



UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police Compliance with Employee Performance Standards

Report Number OIG-2017-05

March 2017

~~REPORT RESTRICTION LANGUAGE~~

~~Distribution of this Document is Restricted~~

~~This report contains sensitive law enforcement material and is the property of the Office of the Inspector General and is intended solely for the official use of the United States Capitol Police, the Capitol Police Board, or any agency or organization receiving the report directly from the Office of Inspector General. No Secondary distribution may be made, in whole or in part, outside the United States Capitol Police or Capitol Police Board, by them or by other agencies or organizations, without prior authorization by the Inspector General or the Capitol Police Board.~~



INSPECTOR GENERAL

PREFACE

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) prepared this report pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended. It is one of a series of audits, reviews, and investigative and special reports OIG prepares periodically as part of its oversight responsibility with respect to the United States Capitol Police (USCP) to identify and prevent fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

This report is the result of an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the office or function under review. It is based on interviews with employees and officials of relevant agencies and institutions, direct observation, and review of applicable documents.

We developed our recommendations based on the best knowledge available to OIG and discussed the draft with those responsible for implementation. It is my hope that the recommendations will result in more effective, efficient, and/or economical operations.


I express my appreciation to those contributing to the preparation of this report.

Fay F. Ropella, CPA, CFE
Inspector General

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abbreviations and Acronyms	iii
Executive Summary	1
Background	2
Objectives, Scope, and Methodology	3
Results	6
Inadequate Controls	7
Non-Compliance with Policies and Procedures	8
Appendices	12
Appendix A – List of Recommendations	13
Appendix B – Department Comments	14



Abbreviations and Acronyms

Calendar Year	CY
Chief Administrative Officer	CAO
Executive Performance Appraisal System	EPAS
Fiscal Year	FY
Government Accountability Office	GAO
Office of Human Resources	OHR
Office of Inspector General	OIG
Performance Evaluation and Communication System	PECS
Standard Operating Procedures	SOP
United States Capitol Police	USCP or the Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Capitol Police (USCP or the Department) Office of Human Resources (OHR) provides human capital strategies and tools for recruiting, hiring, developing, retaining, and transitioning a highly skilled and high-performing workforce to support the Department mission. According to Directive [REDACTED] and Directive [REDACTED] both dated May 28, 2012, the Department prepares annual performance plans for each sworn and civilian employee and appraises that performance with respect to how well the employee has met the requirements of his/her individual performance plan. The Directives identify OHR as the responsible party for overall implementation and administration of the EPAS and PECS processes.

During the Office of Inspector General (OIG) evaluation of the Department discipline process, Congressional Oversight Committee staffers were interested in whether USCP complied with employee evaluation requirements. As a result of that interest and in accordance with its Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 annual plan, OIG conducted a performance audit to determine if the Department (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring compliance with Department policies, and (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures as well as applicable laws, regulations, and best practices. The scope included controls, processes, and operations surrounding employee performance evaluations during FY 2015 through January 2017.

Overall, the Department did not have adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring successful implementation and administration over the EPAS and PECS programs. For example, the Department had not updated Directives [REDACTED] since May 28, 2012. Neither Directive was specific about due dates for performance appraisals, accountability, or monitoring. Although Directive [REDACTED] requires reviews and audits to ensure adherence to policy, the guidance does not specifically state what reviews and audits will consist of or how monitoring of the performance appraisals will occur.

Managers and supervisors were lax about completing employee appraisals and evaluations. During the scope of the audit, USCP had 51.51 percent and 27.88² percent completion rate for calendar year (CY) 2015 and CY 2016³, respectively. During the last 11 years, the Department averaged about 49 percent compliance with performance programs.

As of June 30, 2016, the Department had 2,087 employees subject to annual performance appraisals⁴; 2,076 of those used PECS, and 11 (8 civilians and 3 sworn) of those used EPAS. Among the 2,087 employees, 1,741 were sworn officers and 346 were civilian employees. We selected a sample of 60 employees (54 subject to PECS and 6 subject to EPAS) or 120

¹ OIG used appraisals, evaluations, and performance plans interchangeably.

