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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor (OUA) during the last quarter of 2011, the Board of Trustees at its January 2012 meeting directed that Police Services be reviewed. The OUA had previously reviewed Police Services in 2008.

We visited the California State University, Fresno campus from July 23, 2012, through August 31, 2012, and audited the procedures in effect at that time.

Our study and evaluation did not reveal any significant internal control problems or weaknesses that would be considered pervasive in their effects on police services activities. However, we did identify other reportable weaknesses that are described in the executive summary and body of this report. In our opinion, the operational and administrative controls for police services activities in effect as of August 31, 2012, taken as a whole, were sufficient to meet the objectives stated in the “Purpose” section of this report.

As a result of changing conditions and the degree of compliance with procedures, the effectiveness of controls changes over time. Specific limitations that may hinder the effectiveness of an otherwise adequate system of controls include, but are not limited to, resource constraints, faulty judgments, unintentional errors, circumvention by collusion, and management overrides. Establishing controls that would prevent all these limitations would not be cost-effective; moreover, an audit may not always detect these limitations.

The following summary provides management with an overview of conditions requiring attention. Areas of review not mentioned in this section were found to be satisfactory. Numbers in brackets [ ] refer to page numbers in the report.

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT [7]

University police department (UPD) policies and procedures did not contain all information required by systemwide policy. For example, policies needed to be created in the areas of information security of police systems and crime prevention activities and updated for incident response, Clery reporting, and ammunition tracking.

SYSTEM ACCESS, PHYSICAL SECURITY AND RECORDS RETENTION [8]

Access to the Records Information Management System (RIMS) needed improvement. For example, the RIMS system did not have minimum password standards, nor did it require passwords to be changed at periodic intervals.

FISCAL ADMINISTRATION [9]

Reimbursement processing for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) training needed improvement. Specifically, none of the POST reimbursement checks received in fiscal year (FY) 2011/12 were deposited until July 2012, and a number of reimbursements for FY 2010/11 and FY 2011/12 were still outstanding at the time of the audit. In addition, recovery of UPD costs for special events needed improvement. For example, there was no documentation to support the current rates
charged for police officer work at special events, and there was no review or reconciliation of the cost recovery account where special event revenues and expenditures were recorded.

**MAJOR INCIDENTS AND CRIME REPORTING [11]**

The campus emergency management plan had not been updated since 2008.

**WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION CONTROLS [12]**

UPD weapons policies needed to be updated, and presidential approval for non-standard weapons was not documented.
INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The California State University (CSU) Public Safety Program began in 1974 with a two-year pilot project on the CSU Northridge campus. A systemwide committee subsequently forwarded recommendations regarding a “public safety approach” for CSU campuses to the chancellor. The chancellor’s Council of Presidents endorsed the recommendations, and public safety departments were established on all CSU campuses. In 2007, those departments were renamed “police services” to emphasize the service aspect, and since then, campuses have been adjusting their organizations accordingly.

The CSU residence population has increased greatly over the years, and the problems associated with this growth have been similar to those experienced by small municipalities. Sexual assaults, alcohol use, drug abuse, and vandalism have increased, and legislation has mandated more involvement by university police officers in the investigation and prevention of crimes, as well as the care of the victims. As a result, CSU police services departments have created policing programs and preventive patrols to deter crime. Also, the growth of on-campus housing has increased the complexity of emergency planning, and parking structures built on campuses have sparked an increase in auto burglaries and theft and have necessitated the need for increased patrols.

The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1989 became Title 2 of Public Law 101-542, the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act of 1990. The act amended Section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 by adding campus crime statistics and security policy disclosure provisions for colleges and universities. This law (now known as the Jeanne Clery Act) applies to all institutions of higher education, both public and private, that participate in any federal student aid programs and requires schools to publicly disclose basic security policies and three years of campus crime statistics.

In 1992, the Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights was incorporated into the Jeanne Clery Act. Then, in 1998, the act was amended to expand the scope of campus crime statistic reporting, to ensure crime statistics are reported in accordance with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reporting program, and to require the maintenance of a public police log of all reported crimes. It also requires each campus to maintain a policy that mandates the issuance of timely warnings when a crime, reportable in the annual statistics, is known to the school and poses an ongoing threat to the campus. The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 reauthorized the Higher Education Act of 1965 and provided additional campus reporting requirements, such as the relationship of campus security personnel with state and local police, emergency response and evacuation procedures, and missing person procedures.

