

**POLICE SERVICES**  
**SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Audit Report 08-27**  
**October 23, 2008**

---

**Members, Committee on Audit**

Melinda Guzman, Chair  
Raymond W. Holdsworth, Vice Chair  
Herbert L. Carter    Kenneth Fong  
Margaret Fortune    George G. Gowgani  
William Hauck

---

**Staff**

University Auditor: Larry Mandel  
Senior Director: Michelle Schlack  
Audit Manager: Michael Zachary

---

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

---

## **CONTENTS**

Executive Summary .....	1
Introduction.....	2
Background .....	2
Purpose.....	4
Scope and Methodology .....	6

---

## **OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES**

Program Administration.....	7
Police Activities and Crime Reporting .....	8
Evidence, Weapons, and Equipment.....	9
Evidence.....	9
Firearms .....	11

## **APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A:	Personnel Contacted
APPENDIX B:	Campus Response
APPENDIX C:	Chancellor's Acceptance

---

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

CALEA	Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement
CSU	California State University
EMP	Emergency Management Plan
EO	Executive Order
IACLEA	International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators
POST	Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
RIMS	Records Information Management System
SAM	State Administrative Manual
SFSU	San Francisco State University
UPD	University Police Department

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As a result of a systemwide risk assessment conducted by the Office of the University Auditor during the last quarter of 2005, the Board of Trustees, at its January 2008 meeting, directed that *Police Services* be reviewed. *Police Services* was last audited in 2000.

We visited the San Francisco State University campus from May 27, 2008, through July 3, 2008, 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 controls. 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 of police services in effect as of July 3, 2008, taken as a whole, were sufficient to meet the objectives stated below.

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.

### **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION [7]**

The campus emergency management plan and related procedures were not current.

### **POLICE ACTIVITIES AND CRIME REPORTING [8]**

A formal law enforcement agreement was not confirmed for support services provided to the Romberg Tiburon Center by the Marin County Sheriff's Department.

### **EVIDENCE, WEAPONS, AND EQUIPMENT [9]**

The administration and recordkeeping of evidence was deficient in the following areas: final disposition and location of evidence, evidence identification, and timely alarm testing. Firearms control procedures were in need of improvement in the areas of long gun assignment and handgun inventory.

---

## INTRODUCTION

### **BACKGROUND**

The California State University (CSU) Public Safety Program was developed in 1974, commencing 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 as an appropriate program for the CSU, and thereafter, necessary actions were taken to bring the program to fruition. In 2007, the CSU campus police departments were renamed from public safety to police services to emphasize the service aspect of the campus police departments, and 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 municipal police departments. Sexual assaults, alcohol, drugs, and vandalism increased; and legislation mandated more involvement by university police officers in the investigation and prevention of crimes, as well as care for the victims. As a result, CSU police services departments created policing programs and preventive patrols to deter crime. The growth of on-campus housing also increased the complexity of emergency planning. Furthermore, parking structures were built on campuses, and an increase in auto burglaries and theft 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. President George Bush signed the act into law on November 8, 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, which participate in any federal student aid programs and requires schools to publicly disclose three years of campus crime statistics and basic security policies. In 1992, the *Campus Sexual Assault Victims’ Bill of Rights* was incorporated into the Jeanne Clery Act. In 1998, the Jeanne Clery Act was amended to expand the scope of campus crime statistic reporting, ensure crime statistics were reported in accordance with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Reporting program, and require the maintenance of a public police log of all reported crimes as well as a policy to issue timely warnings when a crime, reportable in the annual statistics, is known to the school and poses an ongoing threat to the campus. The law was most recently amended in 2000 to require schools, beginning in 2003, to notify the campus community about where public “Megan’s Law” information about registered sex offenders on campus could be obtained.

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, which will: (1) designate which law enforcement agency has operational responsibility for the investigation of violent crimes occurring on campus and (2) delineate the specific boundaries of each agency’s operational responsibility.