² Completion rate for CY 2016 may actually be higher as additional appraisals are completed and submitted to OHR.

³ OHR provided employee counts in calendar year format. To accurately report compliance rates, the evaluations were compared to employee counts on a calendar year basis.

⁴ The Chief of Police and the Chief Administrative Officer are not included in the EPAS Directive.

performance appraisals to determine Department compliance with its directives, as displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 – Samples from Appraisal/Evaluation System

Evaluation System	EPAS Employees	PECS Employees	Totals
Employees Selected	6	54	60
Total Appraisals	11	109*	120

Source: OIG generated from FYs 2015-2016 data provided by OHR.

*One employee included in the EPAS count was tested in PECS in the first year due to a promotion from FYs 2015 to 2016. The 109 PECS record count includes the performance evaluation for FY 2015.

Of the 109 PECS performance appraisals for FY 2015 and FY 2016, supervisors did not complete 75, or 69 percent. Department supervisors also did not complete annual performance appraisals for Department executives. OHR was unable to locate 11 EPAS performance appraisals for either FY 2015 or FY 2016. That condition occurred primarily because OHR did not have a system of monitoring that would ensure that Department supervisors consistently completed annual performance appraisals for employees. Of 120 performance appraisals, managers and supervisors only submitted 33 to OHR—a failure rate of 73 percent. Of the 33 completed and submitted, 25 were late, not dated or signed before the end of the appraisal period—a non-compliance rate of 76 percent.

Late or nonexistent evaluations can potentially have a negative effect on employee morale, which can in turn affect Department performance as well as require additional resources to correct the negative impact. Given the high rate of missing, late, and incomplete evaluations, we recommend the Department place additional emphasis on ensuring timely evaluations. The Department should update the Directives to include effective monitoring controls. To ensure accountability and compliance, the Department also should hold managers and supervisors accountable for timely completion of performance plans and feedback. See Appendix A for a complete list of OIG recommendations.

On March 9, 2017, OIG conducted an exit conference and on March 10, 2017, we provided a draft report to Department officials. We incorporated the Department’s comments as applicable and attached their response to the report in its entirety in Appendix B.

Background

The employee evaluation⁵ process is an important tool for influencing employee performance. Employee evaluations are the official documents used to support many personnel actions, including within-grade pay increases, performance awards, promotions, and adverse performance-based actions. According to the *USCP Strategic Plan for FY 2015-2019*, one of the United States Capitol Police’s (USCP or the Department) transformational priorities is to establish a “Performance-Based Culture to Set Clear Expectations,” and the associated strategic goal is to “maximize efficiency and effectiveness through best practices and promote accountability through employee engagement and a positive work environment.”

⁵ Evaluation and appraisal used interchangeably throughout this report.

As a general policy, USCP prepares annual performance plans for each sworn and civilian employee and appraises that performance with respect to how well the employee has met the requirements of his/her individual performance plan. The basic purpose of Performance Evaluation and Communication System (PECS) and Executive Performance Appraisal System (EPAS) is to ensure and support employee performance that contributes to achieving the strategic plan, goals, and objectives of the Department. The Department's employee performance evaluation process comprises three parts: annual performance planning by the supervisor and employee, a midyear performance review, and a summary rating of employee performance at the end of the appraisal period.

According to the *Office of Human Resources (OHR) Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-2018 Plan*, OHR supports the USCP mission through human capital and development, providing consultation services, developing and administering policies, programs, and procedures that are necessary to ensure an effective and efficient human resources management program. "OHR ensures compliance with all applicable policy requirements of the Department, the Capitol Police Board and the Office of Compliance for the fulfillment of overall human resources management objectives."

According to its Office Plan, OHR is a staff function, which reports directly to the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). While OHR organizationally reports to the CAO, many of its functional activities require a direct relationship to the Chief of Operations and the Chief of Police.