In California, the Kristen Smart Campus Safety Act of 1998 was signed into law on August 11, 1998. This act requires California colleges to promulgate rules requiring each of their respective campuses to enter into written agreements with local law enforcement agencies that designate which law enforcement agency has operational responsibility for the investigation of violent crimes occurring on campus. It also requires campuses to delineate the specific boundaries of each agency’s operational responsibility.

Recent budget cuts in higher education in California have resulted in increased student protests and demonstrations at the CSU and other California educational institutions. It remains a challenge to balance freedom of speech and assembly with the maintenance of order, and there has been increased scrutiny by the public and the legislature regarding the management of these events, especially in the use of force.
In recent years, in response to increased training standards from the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and governmental agencies, campus administrators have worked to upgrade the quality of university police services, and five CSU campuses are currently accredited by international accreditation agencies. CSU Los Angeles, CSU Fullerton, CSU San Marcos, and San Francisco State University have received accreditation from the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, and San Francisco State University and CSU Northridge have received accreditation from the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies.

At the systemwide level, policies have been developed to create uniform standards for vehicles, equipment, training, emergency preparedness, and critical response units, as well as semiannual meetings of campus police chiefs. In April 2001, the chancellor’s office issued Executive Order (EO) 787, modifying the CSU Public Safety Policy Manual that was required by agreement between the CSU Board of Trustees and the Statewide University Police Association. In 2007, administrative and risk management responsibilities for systemwide police services were reassigned from Systemwide Human Resources to the Office of Risk Management.

In 2010, in response to the recommendations of the 2008 Police Services Systemwide Audit, a systemwide chief law enforcement officer position was created. Responsibilities of the chief law enforcement officer include oversight over compliance issues in police services and emergency management, such as developing policies and procedures addressing systemwide police services, emergency preparedness, critical incident response, and chancellor’s office security issues. The position reports to the assistant vice chancellor of risk management and public safety.

In addition, EO 1046, Police and Public Safety Police Guidelines, and additional police services technical letters were implemented in 2010 to further define systemwide policies and expectations for campus police departments. These policies require campuses to maintain event management and crowd control procedures, as well as use-of-force guidelines and procedures, to ensure that management of protests and demonstrations is adequately and consistently controlled throughout the CSU system.

Throughout this report, we will refer to the program as police services. The titles of the departments assigned responsibility for managing CSU campus public safety and parking operations include, among others, the department of public safety, police and parking services, and the university police department.
PURPOSE

Our overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to the administration of police services and law enforcement, and to determine the adequacy of controls over related processes to ensure compliance with relevant government regulations, Trustee policy, Office of the Chancellor directives, and campus procedures.

Within the overall audit objective, specific goals included determining whether:

- Administration and management of the police services (PS) program provide an effective internal control environment, clear lines of organizational authority and responsibility, current and comprehensive policies and procedures, and self-evaluation techniques to measure program and management effectiveness.

- Access to the police services office and automated systems is adequately controlled and limited to authorized persons, data backup procedures are in place, and physical security over system hardware is adequate.

- Security and retention of departmental records are adequate.

- Staffing and scheduling provide appropriate coverage, effective use of overtime, and compliance with collective bargaining agreements.

- Hiring, certification, and training of police services employees is in accordance with POST standards, state regulations, and CSU policy.

- Citizen complaints and internal investigations are handled in compliance with state and federal regulations, CSU policy, and collective bargaining agreements.

- Budgeting processes adequately address police services funding and expenditures, and budget monitoring processes ensure effective accounting and management control.

- POST reimbursements, PS expenditures, and cost recovery for services and events are adequately controlled.

- Processes and policies exist for managing and reporting major incidents in accordance with state and federal regulations and CSU policy.

- Crime reporting procedures are well controlled and in accordance with federal and state regulations, and relationships with outside agencies comply with the Kristen Smart Campus Security Act of 1998.

