracked by the OIG's new Non-Categorical Use of Force unit, which will focus specifically on analyzing these lower-level uses of force." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should complete a draft of the Non-Categorical Use of Force policy revisions adopted by the Commission in 2013 and present it to the Commission for approval. As recommended in the OIG's 2013 Follow-Up Report, it should also evaluate the possibility of using body-worn cameras to record non-employee witness interviews during a Level II Non-Categorical Use of Force. The findings of this review should also be presented to the Commission for its review."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"The Department has implemented a policy requiring that all employee reports of less-lethal devices that do not make contact with the targeted individual be forwarded to Critical Incident Review Division (CIRD) for tracking and analysis. The reports will also continue to be sent to In-Service Training Division for the issuance of less-lethal rounds and ammunition. Additionally, the Department has recently established a Force Options Training Unit that focuses specifically on non-lethal and less-lethal use of force equipment and issues." (2019)</p> <p>"At CIRD, the information that is received regarding non-contact uses of less-lethal force is collected on a stand-alone spreadsheet, rather than as a part of the use of force database itself. According to the spreadsheet, there were six non-contact uses of a less-lethal device that occurred during 2018, not including those that occurred in combination with reportable force. Given the apparently small number of such cases, the OIG continues to recommend that non-contact uses of a less-lethal weapon be reported and analyzed in the same manner as contact uses of the same devices." (2019)</p> <p>"Since the OIG's initial report, the Department has finalized two Special Orders relating to the NCUOF investigation process. With the completion of those orders, both of which were approved by the Commission, the Department has now implemented the majority of the policy revisions recommended by the OIG. Two additional recommendations – which concern obtaining independent statements from officers and clarifying the NCUOF classification standards – remain under review as part of the Department's broader revision of the NCUOF process." (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>De-escalation- 70 courses into which Tactical De-escalation and Tactical Communication are to be incorporated, 41 POST certified courses have been completed and recertified. 17 LAPD courses have been completed and recertified. Remaining courses are in progress.</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Use of Force Policies</p>	<p>External Investigation of Incidents: Policies should mandate external and independent criminal investigations in cases of police use of force resulting in death, officer-involved shootings resulting in injury or death, or in-custody deaths.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
	<p>Independent Prosecutors: Policies should mandate the use of external and independent prosecutors in cases of police use of force resulting in death, officer-involved shootings resulting in injury or death, or in-custody deaths.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. [This item is not within the authority of the Department or the Commission].</p>
	<p>Reporting Data: Policies should require agencies to collect, maintain, and report data to the Federal Government on all officer-involved shootings, whether fatal or nonfatal, as well as any in-custody death.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"LAPD officers are currently required to report all uses of force above the level of a firm grip, joint lock, or other minor force that does not result in injury or a complaint of pain. In comparing LAPD's policy on reportable force to the above standards and other agencies' policies, the OIG found that it was generally well aligned with, or more expansive than, those of most other agencies." (2017)</p> <p>"The Department is one of the few agencies surveyed, however, that does not collect data on the use of a less-lethal weapon (for example, TASER or beanbag shotgun) that does not contact a person. While these deployments are reported on an officer's log, they are not incorporated into the use of force data tracking system. This policy also diverges from the Department's own policy on officer-involved shootings, which are reported and investigated regardless of whether a person is hit. The Department should follow this same practice with the use of less-lethal weapons that do not make contact with a person, ensuring that these incidents are incorporated into its use of force database." (2017)</p> <p>"The Department currently tracks all reportable uses of force in its risk management database, TEAMS II, which also includes extensive information about the characteristics of each incident. As described earlier, the Department has also developed an expanded its annual use of force report, called the "Use of Force Year-End Review," which includes a great deal of information about LAPD uses of force at all levels. The report, which also contains analysis of changes over time and how use of force statistics compare with other law enforcement data, is currently one of the most detailed and comprehensive resources involving use of force at any law enforcement agency." (2017)</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
Use of Force Policies		<p>"Although the LAPD already tracks basic information about stops, this will significantly expand the amount of data gathered. The Department was required to begin collecting the required complaint data in 2016 [pursuant to AB 953 / RIPA] and will begin collecting the expanded stop data in 2018; it is currently in the process of developing systems to facilitate this process." (2017)</p> <p>"As of this writing, the Department has developed a comprehensive plan to identify, review, and report the required use-of-force and assault data to the DOJ, and has recently submitted its first year of data. In its review of the Department's plans, however, the OIG has noted that there are a small number of Serious Bodily Injury (SBI) cases that may not be included under the current plan. Specifically, this includes those cases where subject is not hospitalized, but their injuries meet the standard for SBI due to a loss of consciousness or a wound requiring extensive suturing. This is primarily due to a lack of clarity over how certain SBI factors should be applied — for example, how many sutures would qualify as "extensive" — as well as limitations in how injury data is currently captured in the Department's use of force database. Due to confusion among California agencies about these issues, the DOJ has reportedly relaxed its requirements until standard guidelines can be set forth for the next year's reporting period. According to the Department, it has taken a leadership role in working with the DOJ to develop standardized definitions for these types of injuries. Once these guidelines are implemented, the Department will take steps to ensure that its data systems are adapted where necessary to achieve full compliance with the law and relevant guidelines." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should continue to develop a plan to implement the requirements of AB 953. In doing so, it should consider whether there are additional data fields that might be useful for LAPD purposes." "The Department should develop, in consultation with the Commission and the OIG, systems and mechanisms for the analysis of stop and search data to identify potential disparate treatment, implicit or explicit bias, differential enforcement practices, or Fourth Amendment concerns. As part of this process, it should present the findings of the recent evaluation of the TEAMS II Early Warning System to the Commission and discuss the extent to which stop data could be incorporated into its framework, along with other tools for analysis."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"Since the OIG's initial report was presented, the Department and the Commission have implemented a series of significant policies with respect to increasing transparency, including those authorizing the release of video footage and other files related to certain critical incidents. The Department is also currently working to prepare for the implementation of California Senate Bill (SB) 978. This new law, which requires that agencies post "all current standards, policies, practices, operating procedures, and education and training materials" that would be disclosable in response to a California Public Records Act request, will go into effect on January 1, 2020." (2019)</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
Use of Force Policies		<p>“Along with automated data integrity processes to ensure data matching, the Department plans to conduct additional audits and inspections using video footage to ensure that the entries are accurate.” (2019)</p> <p>“With respect to the inclusion of possible additional fields, the Department does include one question when collecting stop data that is not specified by the RIPA regulations. This question asks whether the officers who conduct a detention were able to determine each detainee’s race/ethnicity prior to initiating the stop. According to the Department, this question was added to better determine whether race had an impact on the decision to conduct the stop.” (2019)</p> <p>“Now that the expanded data collection program has been in effect for over a year, the OIG recommends that the Department again consider whether additional fields might be useful for its purposes. The OIG’s own review has identified a few possible areas for consideration, as described below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Type of stop. Unlike previous iterations of LAPD stop data programs, the current version (as well as the fields mandated by the RIPA regulations) does not indicate whether a particular stop is a motor vehicle or pedestrian stop. • Homeless status. At the request of the Commission, the Department has recently begun to track and report the number of crimes, uses of force, arrests, and other enforcement actions that involve a person who is experiencing homelessness. Homeless status is not currently tracked for stops, however. • Local ordinance. To assist in tracking the suspected violation that is the basis for the stop, the stop data system provides a drop-down list of State regulatory code sections. Local ordinances, however, are tracked in one catch-all category on the drop-down list. Including a field designed to track this data with consistency would allow the Department to better analyze the reason for each stop, including for quality-of-life municipal code violations. • Asked if on parole or probation. Documenting when officers ask a person whether they are on parole or probation would allow the Department to assess whether there are any disparities with regard to who is being asked and under what conditions.” (2019) <p>“The LAPD does not currently have a process for analyzing the stop data it collects, although it has made attempts to do some analysis in the past. The Department has recently engaged one of its research partners, Justice & Security Strategies, Inc. (JSS), to extract and review data on stops and identify possible areas for improvement. A major focus of this analysis will be a review of Field Interview Card data in an effort to determine whether members of the community are being stopped repeatedly by LAPD officers over a short period of time. The results of this review are expected to be presented publicly.” (2019)</p> <p>“In discussions with the Department, the OIG has recommended that it also work to develop clear methodologies to display and analyze its stop data – at the officer, Area, and Department-wide levels – for its internal use on an ongoing basis. Ideally, this analysis would be automated through a dashboard or some other process to ensure accuracy and accessibility. The Department has already begun this process through its internal stop data interface, which allows users to filter data and produce summary statistics across various dimensions.” (2019)</p> <p>“The Department has also made efforts to create a working group focused on data analysis, which will include representatives from the OIG and the Commission as well as researchers. The first meeting of this group is scheduled for early October 2019.” (2019)</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Use of Force Policies</p>	<p>Release of Information: Policies should clearly state what types of information will be released, when, and in what situation, to maintain transparency. This should also include procedures on the release of a summary statement regarding the circumstances of the incident by the department as soon as possible and within 24 hours.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"In October of 2016, the OIG released a comparative review of use-of-force-related policies and practices at selected agencies in other jurisdictions. As a result of that report, the Commission adopted a recommendation that the Department shall determine what additional information regarding uses of force, including officer-involved shooting incidents, can be released to the public in an expedited fashion and develop a protocol for ensuring the accuracy of the information released." (2017)</p> <p>"The Department conducted extensive research on the topic, including meeting with other agencies about their processes, and presented its new protocol to the Commission on January 31, 2017. The new process significantly expands the type and quantity of information to be released to the public, which will be facilitated by the creation of a new webpage dedicated to CUOF incidents that will aggregate different sources of information about an incident by case number. According to the Department, the information to be linked will include press releases, autopsy reports, and upon completion, analyses by the District Attorney's Office, the Chief of Police, and the Police Commission. The Department is also exploring the possibility of developing a Community Briefing Video for each case, to be posted on the dedicated webpage, that will include maps, photographs, and other graphics describing the evidence gathered to date." (2017)</p> <p>"The new webpage went live in mid-April and can be found at http://www.lapdonline.org/use_of_force. It currently contains preliminary information about each officer-involved shooting that has occurred in 2017, to be updated with additional information as it becomes available. The Department is working on making each press release available in Spanish. As additional information is added to the page, OIG will monitor the content to ensure that the information reported is accurate." (2017)</p> <p>"The Department has also created a timeline for the release of this information and designated responsibility for the approval of each release by Media Relations. Other changes to the protocol, which have already been implemented, include a requirement that a member of command staff from the Department's Public Communications Group respond to each officer-involved shooting where a person was hit, as well as other high-profile incidents, and that an initial press release be distributed within 24-48 hours of the incident occurring. The OIG will continue to monitor the roll-out and implementation of the new protocol." (2017)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>A CRITICAL INCIDENT VIDEO RELEASE POLICY was established in 2018, and the Board of Police Commissioners updated the CRITICAL INCIDENT VIDEO RELEASE POLICY – REVISED, on 8/28/2020, which can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecommunity.org/082820/BPC__20-0107.pdf</p> <p>See also: LAPD Manual 11420.55.</p>
<p>Board Review of Serious Incidents: Establish a Serious Incident Review Board comprising sworn staff and community members to review cases involving officer involved shootings and other serious incidents that have the potential to damage community trust or confidence in the agency. The purpose of this Board should be to identify any administrative, supervisory, training, tactical, or policy issues that need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The LAPD Use of Force Review Board reviews the circumstances involved in all categorical use of force cases and reports it findings and recommendations to the Chief of Police. The Board seeks to identify any administrative, supervisory, training, tactical, or policy issues that need to be addressed.</p>	