As of June 30, 2016, the Department had 2,087 employees subject to annual performance appraisals⁶; 2,076 of those used PECS, and 11 (8 civilians and 3 sworn) of those used EPAS. Among the 2,087 employees, 1,741 were sworn officers and 346 were civilian employees, as shown in the table.

Table 2 – Employees Subject to an Appraisal

Employees	Count	Percentage	PECS	EPAS
Sworn	1,741	83.42%	1,738	3
Civilian	346	16.58%	338	8
Total	2,087	100.00%	2,076	11

Source: OIG generated from data provided by OHR as of June 30, 2016.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted this audit to determine if the Department (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring compliance with Department policies, and (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures as well as applicable laws, regulations, and best practices. The scope included controls, processes, and operations surrounding employee performance evaluation during FY 2015 through January 2017.

To accomplish our objectives, we interviewed officials from OHR and reviewed documentation to gain an understanding of the evaluation process in the following areas:

⁶ The Chief of Police and the Chief Administrative Officer are not included in the EPAS directive.

- Appraisal process
- Probationary period appraisal
- Electronic performance communication system
- Record retention policy
- Procedures and systems used to track and monitor performance evaluation
- Performance improvement plans
- Individual development plans
- *Office of Human Resources (OHR) FY 2015 – FY 2018 Plan*
- *USCP Strategic Plan FY 2015-2019*

To determine compliance, we reviewed the following guidance, consisting of USCP Directives, Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), USCP Bulletins and policies, and industry standards:

- USCP Bulletin [REDACTED], dated July 30, 2015
- Government Accountability Office (GAO), GAO-14-704G, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*, dated September 2014
- USCP Bulletin [REDACTED], dated June 4, 2014
- Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, *Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies*, 5th Edition, revised March 4, 2014
- USCP Bulletin [REDACTED], dated September 12, 2013
- USCP Bulletin 2050B, [REDACTED], dated June 21, 2013
- USCP Bulletin [REDACTED], dated June 20, 2013
- USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated October 19, 2012
- USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012

- USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012
- USCP Directive [REDACTED] dated May 28, 2012
- USCP Directive [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012
- USCP Directive [REDACTED] dated May 28, 2012
- USCP Bulletin [REDACTED] dated August 15, 2011
- USCP SOP [REDACTED], dated June 1, 2011
- USCP [REDACTED] dated February 18, 2005

We performed testing to determine compliance with USCP Directives regarding employee performance evaluations. There were 2,087 employees: 2,076 of which were subject to PECS and 11 (8 civilian and 3 sworn) of those were subject to EPAS testing criteria. Using a combination of statistical and judgmental methodology, we selected a sample of 60 employees to determine the Department's compliance with employee performance evaluation standards. Based on the results of two other OIG projects (Report Number OIG-2017-01 and OIG-2017-02⁷) and discussion with knowledgeable personnel, we selected sworn officers with the rank of Captain through Deputy Chief. This resulted in a selection of 31 sworn employees as of June 30, 2016. Because of the high proportion of lower-level sworn officers, we decided to select an additional random sample of 15 sworn officers with a rank below Captain, which resulted in a selection of 46 sworn officers. The remaining 14 of 60 employees were selected from the civilian population. Six of those individuals selected in our sample fell under EPAS, while the remaining 54 individuals fell under PECS standards.

Table 3 – Samples from Appraisal/Evaluation System

Sample by PECS/EPAS	Sworn	Civilian	Total
EPAS	3	3	6
PECS	43	11	54
Total	46	14	60

Source: OIG generated from OHR data related to FYs 2015 and 2016.

OIG conducted this performance audit in Washington, D.C., from February 2017 through March 2017 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence that will

⁷ OIG-2017-01, *Evaluation of the United States Capitol Police Disciplinary Process*, dated December 2016; OIG-2017-02, *Independent Auditor's Report Financial Statements for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2015*, dated December 2016.

provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. On March 9, 2017, we conducted an exit conference and March 10, 2017, we provided a draft copy of this report to Department officials for comment. See Appendix A for a complete list of OIG recommendations. OIG incorporated Department comments as applicable and attached their response to the report in its entirety as Appendix B.