In recent years (and in response to increased training standards from the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), legislatures, and governmental agencies), campus administrators have worked to upgrade the quality of university police services. This has included, but was not limited to, the development of uniform standards for vehicles, equipment, training, emergency preparedness, and critical response units; semiannual meetings of campus police chiefs; and close interaction with Systemwide Human Resources and the Office of Risk Management at the chancellor's office. In April 2001, the chancellor's office issued Executive Order 787, modifying the CSU Public Safety Policy Manual that was required by agreement between the Board of Trustees of the CSU and the Statewide University Police Association. The CSU Police Departments' Systemwide Operational Guidelines were developed and issued by the Systemwide Police Advisory Committee in 2002, and revised in November 2007, with the intent of providing detailed guidance to support the broad and general coverage provided by the Public Safety Policy Manual. Additionally, CSU Los Angeles, CSU Fullerton, and San Francisco State University received accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA); and most recently, the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Agencies accredited San Francisco State University and CSU Northridge. Sonoma State University anticipates CALEA accreditation in 2009. Lastly, in 2007, administrative and risk management responsibilities for systemwide police services were reassigned from Systemwide Human Resources to the Office of Risk Management.

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**

The overall audit objective was to ascertain the effectiveness of existing policies and procedures related to the administration of police services, police activities, and law enforcement, and to determine the adequacy of controls over parking revenues and citations, and crime reporting.

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

- ▶ Administration and management of the police services 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.
- ▶ Staffing and scheduling provide appropriate coverage, effective use of overtime and compliance with the collective bargaining agreement (CBA).
- ▶ Police services participation in campus emergency management and the CSU Critical Response Unit are clearly defined, training is provided, and a designated emergency operations center exists.
- ▶ 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.
- ▶ Budgeting procedures adequately address police services funding and expenditure, and budget monitoring procedures ensure effective accounting and management control.
- ▶ Chargebacks and POST reimbursements, miscellaneous revenues, and petty cash are adequately controlled, and grants are administered in accordance with grant requirements.
- ▶ The dispatch function is properly controlled, and daily activity logs/records are comprehensive and permit measurement of the effectiveness and efficiency of police operations.
- ▶ Police activities are adequately documented, and access to police services records, investigative files, and criminal offender record information is sufficiently restricted and safeguarded.
- ▶ 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.
- ▶ Campus safety plan, Megan's Law compliance, and crime awareness programs are in place and in accordance with federal and state regulations.

---

INTRODUCTION

- ▶ Hiring, certification, and training policies comply with POST, performance evaluation administration is consistent and timely, stipends and compensatory time off are administered in compliance with the CBA, and internal investigations are handled in accordance with state regulations, CSU policy, and the CBA.
- ▶ Crime scene evidence, weapons, and other police services equipment are properly handled, accounted for, and safeguarded, and weapon issuance and use comply with state regulations and CSU policy.
- ▶ Parking revenues are adequately controlled, properly accounted for, and used in accordance with CSU policy and state regulations, and parking citation issuance, processing, and administration are adequately controlled and in accordance with the California Vehicle Code.

## **SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY**

The proposed scope of audit, as presented in Attachment B, Agenda Item 2 of the January 22-23, 2008, meeting of the Committee on Audit, stated that *Public Safety* (now *Police Services*) includes primarily police activities and law enforcement including parking program administration and enforcement, and crime reporting. Potential impacts include lack of, out-of-date, or undistributed policies and procedures; underdeveloped or unused measures for self-evaluation and improvement; poor or undefined relationships with external agencies; inefficient use of physical assets or human resources; non-compliance with state-mandated standards and training requirements; unauthorized use of law enforcement data; inadequate crime reporting; lack of control or poor maintenance over sensitive or special equipment; excessive costs; lost parking fine revenue; inadequate control or supervision over activities having safety or liability considerations; and poor adjudication of internal investigations or personnel complaints.

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 state and federal laws, Board of Trustee policies, and Office of the Chancellor and campus policies, letters, and directives. The audit review focused on procedures in effect from January 1, 2007, through May 27, 2008, along with limited testing of calendar year 2005 and 2006 records.