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Use of Force Policies</p>	<p>Peer Review of Critical Incidents: Implement nonpunitive peer review of critical incidents separate from criminal and administrative investigations. What distinguishes sentinel event reviews from other kinds of internal investigations of apparent errors is that they are non-adversarial.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. There is one peer member on the Use of Force Review Board.</p>
<p>Preventing Biased Policing</p>	<p>Adopt Scientifically Supported Eyewitness Identification Procedures: Adopt identification procedures that implement scientifically supported practices that eliminate or minimize presenter bias or influence. Review policies governing law enforcement procedures for conducting and recording identifications, and policies and practices to address the issue of misidentification.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
	<p>Publicly Available Department Demographics: Report and make available to the public census data regarding the composition of department including race, gender, age, and other relevant demographic data.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. 2020 Update: The LAPD annually publishes <i>Use of Force Data Reports</i>, which contains this information and the demographics of officers involved in Use of Force cases. The gender and ethnic diversity of the LAPD can be tracked in the <i>Sworn Personnel by Rank, Gender, and Ethnicity Report (SPRGE)</i> which is updated every deployment period, which can be found here: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/PR91%20Oct2020.pdf Demographics of incoming classes is also available: Details of this class can be found at: https://www.lapdonline.org/home/news_view/66929</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
Preventing Biased Policing	<p>Collect, Maintain & Analyze Stop/ Detention Demographics: Collect, maintain, and analyze demographic data on all detentions (stops, frisks, searches, summons, and arrests). This data should be disaggregated by school and non-school contacts.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"AB 953, or RIPA, requires all agencies to collect and report extensive information about pedestrian and vehicle stops, as well as information about complaints of racial or identity profiling. Although the LAPD already tracks basic information about stops, this will significantly expand the amount of data gathered. The Department was required to begin collecting the required complaint data in 2016 and will begin collecting the expanded stop data in 2018; it is currently in the process of developing systems to facilitate this process." (2017)</p> <p>"As part of its response to biased policing, the Department also tracks all complaints received and publishes quarterly reports on the characteristics of these complaints as well as their findings. The Department has recently taken several steps to bring this system into compliance with the complaint-reporting requirements of AB 953. Actions taken to date have included realigning categories, adapting computer systems, and updating the LAPD's policy on biased policing to include the category of age, which was included in the States definition but not the Department's." (2017)</p> <p>"Pursuant to AB 953, the LAPD is also currently preparing to expand its stop data collection program to incorporate significantly more data about each pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle stop. In doing so, this program will revert to collecting data similar to that which was collected pursuant to the Consent Decree. The Department's data collection program originally required detailed information about the person stopped, the actions taken during the stop, and the basis for and result of any such action. In 2009, following unsuccessful attempts to interpret the information collected, the information collected was significantly curtailed." (2017)</p> <p>"As an agency that previously collected much of the data required by the new law, the Department has consulted with the California Department of Justice in an advisory capacity to determine what information should be required and how it should be collected. To that end, the Department is currently working to develop a smartphone "app" to facilitate this process. The LAPD is currently in the process of acquiring a smartphone for each patrol officer to use in conjunction with their assigned body camera, which can also be used for the purpose of collecting the required information in the field. There will also be a web-based version available for those instances when a smartphone is not available or able to collect the data." (2017)</p> <p>"The LAPD does not currently have a process for analyzing the stop data it collects, although it has made attempts to do so in the past. Since [2006], to the OIG's knowledge, the Department has not taken any additional steps to systematically analyze its stop data." (2017)</p> <p>"The Department should conduct research on ways to analyze and use the data to provide greater oversight of field activities and identify areas of potential improvement. It is unlikely that data alone will "prove" the existence of individual misconduct or bias, nor should that be its primary intent. Given what is known about implicit bias, however, the use of data may assist supervisors in identifying particular areas of concern and working to address them. Such analysis could be facilitated by the use of automated processes to identify outliers and calculate officer, Area, or Department-level results, whether through the TEAMS II risk management platform or other means." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department may also want to consider whether there is any additional data it might like to collect for its own purposes that are not currently included in the data set forth by the State. For example, the Department may want to ask whether each person stopped was questioned about their parole or probation status, or whether the person was homeless."</p> <p>"The Department should [also] continue to work to ensure that officers conducting a high volume of discretionary stops, such as Metropolitan Division crime suppression personnel, are equipped with in-car and/or body-worn cameras."</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
Preventing Biased Policing		<p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"The Department has recently begun, as a result of a new State law, to collect additional information about each stop or detention conducted. The data collection form asks officers to provide additional detail about why they initiated each stop and the basis for which they conducted each search. The data also requires officers to enter the results of these activities." (2019)</p> <p>"[A]nother systemic approach to identifying and addressing the effects of implicit bias is the analysis of data, such as stop data, and the incorporation of multiple levels of review from different perspectives. The Department has engaged a reviewer to analyze its stop data for potential issues, and it is in the process of developing a working group to develop a methodology for ongoing, internal review of this data as well." See also: California Policy Lab report, https://www.lapdpolicecomlacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf.</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Board of Police Commissioners held a hearing on stop data on October 28, 2020. Reports prepared related to stop data include:</p> <p>OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-a3d0-44b8-9142-1376c1bb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423_d3e88738022547acb55f3aed9dd7a1dccb.pdf</p> <p>In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolicecomlacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolicecomlacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0165.pdf</p> <p>The California State Racial Identity Profiling Act Report for 2020 can be found here: https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf</p>
Mass Demonstration Policies & Procedures	<p>Employ Continuum of Managed Tactical Resources: Create policies and procedures for policing mass demonstrations that employ a continuum of managed tactical resources that are designed to minimize the appearance of a military operation and avoid using provocative tactics and equipment that undermine civilian trust. Policies should emphasize protection of the First Amendment rights of demonstrators and effective ways of communicating with them.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by the OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Board of Police Commissioners has engaged the National Police Foundation to conduct a review of tactics used during protests and demonstrations in May-June 2020. That report is expected in early 2021.</p> <p>In October of 2020, the Department updated the Use of Force Tactics Directive regarding Crowd Management, Intervention and Control. The updated directive was developed to provide guidelines to assist officers and supervisors during First Amendment activities. First Amendment activity such as a march, demonstrations, protests, rallies or celebratory events, is most often successfully facilitated by using the least amount of visible law enforcement presence necessary. This is coupled with an ongoing assessment of crowd behavior and for supervisors to consider the impact a law enforcement presence has on a crowd, while encouraging the crowd to manage itself during First Amendment activities. (2020).</p>
	<p>Layered Response that Prioritizes De-Escalation: Address procedures for implementing a layered response to mass demonstrations that prioritize de-escalation and a guardian mindset. Consider plans to minimize confrontation by using "soft look" uniforms, having officers remove riot gear as soon as practical, and maintaining open postures.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Board of Police Commissioners has engaged the National Police Foundation to conduct a review of tactics used during protests and demonstrations in May-June 2020. That report is expected in early 2021.</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Civilian Oversight</p>	<p>Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement: Some form of civilian oversight of law enforcement is important in order to strengthen trust with the community. Every community should define the appropriate form and structure of civilian oversight to meet the needs of that community.</p>	<p>Currently, the Board of Police Commissioners is a civilian body of appointed members who oversee the Police Department. The Police Commission is comprised of 5 members of the community who serve in voluntary positions. The Los Angeles City Charter provides as follows:</p> <p>Sec. 571. Board of Police Commissioners.</p> <p>(a) Members of the Board of Police Commissioners shall serve for a maximum of two five-year terms, except that a member may serve up to two years of an unexpired term plus two terms of five years. A member of the Board of Police Commissioners shall be limited to two consecutive one-year terms as President of the Board of Police Commissioners.</p> <p>(b) The Board of Police Commissioners shall have the power to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Issue instructions to the Chief of Police concerning the exercise of the authority conferred on the Chief of Police by the Charter, other than the disciplinary authority conferred by Section 1070; (2) evaluate the Chief of Police annually, set or adjust the compensation for the Chief of Police within the salary guidelines established by Council after recommendations concerning those guidelines have been made to the Council by the Director of the Office of Administrative and Research Services; and forward a copy of the evaluation and salary determination to the Mayor and Council for information; (3) appoint and remove an Executive Director whose position shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of the Charter and who shall not be a member of the Police Department; and (4) appoint and remove an Inspector General of the Police Department subject to Section 245, whose position shall be exempt from the civil service provisions of Article X of the Charter and who shall not be a member of the Police Department. <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>See: Office of the Inspector General, "Review of Stops Conducted by the Los Angeles Police Department in 2019," Recommendations A-3.4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus Stop Practices on Violations Directly Related to Public Safety: Consider other approaches to addressing minor equipment and technical violations that are not directly related to public safety. In keeping with the principles of procedural justice, ensure that all officers use their contacts with members of the public as an opportunity to explain and educate members of the public about relevant laws and processes. • Revise Measures of Productivity: De-emphasize simplified enforcement outcomes – such as citations, stops, and FI cards – as a measure of officer or unit productivity or success. [...] Ban Informal and formal enforcement quotas of any type. <p>https://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0162.pdf#1</p> <p>The Board of Police Commissioners held a hearing on stop data on October 28, 2020. Reports prepared related to stop data include:</p> <p>OIG Review of Stops Conducted by the LAPD in 2019, which can be found here: https://a27e0481-83d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/fb2d4d23_d9e88738022547acb55f3a9d9dd7a1dcb.pdf</p> <p>In addition, the California Policy Lab conducted a review that can be found here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0164.pdf and here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/102720/BPC_20-0165.pdf</p> <p>The California State Racial Identity Profiling Act Report for 2020 can be found here: https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/ripa/ripa-board-report-2020.pdf</p>
<p>Policies for Stops & Searches</p>	<p>End Practices of Stop Quotas or Stops Unrelated to Public Safety: Refrain from practices requiring officers to issue a predetermined number of tickets, citations, arrests, or summonses, or to initiate investigative contacts with citizens for reasons not directly related to improving public safety, such as generating revenue.</p>	