RESULTS

Overall, the Department did not have adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring efficient and effective administration of its performance evaluation system. As a result, managers and supervisors did not comply with Department guidance related to employee performance.

USCP had 51.51 percent and 27.88 percent compliance rates for calendar year (CY) 2015 and CY 2016, respectively, as shown in Table 4. OHR provided employee counts in calendar year format. To accurately report compliance rates, the evaluations were compared to employee counts on a calendar year basis. Based on evaluations entered into [REDACTED]⁸ for the last 11 years, the Department averaged a compliance rate of about 49 percent.

Table 4 – Compliance Rates for Employee Appraisals

Calendar Year	Evaluations Entered into [REDACTED]	Employee Count (as of 12/31)	Compliance Rate
2006	923	1,941	47.55%
2007	972	1,950	49.85%
2008	992	2,051	48.37%
2009	1,060	2,211	47.94%
2010	1,310	2,152	60.87%
2011	1,079	2,148	50.23%
2012	1,039	2,131	48.76%
2013	1,372	2,073	66.18%
2014	921	2,101	43.84%
2015	1,078	2,093	51.51%
2016	595	2,134	27.88%*
Average			49.36%

Source: OIG generated from evaluation tracking report as of February 8, 2017, provided by OHR.

* Compliance rate for CY 2016 may actually be higher as additional appraisals are completed and submitted to OHR

⁸ OHR tracks the performance of the evaluation process using the time and attendance system, [REDACTED]

Inadequate Controls

The Department did not have adequately designed controls that would ensure successful implementation and administration over the PECS and EPAS programs (See Appendices C and D.) An evaluation tracking report, as of February 8, 2017, provided by OHR revealed data indicating failure rates around 50 percent for the last 11 years. Our sample of 60 employees resulted in testing of 120 performance appraisals covering 2015 and 2016. Of the 120 performance appraisals, the managers and supervisors submitted only 33 to OHR, a failure rate of 73 percent.

Although the Department had written policies and procedures related to responsible parties for overall implementation and administration of PECS and EPAS programs, those policies and procedures were not sufficient. For example, Directive [REDACTED] "includes reviews and audits to ensure adherence to policy," but the Directive did not specifically state what the reviews and audits should consist of and how to monitor completion of the performance appraisals. Directive [REDACTED] also stated that "copies of the PECS Performance Planning and Appraisal Form should be distributed to the supervisor, employee, and OHR no later than 30 days after the appraisal period ends"; however, the Directive did not list controls that would ensure completion of the final appraisal or compliance with the time limits. OHR also did not monitor completion of the performance plans (standards) or midyear reviews. For example, a supervisor submitted a final performance appraisal to OHR, but the initial performance plan and midyear review were not completed.

The GAO, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* state:

Effective documentation assists in management's design of internal control by establishing and communicating the who, what, when, where, and why of internal control execution to personnel. Documentation also provides a means to retain organizational knowledge and mitigate the risk of having that knowledge limited to a few personnel, as well as a means to communicate that knowledge as needed to external parties, such as external auditors.

Management documents internal control to meet operational needs. Documentation of controls, including changes to controls, is evidence that controls are identified, capable of being communicated to those responsible for their performance, and capable of being monitored and evaluated by the entity.

The Department should update its policies and procedures to include controls that will ensure successful OHR implementation of the annual performance appraisals for all employees. The Department should also include in its updated policies and procedures to include controls, which would ensure that supervisors are accountable for completing the initial performance plans, midyear reviews, and final reviews within required timeframes.

Employees did not consistently receive annual performance plans, midyear reviews, or final performance appraisals, which are an integral part of the USCP strategic and performance planning process. In turn, decision makers may not have had adequate information or background on employees who may have been up for promotion or discipline, which would have provided documentation in support of executive decisions.