- Weapons are appropriately authorized, and weapons and ammunition are properly handled, accounted for, and safeguarded.
SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The proposed scope of the audit as presented in Attachment A, Audit Agenda Item 2 of the January 24 and 25, 2012, meeting of the Committee on Audit stated that Police Services includes compliance with federal, state, and local rules and regulations, systemwide directives, and campus policies and procedures. Proposed audit scope would include review of campus policies and procedures; compliance with state-mandated standards and training requirements; timely and appropriate response to incidents, including appropriate policies and training governing the use of force; controls over sensitive or special equipment; accurate crime reporting; appropriate adjudication of internal investigations or personnel complaints; and access to law enforcement data.

Our study and evaluation were conducted in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors and included the audit tests we considered necessary in determining whether operational and administrative controls are in place and operative. This review emphasized, but was not limited to, compliance with Board of Trustee policies and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. The audit focused on procedures in effect from January 1, 2010, through August 31, 2012.

We focused primarily on the internal administrative, compliance, and operations controls over PS activities. Specifically, we reviewed and tested:

- Procedures for communicating systemwide and campus-specific policies, rules, and regulations.
- Staffing, scheduling, and internal investigation procedures.
- Fiscal procedures for budgeting, chargebacks, POST reimbursements, and expenses.
- Procedures for maintaining and securing public safety records, files, and information.
- Procedures for accumulating and reporting crime statistics.
- Hiring, certification, and training compliance.
- Procedures for controlling weapons and ammunition.
- Data security, disaster recovery, and backup procedures.
OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, 
AND CAMPUS RESPONSES

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

University Police Department (UPD) policies and procedures did not contain all information required by systemwide policy.

We found that:

- The UPD policy manual did not include specific policies on information security in police systems or crime prevention activities.

- The active shooter/incident response policy did not include expectations for conducting annual active shooting training exercises.

- The Clery reporting policy did not include expectations for the reconciliation of crime statistics data with Clery statistics, chancellor’s office reporting, and Uniform Crime Reporting regulations.

- The firearms policy did not include tracking of ammunition purchases and inventory procedures.

Technical Letter Police Services (PS) 2010-01, CSU Police Services Policies and Manual Maintenance Requirements, dated July 26, 2010, states, in part, that each campus police department shall implement and maintain operational policies and procedures in the following areas: information security of police data, access to terminals, computer-aided dispatch/record management systems, Department of Justice terminals, data back-up and storage procedures in accordance with best practices doctrines to include but not be limited to password complexity, intervals, and off-site storage; procedures for tracking ammunition purchases, inventory, distribution, and use; reconciliation of crime statistics data and consistency of data with the Jeanne Clery statistics, the Chancellor’s Criminal Statistics Report, and the Uniform Crime Reporting regulations; policy and procedures for mitigating campus crime and encouraging crime prevention deterrence activities; and an active shooter/incident policy that includes expectations for conducting periodic, but not less than annually, active shooter training exercises, classroom instruction, table top exercises, and other applicable training methods.

The chief of police stated that the department had recently subscribed to the Lexipol policy management service and created a comprehensive policy manual; however, these particular items had not been included due to oversight.

Incomplete written policies and procedures increase the risk of non-compliance with government and California State University (CSU) requirements and the potential for weaknesses in the internal control environment.
Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus update UPD policies and procedures to incorporate all information required by systemwide policy.

Campus Response

We concur. The campus will update UPD policies and procedure to incorporate all information required by systemwide policy by April 17, 2013.

SYSTEMS ACCESS, PHYSICAL SECURITY, AND RECORDS RETENTION

Access to the Records Information Management System (RIMS) needed improvement.

We noted that:

- The RIMS system did not have minimum password standards, nor did it require passwords to be changed at periodic intervals.

- The semiannual review of RIMS system users was not documented.

The California State Information Security Office, Information Security Program Guide for State Agencies, dated April 2008, states that best practices for access control include establishing password standards such as minimum length requirements with a combination of characters and numbers, appropriate periodic password aging, and auditing access level rights at regular intervals.

Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM) §8060.0, Access Control, effective April 19, 2010, states that appropriate campus managers and data owners must review, at least annually, user access rights to information assets containing protected data, and the results of the review must be documented.

The chief of police stated that because access to the RIMS system was restricted using campus network authentication, he was unaware that further system controls were required. Additionally, he stated that he was unaware of the requirement to document the user access review of the RIMS system.

Failure to set local password controls and document reviews of system users increases the risk of inappropriate access to systems and sensitive data.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus:

a. Implement minimum password standards for the RIMS system, and require that passwords be changed at periodic intervals.
b. Document the semiannual review of RIMS system users.