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
Policies for Stops & Searches	<p>Consent for Searches: Officers should be required to seek consent before a search and explain that a person has the right to refuse consent when there is no warrant or probable cause. Officers should obtain written acknowledgement that they have sought consent to a search in these circumstances.</p>	<p>2020 Update:</p> <p>See: Office of the Inspector General, "Review of Stops Conducted by the Los Angeles Police Department in 2019," Recommendation B-3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Consensual Searches. Require that officers receive affirmative, verbal consent for all consensual searches, and that they advise the person that they may both refuse to consent and withdraw their consent any time. This advisement as well as the person's verbal consent should be captured on camera or, if not practicable, documented on a written form. Requests for consent should clearly indicate the scope of the search being requested. Officers should request consent for a search only where there is an articulable law enforcement purpose, and they should indicate this purpose for the record on the associated video, where practical. Officers should also explain to the person the reason for the request." [Policy pending BOPC approval] <p>https://www.lapdpolicecomlacty.org/102720/BPC_20-0162.pdf</p> <p>On November 17, 2020, the Board of Police Commissioners passed a consent to search policy. See http://www.lapdpolicecomlacty.org/11720/BPC_20-0156.pdf</p>
	<p>Officer Identification: Adopt policies requiring officers to identify themselves by their full name, rank, and command (as applicable) and provide that information in writing to individuals they have stopped (such as with a business card). Policies should require officers to state the reason for the stop and the reason for the search if one is conducted.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"APD policy currently requires that officers provide a business card to those they have detained and released without a citation or arrest, and that, for stops that are documented in the stop data system, the business card include the date and time of the stop as well as the last four digits of the related incident number. It also requires that the person be informed of the reason for the detention." (2017)</p> <p>"Despite these mandates being written in the policy manual, however, the OIG has observed that officers do not appear to consistently provide subjects of a stop with a business card. It has also noted in a previous report that reviewers could not always identify the explanation of the stop in videos associated with a pedestrian stop. Following the OIG's raising of this issue, the Office of Operations moved quickly to prepare a notice reminding all Bureau commanding officers of requirements relating to collecting stop data and, when no enforcement action is taken, providing those stopped with a business card." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department should continue to reinforce and hold officers accountable for requirements that they identify themselves during a stop, provide a business card, and explain the reason for the stop."</p> <p>"In recent months, the Department has been reviewing how best to apply and enforce the business card policy, and it is currently working to finalize a change in language that will require officers to "offer" a business card rather than to "provide" it. As noted in Section A-1, it has also been developing a Procedural Justice Review form that specifically incorporates an assessment of whether the officers explained the reason for each stop, as required. The OIG will continue to monitor this issue, and officers' adherence to these policies, as part of its auditing responsibilities." (2019).</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Policies for Stops & Searches</p>	<p>Procedures for LGBTQ Communities: Establish search and seizure procedures related to LGBTQ and transgender populations and adopt as policy the recommendation from the President's Advisory Council on HIV/AIDS to cease using the possession of condoms as the sole evidence of vice.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>California Penal Code Provides: Per PC 647.3(b) and Evidence Code 782.1, the possession of condoms, in any amount, shall not provide a basis for probable cause for arrest of, and is not admissible as evidence in the prosecution of any individual for violations related to an act of prostitution as contained in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC 372 Nuisance; • PC 647 (a) Lewd or Disorderly Conduct; • PC 647 (b) Prostitution; and, • PC 653.22 Loitering to Commit Prostitution.
	<p>Prohibit Profiling and Discrimination: Adopt and enforce policies prohibiting profiling and discrimination based on race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, gender, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, immigration status, disability, housing status, occupation, or language fluency. Invasive searches should never be used for the sole purpose of determining gender identity, and an individual's gender identity should be respected in lock-ups and holding cells to the extent that the facility allows for gender segregation.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report: "While the Department's current policy is generally well aligned with this recommendation, it does not include the categories of immigration status, housing status, occupation, and language fluency. The LAPD has separate policies on immigration and housing status as well as language fluency, but the OIG recommends that the Department develop specific anti-bias language about these classifications as well." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department should expand its policies to include anti-bias language for immigration status, housing status, occupation, and language fluency."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report "While the Department's current policy is generally well aligned with this recommendation, it did not, at the time of the OIG's initial report, include the categories of immigration status, housing status, occupation, and language fluency. The LAPD had separate policies on immigration and housing status, as well as language fluency, but the OIG recommended that the Department develop specific anti-bias language about these classifications as well." (2019)</p> <p>"The OIG has had several conversations with the Department and Commission members about the most appropriate way to address this recommendation. A draft policy that incorporates the recommended revisions was recently finalized and is expected to be presented to the Commission in the coming weeks." [This has been completed – see: Administrative Order No. 19, 2019.] See also: Administrative Order Prohibiting Biased Policing</p>
<p>Pillar Three: Technology & Social Media</p>		
<p>Technology Policies</p>	<p>Prevent Tampering with Evidence: Deploy smart technology that is designed to prevent the tampering with or manipulating of evidence in violation of policy.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Technology Policies</p>	<p>Encourage Public Engagement When Considering New Technology: Encourage public engagement and collaboration, including the use of community advisory bodies, when developing a policy for the use of a new technology.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"Under the Department's current structure, all new policies and policy revisions must be approved by the Commission. The meetings where these decisions take place are necessarily open to the public and require that members of the community be permitted to submit a comment on any item prior to its approval by the Commission. The Commission has also worked to expand its efforts to collect feedback on issues of particular interest to the public." (2017)</p> <p>"Although the Department regularly involves relevant LAPD staff in the development and review of new and revised policies, the OIG is not aware of any process where the feedback is solicited directly from employees in a systematic manner. For example, police unions may often be involved in the development of policy to be presented to the Commission, and the Commission meets regularly with command staff as well as officers at roll calls or other meetings. The Department also has some programs to obtain general feedback, such as the creation of a special Employee Relations Group (ERG) email account to allow officers to directly provide feedback and the scheduling of "vertical staff meetings" that include employees and management from different ranks." (2017)</p>
	<p>Technology Assessments:</p> <p>Include an evaluation or assessment process to gauge the effectiveness of any new technology, soliciting input from all levels of the agency, from line officer to leadership, as well as assessment from members of the community. For example, a department might create an advisory group when a new technology is adopted, comprised of officers, union representatives, and members from other departmental units, representatives from the prosecutor's office, the defense bar, advocacy groups, and citizens.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
	<p>Serving People with Special Needs: Adopt the use of new technologies that will help them better serve people with special needs or disabilities.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Technology Policies</p>	<p>Review and Consider Best Practices for Body Worn Cameras: To assist in implementing BWCs, review and consider the Bureau of Justice Assistants BWC Toolkit, which provides guidance and model policy for law enforcement agencies implementing BWC programs.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"As noted by the OIG, the Department has indicated it would release such video only in conjunction with a court order or other compelling circumstances. There is currently no written policy on the release of BWV or other video, however, such as video captured by a vehicle's Digital In-Car Video System (DICVS) or surveillance footage. Following the OIG's report, the Commission directed that a process be initiated to receive input from the public and officers on a video release policy for CUQF incidents." (2017)</p> <p>"In January 2017, the Commission announced that it had engaged the Policing Project of the New York University School of Law to gather feedback and opinions about the Department's video release process. The Project, which has local support from the UCLA and UC Irvine Schools of Law, will then develop a report on its findings to the Commission. This process will include forums with the community, as well as surveys and meetings with Department employees, employee unions, and other stakeholders. The project held the first of its five community meetings on March 23 and will complete the information-gathering phase on May 7." (2017)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>For the LAPD Digital In-Car Video System Policy, see: LAPD Manual 3/579.13 at www.lapdonline.org/lapd_manual/volume_3.htm#601.</p> <p>For the LAPD Body Worn Video Policy, see: LAPD Manual 3/579.15 at www.lapdonline.org/lapd_manual/volume_3.htm#601.</p> <p>For the LAPD Critical Incident Video Release Policy, see: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/082520/BPC_20-0107.pdf</p>
	<p>Updating Public Record Laws: Federal, state, local, and tribal legislative bodies should be encouraged to update public record laws. Public record laws, which allow public access to information held by government agencies, including law enforcement, should be modified to protect the privacy of the individuals whose records they hold and to maintain the trust of the community. Special concerns arise with releasing recordings of police interactions with minors.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Social Media Policies</p>	<p>Adopt Policies to Increase Transparency and Accessibility: Adopt model policies and best practices for technology-based community engagement that increases community trust and access. These policies and practices should at a minimum increase transparency and accessibility, provide access to information (crime statistics, current calls for service), allow for public posting of policy and procedures, and enable access and usage for persons with disabilities. Social media must be responsive and current.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. 2020 Update: See: Procedures and guidance for official department and personal social media accounts, published October 19, 2018 See also: LAPD Critical Incident Video Release Policy, which can be located here: http://www.lapdpolice.com/lacity.org/082520/BPC__20-0107.pdf</p>
<p>"Less than Lethal" Technology</p>	<p>Adopt Policies Regarding Use of Social Media By Officers: Develop policies and practices on social media use that consider individual officer expression, professional representation, truthful communication, and other concerns that can impact trust and legitimacy.</p> <p>Change Weaponry: Policies and procedures must change, but so should the weaponry. Develop new "less than lethal" technology to help control combative suspects, such as conductive energy devices (CED) that may decrease the number of fatal police interventions. But new technologies should still be subject to the appropriate use of force continuum restrictions.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. See: Chief of Police Notice Relative to Social Media Policy</p> <p>The 2017 OIG Report: "The OIG recently released a report on the Department's use of less-lethal weapons, developed in response to the Commission's direction to evaluate how such tools are used in incidents involving persons who are mentally ill or armed with weapons other than firearms. As explained by the OIG in its report, such tools may be effective in resolving a mental health crisis without the use of deadly force. The OIG's report also detailed the Department's training on the use of less-lethal weapons, with specific scenarios relating to common situations involving a person in crisis. Report also found that the Department has taken several steps to increase the availability and accessibility of these tools for patrol officers in the field. These include acquiring additional TASERS, testing wider deployment of the 40mm less-lethal launcher, and installing mounting systems to make beanbag shotguns more accessible to officers in the field. In addition to these steps, the Department established two additional protocols to ensure better supervisory oversight of such incidents." (2017)</p> <p>2020 Update: Bolawrap Pilot Program began 02/06/2020 See also: Office of the Inspector General Report issued in 2017 entitled: Overview of Less-Lethal Tools and Deployment which can be found here: https://a27e0d81-a3d0-44b8-8142-1376c6fb6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2dd423__486428073da94a2aa412c01014b500b4.pdf</p>

