



As promised, I am bringing solutions and not only problems. This is your voice as it relates to the current promotional system. My next step will be to meet with the stakeholders and present your concerns to them in an effort to work together to make this system as fair as possible.

Question No. 2: In your experience, do you think the current LAPD advanced paygrade opportunities are fair?

78.8 percent of the participants responded “No,” while 21.12 percent responded “Yes.”

Below are some suggestions from our members:

- Additional promotional training, promoting based on merit.
- Response No. 30 stated, “I would recommend that peer and subordinate surveys of a candidate be solicited asking specific questions that are pertinent to the position being selected. These questions should include leadership, decision making, interpersonal relationships (does the candidate know how to get along well with other employees?), and specific job knowledge ... would encourage the League to lobby for peer and subordinate input on annual evaluations.”
- Some participants called for a greater degree of clarity/honesty in the process. Specifically, response No. 59 answered, “Video or audio recordings of interviews would allow for second-party review of the process. Maybe not all interviews would be reviewed by the second party, but the random review would provide some level of oversight.”
- Response No. 98 stated, “Look at what an individual has accomplished or overcome rather than the rhetoric of what they intend to do.”
- Several participants suggested a blind panel or candidate packages without names/ethnicity/gender listed until the oral interview step or until the decision to hire is made.
- More than 15 participants expressed the need for civilian input, possibly adding a civilian interviewer on panel/full panel of civilian for an oral interview, while other responses called for personnel outside of the division/outside bureau being the interview panelists.
- Several participants suggested making all parts of the promotion process equal weight (i.e. written test/oral interview/experience), response No. 316 suggested the following

breakdown, “25 percent should be work experience, 25 percent productivity, 25 percent interview, 25 percent education/training,” while response No. 378 stated, “50 percent, interview 50 percent. Judged by two separate panels.”

- Many of the participants stated interview/written test questions should pertain to the position being applied for, also removing college requirement or allowing years of service as an equivalent factor to college units/degrees. Response No. 1175 stated, “Have a sliding scale for patrol years to equal college credits.”
- Response No. 286 stated, “Whenever numerous applicants take a promotional oral for a position and that position is a re-run or re-advertisement,” the League should be questioning that.
- At least one participant suggested setting minimum standards that the whole pool of applicants must meet to continue in the promotion process.

Question No. 4: In your experience, do you feel the civil service promotional examination process is fair? (*Had the most responses.*)

46.34 percent of the participants responded “Yes,” while 53.66 percent responded “No.”

Below are some suggestions from our members:

- Participants expressed process was used more to disqualify certain candidates than evaluating them.
- Another participant stated no, “it has not evolved in 20 years,” while others expressed that written test questions favor officers in administrative positions who have time/ability to “research/study” this information (i.e. “regulations in old manuals”).
- Many participants said the process was too subjective.
- Response No. 175 and a few others expressed more fair than the advanced paygrade selection system. “At least in the promotional exam system, you’re removing prejudice, personal agendas, and favoritism while objectively verifying a functional level of an individual’s subject-related knowledge.” Response No. 233 stated, “more objective than our promotional pay grade system.”
- One participant stated, “Get rid of all Jacobs promotional system.” Another restated that peer feedback should be included in candidate package.
- Suggestion (like the last question) to make years of experience equivalent to bypass educational requirement.
- Response No. 568 cited this specific question, “How far must an aircraft land from a school?” which he felt was inappropriate. Multiple participants after stated command staff are aware written exam is a “de-selector.”
- Response No. 602 stated questions are leaked and afternoon group has an [unfair] advantage.
- Some participants felt there should be oversight of the written test questions. There are mistakes on the tests that fly under the radar and can change the meaning of the question, which interpreted by a candidate will undoubtedly change their response to the question (i.e., one participant referred to these as “double-worded questions”).
- At least two participants expressed awareness of “secret probation” of five years from the last complaint, which isn’t stated in manual.

- Response No. 703 stated, “One’s institutional knowledge of Policy and Procedure is important.”
- Response No. 761 suggested, “The examination should be written by people who currently hold the position that employees are testing for [and] not by command staff or civilians.”
- *Several participants of this question and the last felt the written test should not be pass/fail, it should be scored. Also, in response to the previous question, at least two participants suggested a debrief/review of process test scores for candidates who weren’t selected to improve their chances in the future.*

Question No. 5: As it relates to civil service promotions, do you feel that the oral interview, which holds 100 percent weight, is fair?

24.32 percent of the participants responded “Yes,” while 75.68 percent responded “No.”

Below are some suggestions from our members:

- “There should be a balance between the written, oral and package (experience). The interview is only a *small subjective glimpse of what that person offers and is often biased by the interview moderators’ personal opinions, personal knowledge, biases and outside influences.* Also, some very qualified, skilled and experienced applicants may not present well in an interview but have the ability and knowledge to successfully handle the task. Also, *interview responses and questions can be spoon-fed to select individuals with provided and cultivated responses without really giving any true or real insight into their strengths, abilities or experience.* A written test, if designed with applicable and relevant questions and material, would give insight to the person’s actual knowledge. Lastly, the *experience and package would reflect their strengths and ability as directly related to completed tasks and assignments.* At this time, so many less tenured and inexperienced individuals are being promoted, based on relationships and alliances, without the knowledge to effectively carry out their duties and/or supervise and develop subordinates. This lack of experience is weakening our Department and opening us up to liability.”
- “At most, it should be 40 percent, or at most 50 percent, as this is where favoritism tends to cloud the rankings.”
- Several participants felt written test and oral interview should be 50/50, many others felt candidates’ final determination whether to promote should be a combination (equal worth each) of written test, package review and oral interview.
- Several participants suggested that some individuals can give good oral interviews, but aren’t always who they seem, so weight should be taken off the oral to account for this, and more weight should be added to peer feedback and/or written exam results and/or experience (i.e. response No. 242 stated, “Great cops can have bad interviews, and bad cops can give good interviews.”).
- Some participants suggested a point system for accomplishing tasks, which would encourage candidates to take on responsibilities and duties.
- “The score should be a type of checklist wherein the applicant is given a designated number of points by answering questions, particular assignments that actually prepare the applicant for promotion (such as a sergeant II AWC who is applying to be a lieutenant),