Conclusions

The Department did not have adequate controls to ensure that supervisors provided and completed annual performance plans, midyear reviews, and performance appraisals as required. Department guidance should be updated to include specific details regarding OHR and senior management monitoring to ensure employee performance contributes to achieving the Department's mission, goals, and objectives. As a result, employees were not consistently receiving performance evaluations—a situation that could lead to incomplete and inadequate information for decision makers. Thus, OIG makes the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the United States Capitol Police update the Directives [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012; and [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012; to include controls for issuance, completion, monitoring, and documentation that will ensure accountability of the appraisal program. Monitoring should include a requirement for periodic reports to Commanders and Office Directors on the status of incomplete appraisals.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the United States Capitol Police hold supervisors accountable for timely completion of performance plans and feedback to subordinates and document such efforts in supervisors' annual appraisals, thereby, ensuring accountability and compliance with directives.

Non-Compliance with Policies and Procedures

Managers and supervisors did not comply with the Department PECS and EPAS performance planning process. The non-compliance issues included managers and supervisors submitting evaluations that were (1) incomplete, (2) late, and (3) contained errors. The condition occurred because the Department did not have a process for ensuring compliance.

Non-Compliance with Appraisal and Evaluation Directives [REDACTED]

OHR did not comply with Directives [REDACTED]. Directive [REDACTED] requires that supervisors complete annual performance appraisals for selected executives. Senior officials did not, however, complete performance appraisals in a timely manner. Our sample of six executives using EPAS resulted in 11⁹ performance appraisals covering FY 2015 and FY 2016—of which none had an appraisal in their personnel files. The Department promoted one of the executives during our scope after he received a performance appraisal however, he did not receive a performance appraisal the year after he was promoted. This could indicate the Department either promoted employees without an evaluation or that managers prepared evaluations only for promotions.

⁹ We selected six executive employees to test for an annual evaluation for FY 2015 and FY 2016 (6 employees X 2 annual evaluations = 12 evaluations.) The Department promoted one of the six employees selected in our sample. For this employee we only tested one evaluation that pertained to EPAS (12 evaluations - 1 = 11 evaluations.)

Directive [REDACTED] requires that the Department must “prepare annual performance plans for the incumbents of executive positions and to appraise their performance with respect to how well the employees have met the requirements of their performance plans.” OHR did not, however, conduct the required reviews and audits during FY 2015 or FY 2016. OHR officials stated the reviews were not completed because of limited resources.

Directive [REDACTED] requires preparation of “annual performance plans for each sworn and civilian employee” and appraisals for “performance with respect to how well the employee has met the requirements of his/her individual performance plan.” OHR did not provide documentation that supervisors completed annual reviews for Department employees. Our sample of 54 PECS for employees resulted in an overall sample size of 109¹⁰ appraisals during FY 2015 and FY 2016. Of those 109, only 33 or 31 percent, were documented as having conducted an evaluation with the employee.

Although it is responsible for the overall implementation and administration of the EPAS and PECS programs, OHR did not have a system for monitoring compliance with directives. In addition, Directive [REDACTED] did not adequately outline controls and responsibilities related to the completion of performance evaluations.

Absence of performance appraisals and feedback for Department employees could result in an overall decline in the Department effectiveness, leaving decision makers without sufficient information on employees who may be up for promotion or discipline, which would provide documentation in support of decisions made.

Untimely Completion of Performance Plans and Appraisals

Directive [REDACTED] requires that rating officials sign and date appraisals to document that reviews were conducted. Some supervisors did not, however, complete the performance plans and appraisals in a timely manner. Of 120 performance appraisals in our sample, only 33, or 28 percent, were completed and in personnel files. Of the 33 completed appraisals, 24 official signatures were either missing or late. In one instance, the rating official signed the initial performance plan 2 months after the rating period ended—approximately 14 months late. Of the 33 completed appraisals, 26 employee signatures for initial performance plans were missing, late, or not dated. In seven instances, the employee signed the initial performance plan a month or more after rating period ended—making it 13 months late. See the timeline below in Table 5.