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)
<p>Pillar Four: Community Policing & Crime Reduction</p> <p>Culture of Community Policing</p>	<p>Policies Reflect Importance of Community Engagement: Develop and adopt policies and strategies that reinforce the importance of community engagement in managing public safety—not only between individual officers and individual neighborhood residents, but also between law enforcement leaders and leaders in key institutions in a community, such as churches, businesses, and schools, supporting the community's own process to define prevention and reach goals.</p> <p>Adopt "Least Harm" Resolutions: Consider adopting preferences for seeking "least harm" resolutions, such as diversion programs or warnings and citations in lieu of arrest for minor infractions.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"Over the past two decades, the LAPD has embraced community policing as its primary philosophy, as described in its core values: "We will work in partnership with the people in our communities and do our best, within the law, to solve community problems that affect public safety." To this end, it has developed an extensive network of programs to engage and partner with the community it serves." (2017)</p> <p>"One highlight is the Community Safety Partnership (CSP), a collaboration between the Department and City Housing Authority that embeds specialized groups of officers into the communities of eight public housing developments. Officers commit to staying at this assignment for a period of at least five years, which gives them an opportunity to build relationships with community members, help develop and support youth programs, and provide other assistance. This program, which has been associated with significant drops in crime and improvements in homicide clearances, was recently expanded to the Harvard Park neighborhood. This will be the Department's first CSP program outside a housing development." (2017)</p> <p>"Other LAPD community programs include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Senior Lead Officer (SLO) program, which assigns officers to oversee each basic car area and act as a liaison between the community and the Department; • Youth programs such as the Summer Night Lights park program, the Cadet leadership program, and LAPD magnet schools; and • Homeless outreach programs such as the Homeless Outreach and Proactive Engagement (HOPE) program, which assigns multidisciplinary teams of officers and outreach workers to connect residents with services and shelter." (2017) <p>"In the past year, the Department has reinforced its commitment to what it calls "relationship-based" policing by consolidating many community engagement and outreach programs under the umbrella of the Community Relationship Division." (2017)</p> <p>"The OIG has found that the Department has demonstrated its commitment to community policing by dedicating staff to reaching out to the community, investing in programs like the ones listed above, the creation of "foot beat" units, and other activities." (2017)</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report:</p> <p>"The Department keeps records of the number of juveniles who, in lieu of being formally arrested, receive referrals to community diversion programs that are focused on restorative justice. Currently, 17 of the Department's 21 geographic Areas are linked with community service providers for the purposes of diversion, with two of those having come online in June 2019. According to Department records, a total of 341 juveniles – about 39 percent of those who were arrested for offenses that are eligible for diversion – have been referred for diversion thus far in 2019. The Department is currently working to obtain additional funding in order to expand on these efforts." (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Board of Police Commissioners held a hearing on juvenile diversion on September 29, 2020, and the LAPD committed to ensuring that all eligible youths are diverted.</p>
<p>Infuse Community Policing Throughout Culture & Organization: Community policing should be infused throughout the culture and organizational structure of law enforcement agencies. Community policing must be a way of doing business by an entire police force, not just a specialized unit of that force.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"[I]n keeping with the Task Force's recommendation that an agency's approach to community policing involve all patrol officers, not just those assigned to specialized divisions or units, the Department has made clear that it expects officers at all levels and positions to engage in community policing strategies." (2017)</p> <p>"In recent months, however, the OIG has heard concerns from officers who feel the Department's emphasis on producing results — for example, COMPSTAT numbers such as arrests, field interviews, and guns confiscated — creates a disincentive for officers to spend time engaging with community members. Others have expressed concerns that, due to low numbers of personnel assigned to patrol duties, they feel pressure not to spend too much time conducting non-enforcement activities or, as noted in a previous section, attend training." (2017)</p>	

21st Century Policing Report—2015

Status from Inspector General Reports (2017 & 2019)