including points for no suspension days, preventable traffic collisions, a certain number of years as a patrol officer or FTO, field sergeant, etc.”

- Some participants mentioned establishing objective criteria for interview panelists.
- Response No. 849 stated, “Weigh oral interview 40 percent, written test 40 percent and essay 20 percent, or some other percentages. DO NOT ALLOW THE CAPTAINS TO SEE THE TEST SCORES!”
- “Seniority points should be applied to the band you make and not increase your score.” (This goes along with a few responses to Question No. 6 that said exclude seniority points.)

Question No. 6: What ideas do you have to improve the current civil service promotional examination process?

- Response No. 18 stated, “1. Written exam. 2. Written essay. 3. Peer and supervisor reviews after passing the above. 4. Oral interview.”
- As in the previous question, establish objective criteria for different boards on oral interview.
- Response No. 49 stated, “Defer to League personnel who have actually studied the issue, listened to many dissenters who factually explain disparities they have observed and developed reasoned, well-thought-out alternatives.”
- Many participants repeated suggestion for civilian oversight/input as far as for interview panel.
- Repeated from previous questions’ responses, video/audio recording of the oral interview.
- Some participants suggested that the interview panel not be privy to questions they will ask or random selection of questions during the oral interview.
- Many participants alluded to bringing down the weight (percentage) of the oral interview some slightly (weight 70–90 percent), some moderately (50–60 percent) and some significantly (20–30 percent) (*i.e. response No. 202 stated, “Limit points for each test component. Example: 20 percent seniority, 20 percent oral interview, 20 percent education, 20 percent written test and 20 percent essay.”*)
- Response No. 275 stated, “Try selecting the interview panel from people who want to be on the board and care about employee development.”
- “Change how the interview panels are selected and assigned.” Response No. 1,170 stated, “Limit the amount of interviews panels can sit on during a workday and throughout the promotional period.”
- Response No. 335 stated, “Needs to be updated, and look at other agencies’ versions.” Another response indicated choosing interview board panel members at random, and another indicated independent boards for an oral interview from outside agencies. Many participants indicated oral boards being contracted to outside agency personnel or private firms.
- For oral interview boards, “Make the two sworn members equal rank so one sworn member doesn’t influence the other.”
- Response No. 606 stated, “Having a degree does not make you qualified. A person who chooses to serve their country as opposed to going to college should have the same opportunity.”

- Response No. 874 stated, “Scoring system like this: 10 percent written test, 50 percent package, 40 percent oral. The essay wouldn’t count towards written. The package would consist of more points for each different assignment worked. Basically, rewarding personnel for learning more about the Department and not staying stagnant.”
- In several of the questions from the survey, participants requested some type of reference/character check for candidates applying for promotional positions. Response No. 940 stated, “More time should be spent looking into the background, work ethic and character of the applicant. Maybe put together a cadre of people to actually go out and interview the candidates’ peers and beyond.” Another response indicated “background checks.”
- Response No. 1,000 stated, “More panelists, five instead of three.”
- Response No. 1,019 stated, “Base it on tenure (more than five years in a field position), merit (an officer’s production: radio calls handled, arrests, citations), and exclude TEAMS report. (Why is there an unwritten rule of five years until you can promote after taking a hit? Isn’t the point of the discipline system to correct behavior rather than to punish and hold back potentially promising officers?!)”

Question No. 7: Do you believe that one command staff officer from an outside agency should replace one of the LAPD command staff officers on the panel for the oral interview before the civil service commission for promotions? NOTE: Currently, one civilian and two sworn members of the LAPD command are panelists.

53.07 percent of the participants responded “Yes,” while 46.93 percent responded “No.”

Below are some suggestions from our members:

- Several responses said more civilians (i.e. two and one command staff) as they may interpret candidates’ qualities/shortcomings more in-depth than in-house panelists.
- At least seven participants said all external panelists.
- Many responses expressed that an outsider could offer no bias.
- Other responses said sworn command only because outsiders aren’t as familiar with Departmental policies/procedures/culture. Response No. 417 stated possibly all sworn from outside agency.
- Several responses indicated adding a panelist from personnel currently employed in the position being sought.
- “One civilian, one command and one outside staff office provide an equal playing field.”
- “City should do away with civilian board member and bring in an outside agency member.”
- Bringing in another civilian would contribute to the neutrality of the board/panel.
- ”As long as the member is not influenced by the LAPD staff officer. There should be NO deliberation after the applicant leaves the room. The individuals should not know what score the others gave. A blind assessment is essential to the integrity of the process.”

- “How about one civilian and two outside command staff officers? Why should any candidate get the benefit of having someone they worked for on his or her oral board?”

As always, if there is ever anything I can do to better support you, do not hesitate to reach out to me at JerrettaSandoz@lappl.org or call me at (213) 545-4903. Be safe.