¹⁰ We selected 54 employees (43 sworn and 11 civilian) under PECS for FY 2015 and FY 2016 (54 employees X 2 annual evaluations = 108 evaluations). One employee was included in the EPAS count of 6 employees but was tested to both PECS and EPAS standards due to a promotion from FY 2015 to FY 2016 resulting in an additional appraisal tested to PECS standards (108 evaluations + 1 = 109 evaluations.)

Table 5 – PECS Appraisal Timeline Example (August 1, 2016 – July 31, 2017)

Initial Performance Plan	September 1, 2016 (30 days after appraisal period begins)
Midyear Review	February 1, 2017 (Approximately middle of the appraisal period)
Final Performance Appraisal Completed	August 15, 2017 (2 weeks after appraisal period ends)
Final Performance Appraisal Submitted to OHR	August 31, 2017 (30 days after appraisal period ends)

Source: Directive [REDACTED]

Of 33 completed midyear appraisals, 28 rating official signatures were either missing or late. In two instances, the rating official signed the midyear review 2 months after the rating period ended. Additionally, 28 employee signatures related to the midyear evaluation were either missing or late. In two instances, the employee signed the midyear review 2 months after the rating period ended.

Of the 33 completed final appraisals, 20 rating official signatures were late or early. In addition, rating officials did not properly date the final appraisals. In one instance, the rating official signed the final performance appraisal 5 months after the rating period ended. In two separate instances, the rating official signed the final performance appraisal prior to completion of the appraisal period. Additionally, 19 employees signed final appraisal either late or early and in numerous cases did not date the final appraisal. In one instance, the employee signed the final performance appraisal 5 months after the rating period ended. In two separate instances, the employee signed the final performance appraisal prior to the completion of the appraisal period.

Table 6 presents a graphical display of exceptions.

Table 6 – PECS Exception Breakdown

Attribute	Not Signed	Not Dated	Late	Early	Total	Error Rate
Number of Appraisals Completed for FY 2015 and FY 2016					33	
Rating Official Signature for Initial Performance Plan	15	-	9	-	24	73%
Employee Signature for Initial Performance Plan	15	1	10	-	26	79%
Rating Official Signature for Midyear Review	26	-	2	-	28	85%
Employee Signature for Midyear Review	25	-	3	-	28	85%
Rating Official Signature for Final Performance Appraisal	-	-	18	2	20	60%
Employee Signature for Final Performance Appraisal	-	1	16	2	19	56%

Source: OIG generated from PECSs data located in the employee personnel files (33 completed appraisals for FY 2015 and FY 2016.)

Directive [REDACTED] states that the immediate supervisor and the employee must discuss core competencies and how those competencies relate to the employee's duties and responsibilities, and the rating official must sign the employee's planning and appraisal forms. The plan should be in place no later than 30 days after the appraisal period begins.

Directive [REDACTED] states that during midyear performance reviews, rating officials must review employee performance, including the employee's strengths or weaknesses regarding core

competencies as well as provide completed appraisals to OHR no later than 2 weeks after the close of the rating period.

Directive [REDACTED] did not provide adequate guidance on controls and responsibilities related to the timely completion of these milestones. In addition, the Department did not monitor compliance with the Directive requiring timely completion of the performance plan, midyear performance review, and the final performance appraisal.

The untimeliness of performance plans for Department employees can result in a lack of clear direction for employees for the following year (appraisal period). The lack of clear direction could further lead to a decline in both employee and Department effectiveness and efficiency.

Furthermore, the lack of direction and guidance does not promote an environment of improvement in the Department or an environment conducive to personal development for the employee.

Untimely Filing of Performance Appraisals with OHR

Directive [REDACTED] stated, "copies of the PECS Performance Planning and Appraisal Form should be distributed to the supervisor, employee, and OHR no later than 30 days after the appraisal period ends." Department rating officials did not provide completed appraisals to OHR in a timely manner. OHR records the time it receives performance evaluations. Our sample of 60 employees resulted in testing of 120 performance appraisals covering FY 2015 and FY 2016. Of the 120 performance appraisals, the Department only submitted 33 to OHR. Of the 33, 25 appraisals were either submitted late or early. For example, in one instance the rating official submitted the final appraisal to OHR 4 months after the rating period ended. In another instance, the rating official submitted the final appraisal to OHR 9 days prior to the end of the rating period.