Topic	Recommendation	
<p>Culture of Community Policing</p>	<p>Evaluate Officers Based On Community Engagement: Hiring, training, evaluating, and promoting officers based on their ability and track record in community engagement—not just traditional measures of policing such as arrests, tickers, or tactical skills—is an equally important component of the successful infusion of community policing throughout an organization. Evaluate officers on their efforts to engage members of the community and the partnerships they build.</p> <p>Evaluate Patrol Deployment Practices: Evaluate patrol deployment practices to allow sufficient time for patrol officers to participate in problem solving and community engagement activities.</p>	<p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should explore ways to measure and incentivize activities associated with community policing. The Department should then return to the Commission in 90 days to present its findings and proposed action on this topic."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report:</p> <p>"[T]he Department is working to identify metrics to measure and incentivize community engagement by officers that occurs in a non-enforcement capacity." (2019)</p> <p>The 2017 OIG Report:</p> <p>"The Department has recently taken steps to increase its minimum patrol staffing levels at each area, which should alleviate many of these concerns. It is also exploring ways to analyze the amount of time that individual officers spend on proactive policing activities, and what these activities consist of. Given the Department's commitment to community policing, it should continue to evaluate current deployment practices, as recommended by the Task Force, to assess whether they provide enough time for all patrol officers to spend time on community engagement and to attend necessary training. It should also look at how such community engagement activities are documented and measured, and whether the LAPD's current incentive and promotion systems properly balance traditional crime suppression activities with community policing." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should continue to evaluate deployment practices to ensure that there is sufficient time for officers to engage in community engagement and partnership."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report:</p> <p>"The Department has developed a number of planned initiatives designed to increase and incentivize community engagement while more accurately tracking deployment patterns and time available to officers to engage in such activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update to the CAD system. One of the primary initiatives contemplated by the Department includes assigning special codes in its new Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system, known as "Premier One." The CAD system tracks officers' activities and statuses in real time, including assignment and response to radio calls, officer-initiated activities, and the results of those activities. The new software has also been designed to capture community engagement time. According to the Department, however, its implementation has been delayed due to technical issues. The Department will next test the system in October 2019, with the hope of full implementation in early 2020. The OIG notes that, in implementing the new system, it will be important to clearly define what types of activities would qualify for the community engagement category. As such, it will also be important to distinguish between community conversations conducted while officers are acting in an enforcement capacity, and those that are specifically non-enforcement in nature, as specified by the Task Force Report and discussed in implicit bias research.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) Program. The Department has embarked on a series of projects with the goal of conducting a detailed evaluation of CSP, which is currently the Department's most significant community policing initiative. As part of this process it has established the CSP Executive Steering Committee, composed of community, academic, City, and Department stakeholders, to provide direction and oversight of the program. The Committee will also review information gathered through a series of CSP Summits and a study by UCLA researchers to identify successes and areas for improvement. [This has been completed – see http://www.lapdpolicescommunity.org/051220/CSP%20Evaluation%20Report_2020_FINAL.pdf] One of the primary goals of this process will be the development of meaningful and accurate measures of community engagement activities and their results. Once this process has been completed, the Department expects that use of these measures will be expanded outside of the CSPs in order to inform the tracking and review of community engagement practices across the Department. • COMPSTAT tracking. COMPSTAT Division has begun collecting community engagement statistics across the Department. As the data was not being reported consistently, however, this process is currently under revision to ensure that it accurately captures the desired information. The Department ultimately plans for this information to be incorporated as part of the regular COMPSTAT inspection process." (2019) <p>"Finally, the Department has been exploring strategies to explicitly incorporate community policing values and concepts into various aspects of Area-level operations. These include, for example, temporarily assigning probationary officers to Senior Lead Officers, where feasible, in order to allow the probationers to learn about community engagement. Another strategy of the Department in this area is to increase the participatory roles of community members in non-enforcement Department functions." (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>In 2020, the Chief of Police created the Community Safety Partnership Bureau (CSPB), following a study prepared by UCLA on the effectiveness of the CSP program. The UCLA Report can be found at: http://www.lapdpolicescommunity.org/051220/CSP%20Evaluation%20Report_2020_FINAL.pdf</p> <p>The LAPD website describes the CSP program and the new bureau as follows:</p> <p>The CSP Bureau fully integrates community voice into its structure. Rather than having a structure built entirely of sworn personnel, the top leadership of the CSP Bureau will consist of a sworn Deputy Chief partnered with a civilian commander (Police Administrator I). The civilian commander will oversee a Regional Advisory Council comprised of leaders within community-based organizations, representatives from City Council offices, and CSP funding partners. The commander and their council will collectively head a Safety Strategy and Innovation Center that develops community-responsive, site-specific plans for existing CSP sites, looks for opportunities for CSP site expansion across the city, and coordinates with other LAPD entities to ensure the CSP model is being integrated throughout all Department's operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CSP Bureau will provide the breadth of leadership necessary to address the various evaluation recommendations. The addition of regional, mid-level supervision will enhance the oversight of administrative and operational functions, while the newly created captain positions will coordinate with both community stakeholders and Department commanding officers to create problem-solving strategies that can be implemented beyond the confines of CSP sites. - By creating a bureau structure to oversee CSP operations, the LAPD is establishing the support systems vital to allowing existing CSP personnel to build on their current successes. The bureau will relieve them of the need to split their attentions between community engagement and administrative functions. They will instead be able to return their full energy and focus to the relationships with community members that have allowed the program to take hold and create dramatic shifts in safety.
--	---

<p>Culture of Community Policing</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emerald Tingitides was selected to be the Deputy Chief overseeing the CSP Bureau. - One of the most significant mandates the CSP Bureau will fulfill is developing strategies to fully implement and institutionalize the CSP model across all aspects of the LAPD. The CSP model's effectiveness is not limited to the stakeholders within tightly defined neighborhood partnering with ten officers and a supervisor. The model's tenets have a place across all of Department operations, and developing a strategy for the Departmentwide integration of these tenets will be taken on by the bureau's leadership and Regional Advisory Council. This complete embrace of policing built on relationships and the pursuit of long-term solutions rather than ongoing enforcement plans will serve as the foundation of the reimagined Los Angeles Police Department. <p>See also: Office of the Inspector General Reports, which discuss Community Engagement:</p> <p>https://e27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1378c0bb6e32/files/ur.com/ygdfbzdd23_68104e4f0d624094ed9766a3971bb5f.pdf</p> <p>https://e27e0481-a3d0-44b8-8142-1378c0bb6e32/files/ur.com/ygdfbzdd23_5b6hb0c0b5124b6979f612eeb877e0a4d6.pdf</p>
---	--	--

<p>Culture of Community Policing</p>	<p>Multi-disciplinary Approach to Crisis Situations: Engage in multidisciplinary, community team approaches for planning, implementing, and responding to crisis situations with complex causal factors. Consider coordinating mental health response teams that include mental health professionals, social workers, crisis counselors, and other professionals making decisions alongside the police. This same model can be used for homelessness, substance abuse, domestic violence, human trafficking, and child abuse.</p>
<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"The Department has also been working on ways to educate the families of persons with mental health conditions about communicating with the police. As part of this process, the LAPD's Mental Evaluation Unit (MEU) has partnered with National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) and other organizations to conduct outreach and develop resource materials. These efforts include, for example, the distribution of a community mental health resource guide and a "911 Checklist" that explains what family members should expect when contacting police. The Department estimates that over 8,000 copies of the checklist, which details information family members should be prepared to provide during a crisis, has been distributed to date." (2017)</p> <p>"MEU also has four dedicated Senior Lead Officers (SLOs), who are responsible for attending community meetings and building relationships with resource providers. It is hoped that these outreach programs will be helpful in improving outcomes during critical incidents, while also providing an opportunity to gather feedback and advice from the family members about their own experiences with the police. The establishment of the Family Liaison Unit, whose role will be to communicate with the families of those killed or injured by the LAPD, might also provide an effective conduit for the communication of lessons learned between the Department and family members." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should continue to explore ways to educate families of persons with mental health conditions on communicating with the call-takers and the police, including the development of trainings or forums."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"In recent years, the Department has been engaged in an intensive effort to significantly increase the capacity and effectiveness of its response to persons in behavioral crisis. This effort includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT). This class allows family members of those with mental health conditions or other disabilities to provide testimony about their experiences. It also teaches behavioral techniques to be used when interacting with persons who have autism or other conditions that may otherwise be misinterpreted or mishandled by officers during crisis situations. The course is provided to all probationary employees in conjunction with PSL 1, and it is a prerequisite for Field Training Officers and officers assigned to details related to homelessness. MHIT is offered twice per month, with the goal of reaching all officers assigned to patrol duties within two to three years. • Outreach to families. The LAPD's Mental Evaluation Unit (MEU) has partnered with the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) and other organizations to conduct outreach and develop resource materials. As reported in the OIG's initial report, these efforts include, for example, the distribution of a community mental health resource guide and a "911 Checklist" that explains what family members should expect when contacting police. The Department reports that it has distributed approximately 24,000 such checklists in English and 23,000 in Spanish. • Community meetings. MEU also has four dedicated Senior Lead Officers (SLOs), who are responsible for attending community meetings and building relationships with resource providers. In 2018, MEU conducted 164 Community Outreach presentations to a total of 4,071 attendees. In 2019, as of July, MEU had given 96 Community Outreach presentations to 2,534 attendees. • Mental Health Crisis Response Program Advisory Committee. This Committee's quarterly meetings are attended by representatives of organizations such as the Mayor's Crisis Response Team, faith-based organizations, non-profit providers, homeless advocates, the Department of Mental Health, other law enforcement agencies, and others, and they are designed to increase collaboration and sharing among such stakeholders." (2019) <p>"The Department has been exploring strategies to explicitly incorporate community policing values and concepts into various aspects of Area-level operations. These include, for example, temporarily assigning probationary officers to Senior Lead Officers, where feasible, in order to allow the probationers to learn about community engagement. Another strategy of the Department in this area is to increase the participatory roles of community members in non-enforcement Department functions." (2019)</p>	

