

Attachment 8 â€” Testing Instrument Sample

Attachment #8

Testing Instrument Sample

2019-12-A PUBLIC COMMENTS - NORTH PATROL DIVISION, PALMDALE STATION					
Control Number:	1	APM Review:	Auditor 2 Emp#	Date:	10/10/19
Incident Report Date:	01/02/19	PM Review:	Auditor 1 Emp#	Date:	10/22/19
Location:	Palmdale Station				
Objective 1 - Complaint Intake					
Objective 1(a) - Determine if personnel complaint forms and informational materials are made available to the public, as required per the AV Agreement. <i>(This objective is on a separate tab because this is a general/overall question)</i>					
Objective 1(b) - Determine if all personnel complaints made during the audit period were accepted and reviewed. <i>(This objective is on a separate tab because this is a general/overall question)</i>					
Objective 1(c) - Determine if non-English language complaint forms and informational materials and/or translation services are available to Limited English Proficient Individuals. <i>(This objective is on a separate tab because this is a general/overall question)</i>					
Objective 1(d) - Determine if a Department member did not refuse to accept a complaint, discourage the complainant from filing a complaint, or provide false or misleading information about filing a complaint.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
9	Based on the information available, did personnel refuse to accept the complaint or discourage the filing of a complaint, or provide false or misleading information about filing a complaint? If so:	NO	NO		
Objective 2 - Complaint Classification					
Objective 2(a) - Determine if complaint investigation related policies were revised, as required per the AV Agreement. <i>(This objective is on a separate tab because this is a general/overall question)</i>					
Objective 2(b) - Determine if personnel complaint were not classified as service complaints.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
16	Based on the information available, was the personnel complaint incorrectly classified as a service complaint?	N/A	N/A		
Objective 2(c) - Determine if the unit commander appropriately classified each allegation and personnel complaint.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
17	How was the complaint received?	Mail	Mail		
18	Who made the complaint?	Involved Person	Involved Person		
19	What was the initial classification of the complaint?	Personnel Complaint	Personnel Complaint		
20	Indicate the complaint reason: <i>(if there is more than one reason, choose "Other" and indicate all reasons that apply in Comment Section)</i>	Other	Other		
21	Was the complaint appropriately classified at the time of intake based on the information available?	YES	YES		
22	After additional information was received or the investigation was conducted, did the classification of the complaint change from the initial classification?	NO	NO		
23	If so, what was the final classification of the complaint? <i>(if there is more than one reason, choose "Other" and indicate all reasons that apply in Comment Section)</i>	N/A	N/A		
24	Based on the information available, was the complaint appropriately classified after additional information was received or the investigation was conducted?	YES	YES		
25	Were all allegations, even if an allegation was not specifically articulated by the complainant, investigated?	YES	YES		
Objective 2(d) - Determine if all allegations of misconduct were investigated. <i>(This objective is on a separate tab because this is a general/overall question)</i>					
Objective 3 - Investigations					
Objective 3(a) - Determine if the personnel complaints were thoroughly investigated, as required per the AV Agreement.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
28	Was automatic preference for a deputy's statement over a non-deputy's statement granted/noted?	NO	NO		
29	Was a witness' statement disregarded because the witness had some connection to the complainant or because of any criminal history?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
30	Were there material inconsistencies between witness statements?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
31	If so, was effort made to resolve the inconsistencies?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
32	Was there sufficient information and relevant evidence to support the disposition?	YES	YES		
33	What was the (main) disposition of the SCR packet?	Employee Conduct Appears Reasonable	Employee Conduct Appears Reasonable		
Objective 3(b) - Determine if alleged incidents of misconduct were referred to the IAB or ICIB.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
34	Was the complaint an alleged incident of misconduct that should have been referred to IAB or ICIB?	NO	NO		
35	If so, was the alleged incident of misconduct referred to the IAB, ICIB, or both?	N/A	N/A		
Objective 3(c) - If the case proceeds criminally, determine if the Division Chief reviewed the matter with the unit commander of IAB.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
36	Did the Division Chief review the matter with the unit commander of IAB?	N/A	N/A		