The untimely submission of performance appraisals can result in inaccurate record keeping and documentation for employees. As a result, sufficient information or background may not have been available for officials when making promotion and discipline decisions.

Conclusions

The Department did not comply with Department guidance requiring that supervisors perform annual performance plans, midyear reviews, and performance appraisals for all Department employees. In addition, managers and supervisors did not comply with guidance regarding timely completion of the performance appraisals. Furthermore, USCP did not comply with Department guidance requiring that supervisors submit completed performance appraisals to OHR in a timely manner. The guidance did not contain adequate controls for ensuring that supervisors complete annual performance plans, midyear reviews, and performance appraisals. The guidance also did not include specific details regarding monitoring. Thus, OIG makes the following recommendation.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that the United States Capitol Police Office of Human Resources utilize [REDACTED] to enhance monitoring, reporting, and documenting of employee appraisals.

APPENDICES



List of Recommendations

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the United States Capitol Police update the Directives [REDACTED] dated May 28, 2012; and [REDACTED], dated May 28, 2012; to include controls for issuance, completion, monitoring, and documentation that will ensure accountability of the appraisal program. Monitoring should include a requirement for periodic reports to Commanders and Office Directors on the status of incomplete appraisals.

Recommendation 2: We recommend that the United States Capitol Police hold supervisors accountable for timely completion of performance plans and feedback to subordinates and document such efforts in supervisors' annual appraisals, thereby, ensuring accountability and compliance with directives.

Recommendation 3: We recommend that the United States Capitol Police Office of Human Resources utilize [REDACTED] to enhance monitoring, reporting, and documenting of employee appraisals.

DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

	UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF 119 O STREET NE WASHINGTON, DC 20510-7218 March 15, 2017	Police 170-274-3025
	COP 170062	
MEMORANDUM		
TO:	Fay F. Ropella, CPA, CFE Inspector General	
FROM:	Matthew R. Verderosa Chief of Police	
SUBJECT:	Response to Office of Inspector General (OIG) draft report <i>Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police Compliance with Employee Performance Standards</i> (Report No. OIG-2017-05)	
<p>The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the United States Capitol Police response to the recommendations contained within the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) draft report <i>Performance Audit of the United States Capitol Police Compliance with Employee Performance Standards</i> (Report No. OIG-2017-05).</p> <p>The Department generally agrees with all of the recommendations and appreciates the opportunity to further improve upon the policies and procedures within the Office of Human Resources. The Department will assign Action Plans to appropriate personnel regarding each recommendation to achieve long-term resolution of each matter.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the OIG's draft report. Your continued support of the women and men of the United States Capitol Police is appreciated.</p> <p>Very respectfully,</p> <p></p> <p>Matthew R. Verderosa Chief of Police</p> <p>cc: Steven A. Sund, Assistant Chief of Police Richard Braddock, Chief Administrative Officer [REDACTED] USCP Audit Liaison</p>		
Nationally Accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc.		

CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Success of the OIG mission to prevent fraud, waste, abuse, or mismanagement depends on the cooperation of employees and the public. There are several ways to report questionable activity.

Call us at 202-593-3868 or toll-free at 866-906-2446. A confidential or anonymous message can be left 24 hours a day/7 days a week.



Toll-Free
1-866-906-2446

Write us:

*United States Capitol Police
Attn: Office of Inspector General
499 South Capitol St. SW, Suite 345
Washington, DC 20510*



Or visit us:

*499 South Capitol Street, SW, Suite 345
Washington, DC 20003*



You can also contact us by email at: OIG@USCP.GOV

When making a report, convey as much information as possible such as: Who? What? Where? When? Why? Complaints may be made anonymously or you may request confidentiality.

Additional Information and Copies: To obtain additional copies of this report, call OIG at 202-593-4201.