<p>Culture of Community Policing</p>	<p>Protect and Promote Dignity of All: Communities should support a culture and practice of policing that reflects the values of protection and promotion of the dignity of all, especially the most vulnerable. Law enforcement officers' goal should be to avoid use of force if at all possible, even when it is allowed by law and by policy. The vision of policing in the 21st century should be that of officers as guardians of human and constitutional rights.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"The LAPD already emphasizes the sanctity of human life in several ways. As part of its 'functional objectives,' the Department recognizes that 'reverence for human life is the primary consideration in developing tactics and strategies in pursuit of our motto: 'To Protect and to Serve.'" Its use of force policy further states that the "guiding value when using force shall be reverence for human life." This principle has guided many of the Department's policies, including those relating to de-escalation and other measures to avoid the use of force. Additionally, with the establishment of the 'Preservation of Life' award, the Department has also taken steps to begin recognizing those incidents where officers successfully avoid using deadly force, even where its use might have been a reasonable alternative." (2017)</p> <p>"LAPD officers are currently required to immediately request medical treatment following an incident where a person has been injured by police actions. The OIG has noted, however, that there is currently no mandate that officers in the field render first aid to the subject prior to the arrival of medical personnel, although Department training does explore this issue in courses such as PSL. In its analysis of a recent CUOF incident, the OIG noted that it has seen instances of officers providing first aid to individuals shot [in] some prior cases, [but] such action is not standard practice and is not required by current Department policy or training." The OIG has recommended that, "consistent with the Department's commitment to the preservation of life, consideration be given to training officers to provide first aid to injured subjects when it is safe to do so." (2017)</p> <p>"In addition to setting the expectation that officers provide first aid when they can do so safely, the Department must also assure, on an ongoing basis, that officers are properly trained to do so. A 2013 OIG report on compliance with State training requirements found that, at that time, the Department [did not] provide the required refresher training on CPR and First Aid." In response to that report, the Department undertook a concerted effort to bring all officers up to date in their certifications. The Department is now reaching the end of its three-year refresher period and is preparing to again begin re-certifying officers to ensure compliance with State law. The OIG notes that in 2015, the State revised its rules to require, going forward, that officers be retained in this topic every two years. The Department must ensure that the re-certification process is ongoing so that officers are equipped to render aid to subjects, victims, and other officers who have been injured." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendations: "The Department should train officers to render aid to subjects following a use of force when safe to do so. It should also ensure, on an ongoing basis, that officers are up-to-date in CPR and First Aid training as required by California law."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report:</p> <p>"Since the publication of the [2017] OIG's report, the Department worked with the City Attorney's Office and other stakeholders to develop a training bulletin on the topic of rendering aid, which was published on August 20, 2019. The bulletin states that officers "should provide basic and emergency medical assistance to all members of the community, including victims, witnesses, subjects, suspects, persons in custody, subjects of a use of force, and fellow officers" to the extent of the officer's training and ability and the level of equipment available ... [and] that officers "should only render aid when it is safe and practicable to do so," and it provides a few examples of when this would not be the case. Its examples of "an unsafe scene, or when aid would not be practicable" include the following: "During or directly after a traumatic incident in which the officer's mindset or physiological condition are not conducive to rendering medical aid (e.g. substantially involved in an officer-involved shooting)." The OIG will monitor the implementation and results of the new bulletin." (2019)</p> <p>"With respect to training and equipment, the Department has indicated that it is currently in compliance with State mandates regarding training and that it has submitted a budget request to the City for \$615,000 for trauma and first aid kits. According to the Department, over 7000 employees have completed their required training within the current two-year training cycle." (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Board of Police Commissioners passed a new use of force policy, which can be found at: http://lapd-assets.lapdonline.org/assets/pdf/SO%20223.pdf, and which includes a rendering aid provision:</p>
---	---	---

<p>Culture of Community Policing</p>		<p>Rendering Aid. After any use of force, officers shall immediately request a rescue ambulance for any person injured. In addition, officers shall promptly provide basic and emergency medical assistance to all members of the community including victims, witnesses, subjects, suspects, persons in custody, subjects of a use of force and fellow officers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the extent of the officer's training and experience in first aid/CPRIAED; and • To the level of equipment available to an officer at the time assistance is needed.
	<p>Require Use of Respectful Language: Because offensive or harsh language can escalate a minor situation, underscore the importance of language used and adopt policies directing officers to speak to individuals with respect.</p>	<p>This matter was addressed by the OIG in the following report: Review of Arrests for Violations of California Penal Code Section 148(A)(1), which can be found at: https://a2760481-e3d0-44b8-8142-1376c7b6b6e32.filesusr.com/ugd/b2cd23_4c3e1e1c762845ae9bcb6375a89dd974.pdf</p>
	<p>Regular Interactions with Neighborhood: Develop programs that create opportunities for patrol officers to regularly interact with neighborhood residents, faith leaders, and business leaders.</p>	<p>As noted in multiple sections above, the topic of Community Engagement was a significant focus of the OIGs 2017 and 2019 reports. Specifically, the OIG recommended providing officers the opportunity and incentive to meaningfully engage with the community.</p> <p>See also: CSP Program, details of which can be found at: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/051220/CSP%20Evaluation%20Report_2020_FINAL.pdf and https://www.lapdonline.org/home/news_view/66780</p>
<p>Co-Produce Public Safety with the Community</p>	<p>Work with Community to Identify Problems & Solutions: Work with community residents to identify problems and collaborate on implementing solutions that produce meaningful results for the community. Members of communities are key partners in creating public safety; so mechanisms and police need mechanisms to engage with each other in consistent and meaningful ways. One model for formalizing this engagement is through a civilian governance system such as is found in Los Angeles.</p>	<p>Work with Community to Identify Problems & Solutions—As noted in multiple sections above, the topic of Community Engagement was a significant focus of the OIGs 2017 and 2019 reports. Specifically, the OIG recommended providing officers the opportunity and incentive to meaningfully engage with the community.</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>In 2020, the Chief of Police created the Community Safety Partnership Bureau (CSPB), following a study prepared by UCLA on the effectiveness of the CSP program. The UCLA Report can be found at: http://www.lapdpolicecom.lacity.org/051220/CSP%20Evaluation%20Report_2020_FINAL.pdf</p> <p>The LAPD website describes the CSP program and the new bureau as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The CSP Bureau fully integrates community voice into its structure. Rather than having a structure built entirely of sworn personnel, the top leadership of the CSP Bureau will consist of a sworn Deputy Chief partnered with a civilian commander (Police Administrator II). The civilian commander will oversee a Regional Advisory Council comprised of leaders within community-based organizations, representatives from City Council offices, and CSP funding partners. The commander and their council will collectively head a Safety Strategy and Innovation Center that develops community-responsive, site-specific plans for existing CSP sites, looks for opportunities for CSP site expansion across the city, and coordinates with other LAPD entities to ensure the CSP model is being integrated throughout all Departments' operations.

<p>Co-Produce Public Safety with the Community</p>	<p>Held Regular Community Forums: Schedule regular forums and meetings where all community members can interact with police and help influence programs and policy.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report The Department has also developed an extensive network of programs to facilitate ways for residents to partner with officers on ways to improve their communities. These include regular forums based both on geographic district and membership in other communities. For example, the Department regularly holds forums with the Muslim community as well as with the LGBTQ community." (2017) 2020 Update: In 2020, the Board of Police Commissioners held a series of 5 community meetings for the public to provide input into police reform proposals.</p>
<p>Joint Trainings with Youth and Community: Engage youth and communities in joint training with law enforcement, citizen academies, ride-alongs, problem solving teams, community action teams, and quality of life teams.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report "The LAPD also conducts regular citizen academies, which teach community members about the Department's operations and policing in general." (2017) 2020 Update: The LAPD sponsors the Cadet Program, details of which can be found at the LAPD Manual 3/245.50; and here: http://www.lapdcadets.com/ In addition, the LAPD runs the ACOP program: http://agency.governmentjobs.com/agency/job_bulletin.cfm?jobID=1741207&sha redWindow=0</p>	
<p>Establish Formal Community Advisory Committees: Establish formal community/citizen advisory committees to assist in developing crime prevention strategies and agency policies as well as provide input on policing issues. Large agencies should establish multiple committees to ensure they inform all levels of the organization. Committees should reflect the demographic makeup of the community or neighborhood being served.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report "The Department has also developed an extensive network of programs to facilitate ways for residents to partner with officers on ways to improve their communities. These include regular forums based both on geographic district and membership in other communities. For example . . . the Department maintains formal Citizen-Police Advisory Boards in each of the LAPD's 21 divisions, which work with the local area command to improve the neighborhood's quality of life and address problems as they arise." (2017) 2020 Update: Information about CPAB Programs can also be found in the LAPD Manual at 2/092.85.</p>	

<p>Co-Produce Public Safety with the Community</p>	<p>Adopt Policing Strategies that Support Economic Development: Adopt community policing strategies that support and work in concert with economic development efforts within communities. Partner on projects devoted to enhancing the economic health of the communities in which departments are located.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
<p>Policies and Programs for At-Risk Youth</p>	<p>Develop Policies and Programs for At-Risk Youth: Communities should adopt policies and programs that address the needs of children and youth most at risk for crime or violence and reduce aggressive law enforcement tactics that stigmatize youth and marginalize their participation in schools and communities.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. 2020 Update: The Board of Police Commissioners held a hearing on juvenile diversion on September 29, 2020, and the LAPD committed to ensuring that all eligible youths are diverted.</p>
<p>Reform Policies that Push Children Into Juvenile Justice System: Education and criminal justice agencies at all levels of government should work together to reform policies and procedures that push children into the juvenile justice system. Work with schools to encourage the creation of alternatives to student suspensions and expulsion through restorative justice, diversion, counseling, and family interventions.</p>	<p>Encourage Restorative Justice Practices: Work with schools to encourage the use of alternative strategies that involve youth in decision making, such as restorative justice, youth courts, and peer interventions.</p>	<p>The 2019 OIG Report: "The Department keeps records of the number of juveniles who, in lieu of being formally arrested, receive referrals to community diversion programs that are focused on restorative justice. Currently, 17 of the Department's 21 geographic Areas are linked with community service providers for the purposes of diversion, with two of those having come online in June 2019. According to Department records, a total of 341 juveniles – about 39 percent of those who were arrested for offenses that are eligible for diversion – have been referred for diversion thus far in 2019. The Department is currently working to obtain additional funding in order to expand on these efforts." (2019)</p>
		<p>Not evaluated by OIG. (Note: the LA Unified School District has an independent Police Department).</p>