We focused primarily upon the internal administrative, compliance, and operational controls provided by the CSU police department's systemwide operational guidelines, campus policies and general orders, and chancellor's office executive orders, and related management activities on campuses, although we also relied on external laws and regulations as well. Most of our work involved the direct interface with police services and parking functions reporting to police services.

Specifically, we reviewed and tested:

- ▶ Procedures for communicating systemwide/campus specific policies, rules, and regulations.
- ▶ Staffing, scheduling, and internal investigation procedures.
- ▶ Fiscal procedures for budgeting, chargebacks, POST reimbursements, grants, stipends, and expenses.
- ▶ Dispatch operations, field reporting requirements, and case monitoring procedures.
- ▶ 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 evidence, weapons, and other public safety equipment.
- ▶ Procedures for controlling and processing parking revenues, parking citations, and parking funds.
- ▶ Data security, disaster recovery, and backup procedures.
- ▶ Disaster preparedness operational procedures if the function reports to police services.

---

## **OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CAMPUS RESPONSES**

### **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

The campus emergency management plan (EMP) and related procedures were not current.

We found that:

- ▶ The EMP document was effective as of January 2006; however, there was no evidence of a full review and approval of the plan within the last year. Certain sections of the document were current, while other sections were in the process of review and revision.
- ▶ Emergency food and water supplies exceeded their expiration dates and although the outdated supplies were kept as a reserve, newer supplies were needed.
- ▶ Certain emergency operations center team administrative supplies were not readily available for review and inspection. Although the supplies were maintained in a locked cabinet, the key was not readily available.

Executive Order (EO) 1013, *CSU Emergency Management Plan*, dated September 7, 2007, states that each campus is delegated the responsibility for the implementation and maintenance of an emergency management program on campus and for developing a campus plan. On an annual basis or more frequently as needed, the plan should be reviewed, updated, and distributed to the emergency management team members and others as identified by the campus. The policy further states that the campus should maintain a campus (emergency) roster of resources that includes food and water, with the update/revision date appearing on the roster.

The chief of police stated that the emergency management position had not been staffed until recently and, as such, some of the review and restocking duties had fallen behind schedule. He also stated that the new employee was not fully aware of the proper key locations.

Failure to maintain a current and complete EMP and supplies that are currently stocked and physically available increases the risk of inadequate response to emergencies.

#### **Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Update the campus emergency plan to ensure that it is current, accurate, and complete.
- b. Ensure that emergency food and water is within its expiration dates and keys to all emergency supplies are available to appropriate staff members at all times.

### **Campus Response**

We concur.

- a. The review and update of the campus emergency plan is in progress. The university police department (UPD) is collaborating with the appropriate campus departments to ensure the campus emergency plan is current, accurate, and complete.

Expected completion date: February 2009

- b. Prior to the completion of the audit, the UPD replaced all expired emergency food, water, and other supplies, and all appropriate staff members have keys to the emergency supplies.

### **POLICE ACTIVITIES AND CRIME REPORTING**

A formal law enforcement agreement was not confirmed for support services provided to the Romberg Tiburon Center by the Marin County Sheriff's Department.

Education Code §67381, *The Kristen Smart Campus Safety Act*, states that California State University campuses shall enter into written agreements with local law enforcement agencies that clarify operational responsibilities for investigations of Part 1 violent crimes occurring on each campus. Furthermore, it states that each written agreement entered into pursuant to this section shall designate which law enforcement agency shall have operational responsibility for the investigation of each Part 1 violent crime and delineate the specific geographical boundaries of each agency's operational responsibility, including maps as necessary.

The chief of police stated that the agreement between the campus and the Marin County Sheriff's Department was available in draft form, but due to time and coordination constraints, it had not been approved and endorsed in final form.

Failure to confirm and implement campus agreements with outside law enforcement agencies increases the risk that the anticipated assistance and response may not be adequate to meet campus needs.

#### **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus confirm the administrative agreement with the Marin County Sheriff's Department for assistance at the Romberg Tiburon Center.

### **Campus Response**

We concur. The UPD will confirm its working relationship with the Marin County Sheriff's Department at the Romberg Tiburon Center.