Audit & Accountability Bureau - Procedural Manual : Attachment 8 à Testing Instrument Sample

Attachment #8
Testing Instrument Sample

Objective 3(d) - Ensure involved supervisor, or any supervisor who authorized the conduct that led to the personnel complaint, did not conduct the complaint investigation.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
37	Did an involved supervisor, or any supervisor who authorized the conduct that led to the complaint, not conduct the complaint investigation?	N/A	N/A	No supervisor present.	
Objective 3(e) - Ensure all persons of the scene giving rise to a misconduct allegation were identified.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
38	Did the investigation report note the identities of all persons who were at the scene?	YES	YES		
Objective 3(f) - Determine if complainant, involved employee, and all witnesses (including deputies) provided a written statement of the incident or were interviewed.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
39	Was the complainant interviewed?	N/A	N/A	RIP was contacted to come in but he never did and the Station attempted several times after to contact him but they were unable to contact him.	
40	If interviewed, what was the interview method (in-person, telephonically, etc)?	N/A	N/A		
41	Were all involved employees interviewed or did they provide a written statement?	YES	YES		
42	Were all witnesses (not including deputy witnesses) interviewed?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
43	Were all witness deputies interviewed or did they provide a written statement?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
Objective 3(g) - Determine if complainant and non-deputy witness interviews were recorded in their entirety.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
44	Was audio/video recording of the complainant's interview available?	N/A	N/A	He was unable to be contacted for an interview.	Complainant didn't return calls and didn't respond to 10-day letter.
45	If so, indicate if the recording was in audio or video form or both.	N/A	N/A	He was unable to be contacted for an interview.	
46	Was the audio/video recording of the complainant's interview recorded in its entirety?	N/A	N/A	He was unable to be contacted for an interview.	
47	If the interview was not recorded in its entirety, was it documented as to why not?	N/A	N/A	He was unable to be contacted for an interview.	
48	Was audio/video recording of the witnesses' (not deputy witnesses) interview available?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
49	If so, indicate if the recording was in audio or video form or both.	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
50	Was the audio/video recording of the witnesses' (not deputy witnesses) interview recorded in its entirety?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
51	If the interview was not recorded in its entirety, was it documented as to why not?	N/A	N/A	No witnesses.	
Objective 3(h) - Determine if complainant, involved employee, and all witness (including deputy) interviews, were conducted separately.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
52	If interviewed, were the interviews conducted separately?	YES	YES	The only person able to be interviewed was the involved party and they were interviewed separately.	
Objective 3(i) - Determine if an interpreter used for LEP complainants or witnesses was not party to the complaint, if applicable.					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
53	Was department personnel used to interpret for a LEP complainant or witness?	N/A	N/A		No LEP needed
54	If so, was the department personnel who was used as an interpreter for the LEP complainant or witness not a party to the complaint?	N/A	N/A		
Additional Information					
Q#	Question	APM Review:	PM Review:	AM Comment:	PM Comment:
55	Initial date complaint was reported?	01/02/19	01/02/19		
56	Unit Commander's Approval Date?	03/13/19	03/13/19		
57	How many calendar days from the Initial Complaint Report Date to the Unit Commander's Approval Date?	70	70		
58	Was the SCR packet completed (approved by Unit Commander) within 30 calendar days?	NO	NO		
59	Was the SCR packet forwarded to Division?	YES	YES		
60	Initial date complaint was reported?	01/02/19	01/02/19		
61	Date the Discovery Unit Received the SCR packet?	04/10/19	04/10/19		
62	How many calendar days from the Initial Complaint Report Date to the date the Discovery Unit received the SCR packet?	98	98		
63	Was the SCR packet forwarded to the Discovery Unit within 60 days?	NO	NO		
64	Did the information on the SCR correspond with the information in PRMG (specifically the PDE)?	YES	YES		
65	Did the WC Log Entry result in a SCR?	YES	YES	The SBAP which includes the WC Log entry info. included the SCR.	
Determine if any complaint initiated during the audit period was not completed.					
General Additional Information: Information is on a separate tab because this is a general/overall question. (This					