<p>Policies and Programs for At-Risk Youth</p>	<p>Help Youth Develop New Behavior Skills: Work with schools to adopt an instructional approach to discipline that uses interventions or disciplinary consequences to help students develop new behavior skills and positive strategies to avoid conflict, redirect energy, and refocus on learning.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. (Note: the LA Unified School District has an Independent Police Department).</p>
<p>School Discipline Policies: Work with schools to develop and monitor school discipline policies with input and collaboration from school personnel, students, families, and community members. These policies should prohibit the use of corporal punishment and electronic control devices.</p>	<p>School Discipline Policies: Work with schools to develop and monitor school discipline policies with input and collaboration from school personnel, students, families, and community members. These policies should prohibit the use of corporal punishment and electronic control devices.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. (Note: the LA Unified School District has an Independent Police Department).</p>
<p>Continuum for Addressing Escalating Misbehavior: Work with schools to create a continuum of developmentally appropriate and proportional consequences for addressing ongoing and escalating student misbehavior after all appropriate interventions have been attempted.</p>	<p>Continuum for Addressing Escalating Misbehavior: Work with schools to create a continuum of developmentally appropriate and proportional consequences for addressing ongoing and escalating student misbehavior after all appropriate interventions have been attempted.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. (Note: the LA Unified School District has an Independent Police Department).</p>
<p>Re-Entry Programs: Work with communities to play a role in programs and procedures to reintegrate juveniles back into their communities as they leave the juvenile justice system. Also work with communities to play a role in re-entry programs in re-entry programs for adults leaving prisons and jails.</p>	<p>Re-Entry Programs: Work with communities to play a role in programs and procedures to reintegrate juveniles back into their communities as they leave the juvenile justice system. Also work with communities to play a role in re-entry programs in re-entry programs for adults leaving prisons and jails.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
<p>MOUs for School Resource Officers: Establish memorandum of agreement for the placement of School Resource Officers that limit police involvement in student discipline, and includes provisions for special training for SROs to help them better understand and deal with issues involving youth.</p>	<p>MOUs for School Resource Officers: Establish memorandum of agreement for the placement of School Resource Officers that limit police involvement in student discipline, and includes provisions for special training for SROs to help them better understand and deal with issues involving youth.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. (Note: the LA Unified School District has an Independent Police Department).</p>

<p>Pillar Five: Training & Education</p>	<p>Engage Community In Training: Engage community members in the training process. Make police training as transparent as possible. Community can evaluate existing training, provide input into shaping some training content and delivery, and, in some cases, participate in training alongside officers.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report "The Department should continue to consider ways to incorporate community participation in the development and delivery of training for officers, where relevant." (2017) "The Department has also developed an extensive network of programs to facilitate ways for residents to partner with officers on ways to improve their communities. These include regular forums based both on geographic district and membership in other communities. For example . . . [t]he LAPD also conducts regular citizen academies, which teach community members about the Department's operations and policing in general." (2017) The 2019 OIG Report: "As of now, community participation is most prominently incorporated into three trainings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT). This training includes participation from, among others, representatives from the Department of Mental Health, community mental health providers, people with mental health conditions or other disabilities – as well as families of those people, and actors who assist with the scenario-based component of the program. • Gang Intervention Awareness Training. This training includes the participation of gang intervention workers, who discuss their role in reducing violence and how they can best work with law enforcement. • PSL 1. As noted in previous sections, the Department has engaged an outside expert to provide a block of training on implicit bias." (2019) <p>"The Department's Police Training and Education Division, which is responsible for the development of training curricula, also incorporates community involvement through its Professional Advisory Committee (PAC). According to the Department, this committee is composed of community leaders, educators, and other community stakeholders who may audit and evaluate LAPD trainings. The PAC meets quarterly to discuss current research in the field, review LAPD materials, provide feedback on trainings observed, and make recommendations to the Department. The goal of the PAC is to assist in the effective integration of community and human relations concepts into LAPD training." (2019) Most training lesson plans are available to the public due to SB 978, which took effect 01/01/2020.</p> </p>
<p>Training</p>		

<p>Training</p>	<p>Provide Leadership Training: Provide leadership training to all personnel throughout their careers. Standards and programs need to be established for every level of leadership from the first line to middle management to executive leadership.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report "In January 2016, the Department officially implemented the first of a series of two-week leadership courses designed to follow and develop new officers as they progress through their first five years in the Department. "PSL I," as the first phase is known, brings back one full Academy class in the 11th month of their one-year probationary period for an opportunity to reflect on their experiences in the field and build on what they learned. In the Academy. Entitled "Building the Community Leader," the first week of the program focuses on community policing concepts and includes sessions on effective communication, implicit bias, procedural justice, use of force philosophy and de-escalation, and the guardian mindset. A particular emphasis of the course was on the importance of incorporating empathy and critical thinking into all interactions with the community. During the second week, participants attend the week-long Mental Health Intervention Training, which builds on and expands the concepts of the first week in training officers about effective and empathetic interactions with persons with mental health and other disabilities." (2017)</p> <p>"The second phase of the course, "PSL II," is slated to begin in late 2017, and will bring these same students back two years after their first PSL training. Although the content is still in development, it is expected to continue building on the concepts of PSL I, focusing on effective communication, procedural justice, de-escalation, use of force, and advanced tactics. This training is also expected to emphasize the importance of rendering aid to members of the public and serves as the required First Aid/CPR refresher for those students who attend the course. The third and final phase of PSL will be implemented an additional two years later, and will continue to build and develop the participants as they complete their fifth year of employment with the Department." (2017).</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department should continue to develop the Police Sciences and Leadership series, ensuring that the program has sufficient staffing and support."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report "Since the 2017 report, the Department has piloted the PSL II course twice and obtained POST certification for it. It also held one official session of the course in March 2019, but it has not yet begun to hold the class regularly due to resource issues. According to the Department, it intends to launch monthly implementation of the course in late 2019." (2019)</p> <p>"The OIG also noted, in its initial report, that there was only one permanent staff member assigned to PSL at that time (See also: Section B-1). Since then, the Department has created a PSL unit permanently staffed by one sergeant and four officers, along with two additional adjuncts from a different unit." (2019)</p> <p>In addition to the above listed training, the Department also has Sergeant School, Watch Commander School, Field Training Officer School, and Command Development.</p> <p>The 2017 OIG Report "Over the past two years, the Department has been engaged in an intensive effort to significantly increase the capacity and effectiveness of its response to persons in behavioral crisis. This effort includes the expansion of multidisciplinary "SMART" crisis response teams and the delivery of a new 40-hour intensive training, called the Mental Health Intervention Training (MHIT), to as many field officers as possible. This process began with the training of officers in units or divisions that have the most frequent contact with persons with mental illness and has also been expanded to all probationary and field training officers, as well as other officers where resources permit. The OIG did not examine this issue closely as part of this review but will continue tracking the Department's efforts in this area." (2017)</p>
	<p>Crisis Intervention Training: POSTs should make Crisis Intervention Training (CIT) a part of both basic recruit and in-service officer training. Equip officers to deal with individuals in crisis or living with mental disabilities, as well as instruction in disease of addiction, implicit bias and cultural responsiveness, policing in a democratic society, procedural justice, and effective social interaction and tactical skills.</p>	

<p>Training</p>	<p>Basic Training on Social Interaction & De-Escalation: POSTs should ensure that basic officer training includes lessons to improve social interaction as well as tactical skills, such as critical thinking, social intelligence, implicit bias, fair and impartial policing, historical trauma, and other topics that address capacity to build trust and legitimacy in diverse communities and offer better skills for gaining compliance without the use of physical force. Basic recruit training must also include tactical and operations training on lethal and nonlethal use of force with an emphasis on de-escalation and tactical retreat skills.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. Instructional Design Unit (IDU) identified a total of 70 courses into which Tactical De-escalation and Tactical Communication are to be incorporated. See also: Department Policy Regarding Design, Development and Approval of Training</p>
<p>Training on Addiction: POSTs should ensure that basic recruit and in-service officer training include curriculum on the disease of addiction. It is important that officers be able to recognize the signs of addiction and respond accordingly when they are interacting with people who may be impaired as a result of their addiction.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>	