**Campus Response**

We concur. The campus will implement minimum password standards for the RIMS system, requiring password changes at periodic intervals. We will also begin to document the semiannual review of RIMS system users. Both items will be completed by January 10, 2013.

**FISCAL ADMINISTRATION**

**POST REIMBURSEMENTS**

Reimbursement processing for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) training needed improvement.

We found that:

- None of the POST reimbursement checks received in fiscal year (FY) 2011/12 were deposited until July 2012.

- Unclaimed or outstanding reimbursements were not reviewed on a regular basis, and the campus did not always follow up with POST on the status of these reimbursements. A number of reimbursements for FY 2010/11 and FY 2011/12 were still outstanding at the time of the audit, although reimbursement requests had been resubmitted for these items in July 2012.

- Segregation of duties for the POST reimbursement process was inadequate. One employee tracked POST receivables, followed up on amounts due, received POST reimbursement checks in the mail, and created the departmental deposit.

ICSUAM §3102.11, *Deposits and Transfers to the Bank*, dated July 1, 2011, states that deposits must be made on a timely and secure basis. Collections at departments must be deposited at a designated cashiering station at least weekly, or whenever collections exceed $500.

ICSUAM §3102.02, *Segregation of Cash Handling Duties*, effective April 1, 2011, states that mailed remittances shall be verified, processed by a separate individual, and restrictively endorsed by the close of business on the date of receipt. The person collecting cash, issuing cash receipts, and preparing the departmental deposit must be someone other than the person performing the monthly review of the general ledger, the person maintaining accounts receivable records, or the person following up on collectibles.

The chief of police stated that the failure to adequately administer POST reimbursements was due to staffing constraints.
Failure to adequately administer POST training reimbursements increases the risk that misappropriation of funds will not be detected, reimbursements will not be received, and the availability of UPD training funds will be reduced.

**Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus:

a. Deposit POST reimbursement checks in a timely manner according to CSU policy.

b. Review unclaimed or outstanding reimbursements on a regular basis, and follow up on the status of these reimbursements with POST as necessary.

c. Implement adequate segregation of duties for the POST reimbursement process.

**Campus Response**

We concur. We will take the following steps to implement these recommendations:

a. Effective December 1, 2012, POST reimbursement checks will be deposited in a timely manner according to CSU policy.

b. Effective December 1, 2012, the campus will begin to review unclaimed or outstanding reimbursements on a regular basis, and follow up on the status of these reimbursements with POST as necessary.

c. Effective December 1, 2012, the campus will implement adequate segregation of duties for the POST reimbursement process. This will include a supervisory review, approval, and reconciliation.

**SPECIAL EVENT ACCOUNTING**

Recovery of UPD costs for special events needed improvement.

We found that:

- There was no documentation to support the current rates charged for police officer work at special events.

- The campus did not have procedures regarding the time frame in which special event billings should be created.

- The cost recovery account where special event revenues and expenditures were recorded was not reviewed or reconciled to ensure the accuracy of amounts in the account.
State Administrative Manual (SAM) §7920 states that each agency is responsible to complete any reconciliation necessary to safeguard state assets and ensure reliable financial data.

SAM §20050 states that elements of a satisfactory system of internal accounting and administrative controls include a system of authorization and recordkeeping procedures adequate to provide effective accounting control over assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenditures. Further, it states that one symptom of control deficiencies are policies and procedures that are either not currently maintained or non-existent.

The chief of police stated that lack of documentation to support current rates charged, delays in invoicing, and lack of review of the cost recovery account were caused by employee turnover.

Inadequate control over recovery of costs for PS work at special events increases the risk of inaccurate, incomplete, and untimely reimbursements to PS and reduces funds available for law enforcement activities.

**Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus:

a. Document the current rates charged for police officer work at special events.

b. Develop procedures regarding the time frame in which special event billings should be created.

c. Implement a periodic review or reconciliation of the cost recovery account where special event revenues and expenditures are recorded to ensure the accuracy of amounts in the account.

**Campus Response**

We concur. The campus will develop standard operating procedures for special event accounting to include documented rates charged for police officer work, time frame for event billing, and periodic review and reconciliation of cost recovery by April 17, 2013.