Expected completion date: January 2009

## **EVIDENCE, WEAPONS, AND EQUIPMENT**

### **EVIDENCE**

The administration and recordkeeping of evidence needed improvement.

We noted that:

- ▶ The final disposition of evidence items for 2005 and prior was not documented in the Records Information Management System (RIMS) evidence database and the location(s) of the evidence was not always accurately identified.
- ▶ The RIMS database was not reporting all evidence locations, thus causing difficulty in evaluating and testing evidence inventory.
- ▶ A test of hard copy case file records, for sample items where RIMS did not have sufficient evidence disposition or location data, showed that documentation did not always provide adequate data showing final disposition or location of evidence.
- ▶ A review of the RIMS evidence database showed that some of the 2003 data was correctly referenced as "03" but numerous line items of it were listed as "30," thus causing search, retrieval, and review difficulties.
- ▶ Alarm testing of the evidence room was not performed on a regular basis by the commanding officer of investigations.

San Francisco State University (SFSU) Police Department *General Order 4-3*, dated October 9, 2006, states that the department will handle evidence and property in a manner to guarantee successful prosecution. Property determined not to have any evidentiary value will be properly released or disposed of in accordance with California statutes. The key to reducing the load on the property/evidence system is by returning (disposing of) items no longer having evidentiary value. Additionally, the general order states that random alarm testing of the evidence room should be done on a regular basis by the commanding officer of investigations. The results should be logged, documented, and appropriate action should be taken in the event that problems are discovered.

State Administrative Manual (SAM) §20050 states that the elements of a satisfactory system of internal administrative control include, but are not limited to, an effective system of internal review and recordkeeping procedures adequate to provide effective control over assets.

The chief of police stated that difficulties with evidence tracking was mainly due to the need for updates to the RIMS, batch entry of location for older data, and the need for a system integrity review to be completed by the software manufacturer. He also stated that the alarm test reviews and documentation were simply overlooked due to the recent appointment of a captain who performed that function.

Inadequate controls over evidence increase the risk of unacceptable evidence at trial, untimely return of property to its rightful owners, inefficient use of evidence storage facilities, and non-compliance with confiscated weapons requirements. Failure to test evidence alarms and document results increases the risk that evidence could be removed or damaged without authorization.

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Update the RIMS system and perform a system integrity review by the manufacturer to ensure complete and accurate recording of evidence location and disposition.
- b. Implement controls to ensure that evidence information is properly recorded in hard copy case files.
- c. Ensure that alarm testing of evidence room is done regularly and the results are documented.

### **Campus Response**

We concur.

- a. The UPD collaborated with the RIMS system manufacturer to perform system integrity review, ensuring complete and accurate recording of evidence location and disposition.
- b. The chief of police will communicate to the records supervisor the importance of maintaining evidence information in properly recorded case files.

Expected completion date: January 2009

- c. The UPD performed and completed the alarm testing of the evidence room prior to the conclusion of the audit. In addition, the department *General Order 4-3, Evidence Control Procedures*, will be updated and communicated to ensure that alarm testing is performed on a quarterly basis.

Expected completion date: January 2009

## **FIREARMS**

Firearms control procedures needed improvement.

We noted that:

- ▶ Long guns held were not treated as assigned firearms and were held within the armory as pool firearms until needed by daily patrol officers. Records showed that when the firearms were checked out for daily use, the police daily vehicle inventory and inspection forms did not always identify the serial number or department assigned number for the pool firearms used.
- ▶ The president's written approval for the use of long guns/shotguns was not obtained.
- ▶ Three handgun serial numbers were incorrectly recorded in the handgun inventory subsidiary ledgers.

Although training programs were being scheduled, training for the AR-15 assault rifle had not been completed for all officers.

SAM §20050 states that the elements of a satisfactory system of internal administrative control include, but are not limited to, an effective system of internal review and recordkeeping procedures adequate to provide effective control over assets.

EO 756, *Authorized Weapons, Weapons Training, and Use of Weapons in CSU Police Departments*, dated September 21, 2000, states that shotguns may be used as authorized by the campus president.