<p>Training</p>	<p>Implicit Bias Training: POSTs should ensure both basic recruit and in-service training incorporates content around recognizing and confronting implicit bias and cultural responsiveness. Implement ongoing, top down training for all officers in cultural diversity and related topics that can build trust and legitimacy in diverse communities. This should be accomplished with the assistance of advocacy groups that represent the viewpoints of communities that have traditionally had adversarial relationships with law enforcement.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"The LAPD began a Department-wide training on implicit bias at the end of March 2017. The training is being provided by Dr. Bryant Marks, a national expert on implicit bias and professor of psychology at Morehouse College. Dr. Marks has also served as an advisor to the White House and was selected to provide implicit bias training to a group of police chiefs during a recent White House briefing on Advancing 21st Century Policing, one goal of which was to assist agencies in implementing the Task Force recommendations.</p> <p>The training will be provided to all Department employees over a series of four-hour sessions, with approximately 100 employees attending each session. Each four-hour session will provide an overview of implicit bias, including how it is measured, its potential impact, and ways that it can be reduced. The course features an anonymous polling technique that encourages participants to talk about their perceptions on difficult issues and to compare these with others' views. The course also incorporates a detailed overview of the Task Force report itself and how some of the recommendations can assist agencies in addressing and mitigating implicit bias." (2017)</p> <p>"The Department has also been working on incorporating implicit bias training into its ongoing courses for officers at all levels. For this process, it relies primarily on a curriculum known as Fair and Impartial Policing (FIP), which also incorporates the topic of procedural justice. The FIP curriculum was developed by Dr. Lorie Fridell, a professor at the University of South Florida who is a nationally recognized expert on biased policing. In collaboration with the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the basic course, which includes three modules over six hours, focuses on the science of human bias – particularly implicit bias – and the importance of building police legitimacy. It then presents the principles of procedural justice as a method to mitigate the effects of implicit bias and to produce fair and impartial policing." (2017)</p> <p>2017 Recommendation: "The Department should consider whether FTOs who reject or are otherwise unable to satisfactorily complete the Fair and Impartial Policing component of the recertification course, or who demonstrate a lack of community or cultural sensitivity, should continue to train new officers." "The Department should consider having a permanent cadre of training staff assigned to PSL and/or FIP, and continue to ensure that classes are taught by experienced, skilled trainers."</p> <p>The 2019 OIG Report</p> <p>"[T]he Department has since created a fully-staffed PSL unit that includes one sergeant and four police officers, as well as two adjunct staff assigned to a different program. Beginning in October 2018, the Department also brought in an outside expert to teach a four-hour block on implicit bias at the beginning of the PSL I course." (2019)</p> <p>"With respect to the FIP cadre, the Department reviewed the possibility of creating a permanent cadre and ultimately determined that it did not have the resources to do so. As such, it will continue to rely on a small number of specially-selected adjunct staff. OIG staff recently attended the FIP portion of a recent FTO Update course and found the instructors to be skilled and experienced." (2019)</p> <p>"Training Division has selected several staff members to attend a three-day "train-the-trainer" course for the Principled Policing curriculum, which was developed by California POST and focuses on implicit bias and procedural justice. Attendees, who were drawn from Academy, FTO, and PSL training units, will learn the skills to teach these topics effectively. To ensure consistency across the Department in this area, the Director of Police Training and Education and the head of the Instructional Design Unit have also attended the course." (2019).</p> <p>"The Department completed a Department-wide training on implicit bias in 2017, which was led by the same outside expert mentioned above. In April 2018, the Department published a review of the training, including results of course evaluations. The report found that 81 percent of the respondents rated the course favorably (above average), and 90 percent rated the instructor in the "most favorable" category. Fifty-nine percent indicated that they thought it was "more likely" that they would incorporate changes in the future, with an additional 23 percent saying that this was "likely." (2019)</p>
------------------------	--	---

<p>Training</p>	<p>Training for Interacting With Diverse Communities: Implement training for officers that covers policies for interactions with the LGBTQ population, including issues such as determining gender identity for arrest placement, the Muslim, Arab, and South Asian communities, and immigrant or non-English speaking groups, as well as reinforcing policies for the prevention of sexual misconduct and harassment.</p>	<p>"In addition to the courses discussed in the previous section (above), the Department has also incorporated implicit bias content into a number of other trainings, including: Recruit Basic Course (Academy), PSL I, PSL II (forthcoming), Building Community Trust and Biased Policing, FTO Update, Supervisor School, [and] Command Development School." (2019)</p> <p>"Since the OIG's initial observations, the Department has revamped and reframed its FTO Update course in an attempt to decrease some of the resistance [displayed by FTOs and training coordinators to certain concepts and research]. The OIG has observed two subsequent sessions and has been generally satisfied with the participation by FTOs in those courses." (2019)</p> <p>"With respect to FTO selection, the Department does include a specific competency section that addresses cultural and gender sensitivity, and it is working to develop a digitized FTO management system that will allow for more effective tracking and analysis of FTO and probationary officer performance. As part of this process, it will also be overhauling the FTO Update training, but it is committed to keeping implicit bias as one of the components of that course." (2019)</p> <p>"To date, much of the Department's approach to implicit bias has focused on training, which helps to reduce biases by discussing them and encouraging officers to recognize them for what they are. In April 2018, it presented a report to the Commission that provided an evaluation of the training that had already been completed and introduced future plans for additional trainings." (2019)</p> <p>"The Department has also begun a number of processes, some of which are related to other recommendations in this report, that reflect lessons learned from research and training on implicit biases. . . . Along with training officers on implicit bias, some of the Department's steps in this direction include the following: [e]mphasis on procedural justice, [c]ollection of detailed stop data, [d]evelopment of community engagement metrics and incentives, [e]xpanded video review by supervisors, and [d]ata analysis." (2019)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>See also: <i>Contacts with the Public – Part II Procedural Justice Training Bulletin</i>, published April 2020.</p> <p>The 2017 OIG Report</p> <p>"While the OIG did not conduct a full review of LAPD training, it found several instances of cultural diversity training, both in the Academy and as part of the POST-mandated refresher courses for officers. Two such examples are detailed trainings on interactions with the Sikh and LGBTQ communities, respectively, which provide officers with education about important topics, as well as advice for identifying and addressing bias in themselves and others. Some trainings also incorporate members of the community. The LGBTQ training for FTO officers, for example, includes a presentation from a member of the transgender community about issues and concerns officers should be aware of. The OIG has also observed other trainings where members of the community, such as persons with autism or with traumatic brain injury, have come to meet with participants and share their experience and insights." (2017)</p> <p>2020 Update:</p> <p>The Department has the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning (LGBTQ) Outreach Program on the LAN homepage with several references. LGBTQ sections added to the Jail Operations Manual. LGBTQ reference card available to all Department employees.</p> <p>See also: Department Program Outreach Program Description to the Lesbian, Gay, Transgender and Questioning Community (Department LAN)</p> <p>Senate Bill No. 179 – The Gender Recognition Act – Nonbinary Gender Marker Recognized on State-issued Identification Documents (Special Order)</p> <p>Police Interactions with Transgender Individuals (Special Order)</p>
------------------------	---	---

<p>Training</p>	<p>Training on Policing In Democratic Society: POSTs should require both basic recruit and in-service training on policing in a democratic society. Particular focus should be placed on ensuring that Terry stops are conducted within constitutional guidelines.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
<p>Education</p>	<p>Incentivize Higher Education: Encourage and incentivize higher education for law enforcement officers. The Federal Government should create a loan repayment and forgiveness incentive program specifically for policing. Offering entry level opportunities to recruits without a college degree can be combined with the provision of means to obtain higher education throughout their career, thereby ensuring the benefits of a diverse staff with a well-educated police force and an active learning culture.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update: Memorandum of Understanding 24, Police Officers Union contract has payments for 60 college units and a bachelor's degree.</p>
	<p>Technology for Scenario-Based Training: Support research into the development of technology that enhances scenario-based training, social interaction skills, and enables the dissemination of interactive distance learning for law enforcement. Present day technologies should also be employed more often—web-based learning, behavior evaluations through body worn camera videos, software programs for independent learning, scenario-based instruction through videos, and other methods.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update: The Department currently uses Force Options Simulators and is exploring virtual reality training.</p>

	<p>Improve Field Training Officer Programs: Support the development and implementation of improved Field Training Officer programs. The most common current program, known as the San Jose Model, is more than 40 years old and is not based on current research knowledge of adult learning modalities. In many ways it even conflicts with innovative training strategies that encourage problem-based learning and support organizational procedural justice.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. 2020 Update: The Department has a Field Training Officer School as well as a Field Training Officer refresher school.</p>
<p>Pillar Six: Officer Wellness & Safety</p>		
<p>Benefits</p>	<p>Pension Plans: Pension plans should recognize fitness for duty examinations as definitive evidence of valid duty or non-duty related disability.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
	<p>Survivors Benefits: Public Safety Officer Benefits (PSOB) should be provided to survivors of officers killed while working, regardless of whether the officer used safety equipment (seatbelt or anti-ballistic vest) or if officer death was the result of suicide attributed to a current diagnosis of duty-related mental illness, including but not limited to post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD).</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
<p>Safety Measures</p>	<p>Promote Safety & Wellness: Promote safety and wellness at every level of the organization. Managers should also model behavior of seeking safety and wellness support.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG. 2020 Update: Behavioral Science Services leads the Department's wellness efforts to include resilience and suicide awareness.</p>
	<p>Annual Mental Health Check: Continue research into the efficacy of an annual mental health check for officers, as well as fitness, resilience, and nutrition.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>

<p>Safety Measures</p>	<p>Implement Scientifically Supported Shift Lengths: Implement scientifically supported shift lengths. Though long shifts are understandable in the case of emergencies, as a standard practice they can lead to poor morale, poor job performance, irritability, and errors in judgment that can have serious, even deadly, consequences.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p>
<p>Provide Individual Tactical First Aid Kits, Training & Anti-Ballistic Vests: Provide every officer with individual tactical first aid kits and training as well as anti-ballistic vests. Mandate that officers wear soft body armor any time they are going to be engaging in enforcement activities, uniformed or not, and provide these items to officers. To further reduce officer deaths, provide body armor to all officers with replacements when necessary.</p>	<p>The 2017 OIG Report "There are [] several recommendations which the Department has recently taken steps to implement, such as . . . [c]onsidering new options for chemical spray and the personal protection shield." (2017)</p> <p>2020 Update: Every officer is assigned an emergency trauma kit. Soft body armor is required by policy and is replaced regularly.</p> <p>See also: LAPD Manual 4/216.52: WEARING OF BODY ARMOR DURING TACTICAL OPERATIONS</p>	
<p>Policies & Training on Safety: Adopt policies that require officers to wear seat belts and bullet-proof vests and provide training to raise awareness of the consequences of failure to do so. Greater efforts should be taken to prevent deaths resulting from traffic accidents, which are the number one cause of officer fatalities in recent years. In-car cameras and seat belt sensors, aggressive safety campaigns, and mandatory seat belt policies are other potential options for agencies to consider.</p>	<p>Not evaluated by OIG.</p> <p>2020 Update: See also: LAPD Manual sections noted below: 4/216.52 WEARING OF BODY ARMOR DURING TACTICAL OPERATIONS 4/289. SAFETY BELTS IN DEPARTMENT VEHICLES</p>	