**MAJOR INCIDENTS AND CRIME REPORTING**

The campus emergency management plan had not been updated since 2008.

Executive Order 1056, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, effective March 1, 2011, states that on an annual basis, or more frequently as needed, the campus emergency management plan should be reviewed, updated, and distributed to the emergency management team members and others as identified by the campus. Documentation of review, update, and distribution must be in the form of a signed and dated written acknowledgment that is attached to the master campus emergency plan.
The chief of police stated that the emergency management plan was not updated in a timely manner due to the reorganization of the division and turnover in the emergency management coordinator position.

Failure to maintain an updated emergency management plan increases the risk of inadequate emergency response.

**Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus update the campus emergency management plan.

**Campus Response**

We concur. The campus will update the campus emergency management plan by April 17, 2013.

**WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION CONTROLS**

UPD weapons policies needed updating, and presidential approval for the use of non-standard weapons was not documented.

We found that:

- Policy 312, *Firearms*, stated that qualifications for duty weapons were to be performed quarterly; however, the campus practice was to perform these qualifications semiannually. In addition, two of the nine sworn officers we reviewed had not qualified on their duty weapons since June 2010 and September 2011.

- Policy 312, *Firearms*, stated that qualifications for off-duty weapons were to be performed quarterly; however, the campus practice was to perform these qualifications annually.

- Policy 432, *Patrol Rifles*, stated that qualifications for patrol rifles were to be performed quarterly and that inspections were to be performed monthly. However, campus practice was to perform qualifications semiannually and inspections annually.

- UPD weapons policies did not address the timing for shotgun qualifications and inspections.

- Presidential authorization for the use of shotguns, pepper spray, rifles, and tasers on the campus was not documented. The campus process for such authorizations was for the police department to submit a memo to the vice president of administration, who would then obtain verbal approval from the president.

California State University, Fresno (CSUF) UPD Policy 312, *Firearms*, states that all sworn personnel are required to qualify quarterly with their duty weapon on an approved range course. It further states that officers will successfully qualify with authorized off-duty weapons prior to carrying them, and thereafter once every three months.
CSUF UPD Policy 432, *Patrol Rifles*, states that officers shall successfully complete quarterly training and qualification. It further states that the rangemaster or armorer shall inspect and service each patrol rifle on a monthly basis.

Collective Bargaining Agreement, Statewide University Police Association, Unit 8, Article 10.6 states, in part, that the following equipment, when authorized by the president, shall be available in each police department: aerosol pepper spray and holder, shotgun, rifle, and taser.

The chief of police stated that in 2011, the department informally started to require qualifications for duty weapons semiannually instead of quarterly due to budget concerns, and that qualifications were sometimes missed due to scheduling conflicts. He further stated that other discrepancies relating to weapons inspections and rifle and shotgun qualifications had not been noticed due to oversight. He also stated that the police department followed the campus process for weapons authorization, and he was unaware of the requirement for documented presidential approval. The vice president for administration and finance stated that notations and verbal affirmation that indicated the introduction of tasers was discussed, reviewed, and approved by the president and the cabinet was provided; however, the campus lacked a formal letter of approval.

Failure to maintain current policies and procedures relating to weapons qualification and inspection requirements, failure to ensure weapons qualifications are completed, and failure to document presidential approval for weapons used on campus increases the risk that officers will not be fully qualified to respond to incidents, increases the possibility that weapons will not be properly maintained and will not function correctly in emergency situations, and increases the potential for liability arising from use of such weapons.

**Recommendation 6**

We recommend that the campus:

a. Update campus weapons policies in the areas of duty and off-duty weapons qualifications and rifle and shotgun qualifications and inspections.

b. Obtain the president’s written approval for the use of non-standard weapons.