SFSU Police Department *General Order 3-1*, dated February 2008, requires that all line personnel, from officer through sergeant, shall demonstrate proficiency with all approved lethal weapons ideally on a quarterly basis, but at least once annually.

The chief of police stated that the discrepancies dealing with handgun and long gun identification were due to clerical difficulties with hard copy recordkeeping procedures and that verbal approval from the president for long guns had been obtained but written approval was simply overlooked. He also stated that training for the AR-15 assault rifle had been very difficult to obtain due to the newly evolving requirements for the number of hours and type of training required by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training.

Failure to maintain accurate firearms inventory and daily location records increases the risk of loss, misplacement, or misuse. Failure to obtain presidential approval for the use of long guns can lead to misunderstanding with regard to the types of approved firearms. Insufficient training in the use of the AR-15 assault rifle can result in inadequate response in the event of an active shooter or similar emergency.

**Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Develop, implement, and maintain an accurate firearms inventory record.
- b. Develop procedures to ensure that unassigned firearms used in police vehicles are tracked to vehicle and officer using serial numbers or department assigned numbers.
- c. Obtain written approval from the president for the use of long guns/shotguns.
- d. Ensure that adequate training is provided to all university police department officers who use AR-15 assault rifles.

**Campus Response**

We concur.

- a. The UPD will develop, implement, and maintain an accurate firearms inventory record.  
Expected completion date: March 2009
- b. The UPD has amended its daily inventory and inspection form to include shotgun and rifle serial numbers/assigned numbers.
- c. The UPD will obtain the president's approval for the use of long guns/shotguns.  
Expected completion date: January 2009
- d. The UPD officers have completed the training for the use of AR-15 assault rifles.

---

## **APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Robert A. Corrigan	President
Selina Chua	Property Clerk, University Police Department (UPD)
Michael Cramer	Information Systems Specialist, UPD
Anthony Duenas	Captain, UPD
Kirk Gaston	Chief of Police, UPD
Lily Gee	Administrative Analyst/Specialist, UPD
Francis Hui	Administrative Support Coordinator, UPD
Ronald Lam	Senior Sergeant, UPD
Abraham Leal	Sergeant, UPD
Troy Liddi	Police Officer, UPD
Franz Lozano	Internal Auditor, Internal Audit
Joy Manaois	Fiscal Services Manager, UPD
Leroy Morishita	Vice President, Administration and Finance
Gayle Orr-Smith	Emergency Preparedness Coordinator, UPD
Mark Osborne	Associate Internal Auditor, Internal Audit
Reggie Parson	Captain, UPD
Julie Shearer	Records/Communications Supervisor, UPD
Jun Takahashi	Captain, UPD
Patricia Tolar	Administrative Analyst/Specialist, UPD
Martha Villanueva	IACLEA/CALEA Accreditation Manager, UPD
Patrick Wasley	Deputy Chief of Police, UPD
Rene Wilson	Sergeant, UPD



1600 Holloway Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94132  
Tel: 415/338-1381  
Fax: 415/338-6210

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

November 19, 2008

RECEIVED  
UNIVERSITY AUDITOR

NOV 24 2008

THE CALIFORNIA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

Mr. Larry Mandel  
University Auditor  
The California State University  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, California 90802-4275

Dear Mr. Mandel:

We have reviewed the Office of the University Auditor Report #08-27 on the Polices Services Audit at San Francisco State University. Our responses to the recommendations are attached which will also be forwarded to your staff electronically. We are taking actions to implement the recommendations.

Documentation demonstrating implementation of recommendations already completed will be forwarded to you separately. Questions regarding the responses may be directed to Leroy M. Morishita, Vice President and CFO for Administration & Finance, at 415/338-2521 or Franz Lozano, Internal Auditor, at 415/405-3736.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Corrigan".

Robert A. Corrigan  
President

FL/id

Attachments

cc: Leroy M. Morishita, Vice President and CFO, Administration & Finance  
J.E. (Penny) Saffold, Vice President /Dean of Students, Student Affairs  
Kirk Gaston, Chief/Director, University Police Department  
Patrick Wasley, Deputy Chief of Police, University Police Department  
Joy Manaois, Fiscal Services Manager, University Police Department  
Franz Lozano, Internal Auditor  
Mark Osborne, Associate Internal Auditor

**POLICE SERVICES**  
**SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Audit Report 08-27**

**PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

**Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Update the campus emergency plan to ensure that it is current, accurate, and complete.
- b. Ensure that emergency food and water is within its expiration dates and keys to all emergency supplies are available to appropriate staff members at all times.

**Campus Response**

- a. We concur. The review and update of the campus emergency plan is in progress. The University Police Department is collaborating with the appropriate campus departments to ensure the campus emergency plan is current, accurate, and complete. Expected completion date: February 2009.
- b. We concur. Prior to the completion of the audit, the University Police Department replaced all expired emergency food, water and other supplies, and all appropriate staff members have keys to the emergency supplies.

**POLICE ACTIVITIES AND CRIME REPORTING**

**Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus confirm the administrative agreement with the Marin County Sheriff's Department for assistance at the Romberg Tiburon Center.

**Campus Response**

We concur. The University Police Department will confirm its working relationship with the Marin County Sheriff's Department at the Romberg Tiburon Center. Expected completion date: January 2009.

## EVIDENCE, WEAPONS, AND EQUIPMENT

### EVIDENCE

#### Recommendation 3

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Update the RIMS system and perform a system integrity review by the manufacturer to ensure complete and accurate recording of evidence location and disposition.
- b. Implement controls to ensure that evidence information is properly recorded in hard copy case files.
- c. Ensure that alarm testing of evidence room is done regularly and the results are documented.

#### Campus Response

- a. We concur. The University Police Department collaborated with the RIMS system manufacturer to perform system integrity review ensuring complete and accurate recording of evidence location and disposition.
- b. We concur. The Chief of Police will communicate to the Records Supervisor the importance of maintaining evidence information in properly recorded case files. Expected completion date: January 2009.
- c. We concur. The University Police Department performed and completed the alarm testing of the evidence room prior to the conclusion of the audit. In addition, the department General Order 4-3, Evidence Control Procedures will be updated and communicated to ensure that alarm testing is performed on quarterly basis. Expected completion date: January 2009.

### FIREARMS

#### Recommendation 4

We recommend that the campus:

- a. Develop, implement, and maintain an accurate firearms inventory record.
- b. Develop procedures to ensure that unassigned firearms used in police vehicles are tracked to vehicle and officer using serial numbers or department assigned numbers.
- c. Obtain written approval from the president for the use of long guns/shotguns.
- d. Ensure that adequate training is provided to all university police department officers who use AR-15 assault rifles.

**Campus Response**

- a. We concur. The University Police Department will develop, implement, and maintain an accurate firearms inventory record. Expected completion date: March 2009.
- b. We concur. The University Police Department has amended its daily inventory and inspection form to include shotgun and rifle serial numbers/assigned numbers.
- c. We concur. The University Police Department will obtain the president's approval for the use of long guns/shotguns. Expected completion date: January 2009.
- d. We concur. The University Police Department officers have completed the training for the use of AR-15 assault rifles.

  
**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
 OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

BAKERSFIELD

December 1, 2008

CHANNEL ISLANDS

CHICO

**MEMORANDUM**

DOMINGUEZ HILLS

EAST BAY

FRESNO

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel  
University Auditor

FULLERTON

FROM: Charles B. Reed  
Chancellor

HUMBOLDT

LONG BEACH

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report 08-27 on *Police Services*,  
San Francisco State University

LOS ANGELES

MARITIME ACADEMY

In response to your memorandum of December 1, 2008, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on *Police Services*, San Francisco State University.

MONTEREY BAY

NORTHRIDGE

POMONA

CBR/jt

SACRAMENTO

Enclosure

SAN BERNARDINO

cc: Dr. Robert A. Corrigan, President  
Mr. Franz Lozano, Internal Auditor  
Mr. Leroy M. Morishita, Vice President, Administration and Finance

SAN DIEGO

SAN FRANCISCO

SAN JOSÉ

SAN LUIS OBISPO

SAN MARCOS

SONOMA

STANISLAUS