**Campus Response**

We concur. We will take the following steps to implement these recommendations:

a. The campus will update the weapons policies in the areas of duty and off-duty weapons qualifications and rifle and shotgun qualifications and inspections. This will be completed by April 17, 2013.

b. Effective December 10, 2012, the campus will obtain the president’s written approval for the use of non-standard weapons.
# APPENDIX A: 
# PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John D. Welty</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Alamano</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant to the Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Booey</td>
<td>Locksmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupe Canales-Shrum</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Davis</td>
<td>Residential Life and Student Conduct Coordinator, University Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gaffery</td>
<td>Administrative Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Gatzman</td>
<td>Information Technology Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celia Gonzalez</td>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Huerta</td>
<td>Chief of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora Kutka</td>
<td>Associate Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Michael</td>
<td>Associate Director, Security, Service Desk, and Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Moffitt</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Murphy</td>
<td>Manager, Human Resources Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillermina Nunez</td>
<td>Community Services Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Parten</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine (Gus) Perez</td>
<td>Administrative Analyst, Police Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Sanchez</td>
<td>Dispatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Shackelton</td>
<td>Accounts Payable/Receiveable Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Simmons-Nielsen</td>
<td>Dispatcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Struck</td>
<td>Police Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Teniente-Matson</td>
<td>Vice President, Administration and Finance and Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael Villegas</td>
<td>Technical Information Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Watson</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerilane Willis</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant, Environmental Health and Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 20, 2012

MEMORANDUM

To: Larry Mandel
   University Auditor
   Office of the Chancellor

From: Cynthia Teniente-Matson
   Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer

Subject: Responses to Police Services Audit Report #12-59

The University has reviewed the preliminary draft of the Police Services Audit Report #12-59. Attached are campus responses to the recommendations. Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Attachment

c: Dr. John D. Welty
   Mr. David Huerta
GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the campus update UPD policies and procedures to incorporate all information required by systemwide policy.

Campus Response

We concur. The campus will update UPD policies and procedures to incorporate all information required by systemwide policy by April 17, 2013.

SYSTEMS ACCESS, PHYSICAL SECURITY, AND RECORDS RETENTION

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the campus:

a. Implement minimum password standards for the RIMS system, and require that passwords be changed at periodic intervals.

b. Document the semiannual review of RIMS system users.

Campus Response

We concur. The campus will implement minimum password standards for the RIMS system, requiring password changes at periodic intervals. We will also begin to document the semiannual review of RIMS system users. Both items will be completed by January 10, 2013.

FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

POST REIMBURSEMENTS

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus:

a. Deposit POST reimbursement checks in a timely manner according to CSU policy.
b. Review unclaimed or outstanding reimbursements on a regular basis, and follow up on the status of these reimbursements with POST as necessary.

c. Implement adequate segregation of duties for the POST reimbursement process.

**Campus Response**

We concur. We will take the following steps to implement these recommendations:

a. Effective December 1, 2012, POST reimbursement checks will be deposited in a timely manner according to CSU policy.

b. Effective December 1, 2012, the campus will begin to review unclaimed or outstanding reimbursements on a regular basis, and follow up on the status of these reimbursements with POST as necessary.

c. Effective December 1, 2012, the campus will implement adequate segregation of duties for the POST reimbursement process. This will include a supervisory review, approval and reconciliation.

**SPECIAL EVENT ACCOUNTING**

**Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus:

a. Document the current rates charged for police officer work at special events.

b. Develop procedures regarding the time frame in which special event billings should be created.

c. Implement a periodic review or reconciliation of the cost recovery account where special event revenues and expenditures are recorded to ensure the accuracy of amounts in the account.

**Campus Response**

We concur. The campus will develop standard operating procedures for special event accounting to include documented rates charged for police officer work, time frame for event billing, and periodic review and reconciliation of cost recovery by April 17, 2013.

**MAJOR INCIDENTS AND CRIME REPORTING**

**Recommendation 5**

We recommend that the campus update the campus emergency management plan.

**Campus Response**

We concur. The campus will update the campus emergency management plan by April 17, 2013.
WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION CONTROLS

Recommendation 6

We recommend that the campus:

a. Update campus weapons policies in the areas of duty and off-duty weapons qualifications and rifle and shotgun qualifications and inspections.

b. Obtain the president’s written approval for the use of non-standard weapons.

Campus Response

We concur. We will take the following steps to implement these recommendations:

a. The campus will update the weapons policies in the areas of duty and off-duty weapons qualifications and rifle and shotgun qualifications and inspections. This will be completed by April 17, 2013.

b. Effective December 10, 2012, the campus will obtain the president’s written approval for the use of non-standard weapons.
January 2, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel
    University Auditor

FROM: Timothy P. White
      Chancellor

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report 12-59 on Police Services,
         California State University, Fresno

In response to your memorandum of January 2, 2013, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on Police Services, California State University, Fresno.

TPW/amd