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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 five campuses from July 23, 2012, through January 7, 2013, and audited the procedures in effect at that time. Campus-specific findings and recommendations have been discussed and reported individually.

In our opinion, the fiscal, operational and administrative controls for systemwide police services activities in effect as of January 7, 2013, 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 [6]

Systemwide policies and procedures relating to police services (PS) needed to be updated, and certain critical areas were not addressed in systemwide policies and procedures. For example, there was no current systemwide policy addressing weapons use and requirements or crowd management, protests, and demonstrations. In addition, roles and responsibilities for systemwide PS, including the framework for communicating information from the chancellor’s office to the campuses, had not been fully addressed and communicated in systemwide policies. Further, the process for sharing systemwide policies and other information and resources needed improvement. For example, systemwide policies such as executive orders could be accessed online, but PS Technical Letters were not accessible due to a concern that policies surrounding PS were sensitive in nature.
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 fiscal, 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 January 17, 2013.

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.

During the course of the audit, we visited five campuses: Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno, San Diego, and San Luis Obispo. We interviewed campus personnel and audited procedures in effect at the time of the audit.
OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Systemwide policies and procedures relating to police services (PS) needed to be updated, and certain critical areas were not addressed in systemwide policies and procedures.

We found that the following policies needed to be updated or clarified:

- Executive Order (EO) 1046, *California State University Police and Public Safety Policy Guidelines*, dated August 4, 2009, requires an annual review of campus operational policies by the assistant vice chancellor for risk management and public safety. However, this review was not being performed consistently.

- PS Technical Letter 2010-02, *California State University Police Services Minimum Training Requirements*, dated July 26, 2010, requires an “annual training program” for active shooter training, use of force training, systems access training, and weapons qualifications training, and indicates that the program should address “compliance with California State University (CSU) and campus policy.” However, there is no CSU policy that requires annual training in the areas of systems access and use of force.

- EO 873, *Denial or Revocation of Retired Officer’s Privilege to Carry a Concealed Weapon*, dated July 14, 2003, cites California Penal Code Section 12027. However, California Penal Code Section 12027 has been updated and renumbered, and new federal guidelines have also been implemented.

- Section 4000, *Public Safety*, of the State University Administrative Manual was outdated and was not always consistent with other systemwide policies pertaining to PS.

- PS responsibilities have been transferred from Human Resources (HR) to Systemwide Risk Management, but PS policies have not been centralized by updating and superseding certain HR coded memos with PS Technical Letters. These include:
  
  - Coded memorandum HR 2002-13, *Compliance with Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training Requirements and Funds*
  
  - Coded memorandum HR 2004-29, *The Jeanne Clery Act*
  
  - Coded memorandum HR 2005-18, *Crime Statistics Reporting Requirements*

In addition, we found that the following critical areas were not addressed in current policies:

- There is no current systemwide policy addressing weapons, such as minimum weapons qualifications requirements, inspection and maintenance requirements, and weapons approval
requirements. EO 756, *Authorized Weapons, Weapons Training, and Use of Weapons in CSU Police Departments*, previously addressed this area. However, it was superseded by EO 1046, which did not incorporate weapons policies.

- Although a working group was created to draft a systemwide policy relating to crowd management, protests, and demonstrations, the policy has not been finalized and implemented.

CBA, SUPA, Unit 8, Article 8.2, dated September 18, 2012, states in part that the CSU shall maintain a systemwide Public Safety Policy Manual that shall be contained in Section 4000, *Public Safety*, of the SUAM, the contents of which may be revised by the CSU.

Government Code (GC) §13402 and §13403 state that management is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of internal administrative controls, which includes documenting the system, communicating system requirements to employees, and assuring that the system is functioning as prescribed and is modified, as appropriate, for changes in conditions. Further, administrative controls are the methods through which reasonable assurance can be given that measures adopted by state agency heads to safeguard assets and promote operational efficiency are being followed.

The systemwide chief law enforcement officer stated his belief that PS Technical Letter 2010-02 addressed, and was consistent with, guidance provided in EO 1046. He further stated that this technical letter was deemed sufficient as a response to the 2008 Police Services Systemwide audit. He also stated that codes, laws, and regulations change, and there was an oversight in recognizing the lack of nexus in the requirements of PS 2010-02 and the various policies that require attention in this finding.

The absence of current and complete PS policies and procedures increases the risk of misunderstandings relating to the performance of duties and functions, inconsistencies in complying with state and federal requirements, and inconsistent treatment and handling of issues.

**Recommendation 1**

We recommend that the chancellor’s office (CO):

a. Review, update, and/or clarify existing PS systemwide policies that have been identified as needing updating or clarification.

b. Develop and implement systemwide policies addressing weapons and crowd management, protests, and demonstrations.

**Management Response**

We concur.

a. PS systemwide policies needing updating have been identified. These policies will be revised, updated, and/or migrated to the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual as deemed appropriate by September 30, 2013.
b. The policy addressing crowd management has been implemented. Other policies will be implemented by June 30, 2013. The policy addressing weapons has been drafted and is being vetted with the campus police chiefs and the assistant vice chancellor for risk management and public safety. Due to meet-and-confer issues, we anticipate this policy will be completed by August 30, 2013.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Roles and responsibilities for systemwide PS, including the framework for communicating information from the CO to the campuses, had not been fully addressed and communicated in systemwide policies.

We found that:

- The role of the systemwide chief law enforcement officer and his authority and responsibility for providing systemwide direction, maintaining systemwide policies and procedures, and monitoring campus activities relating to PS was neither well defined in CSU policy nor communicated to the campuses.

- The framework for communicating information from the CO to the campuses had not been well defined. For example, it was unclear whether communication should be reported through the campus Chief Administrators and Business Officers, through the campus police chiefs, or both.

GC §13402 and §13403 state that management is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of internal administrative controls, which includes documenting the system, communicating system requirements to employees, and assuring that the system is functioning as prescribed and is modified, as appropriate, for changes in conditions. Further, administrative controls are the methods through which reasonable assurance can be given that measures adopted by state agency heads to safeguard assets and promote operational efficiency are being followed.

The systemwide chief law enforcement officer stated that campus police chiefs have been fully briefed on the position, roles, and responsibilities of the systemwide chief law enforcement officer, but the position and the framework for communication, which was recently changed, was not documented in a separate policy.

Ineffective communication of the roles and responsibilities for PS in systemwide policy increases the risk of misunderstandings related to the performance of duties and functions, inconsistent treatment and handling of issues, and noncompliance with state, federal, and CSU requirements.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the CO address the roles and responsibilities for systemwide PS, including the framework for communicating information from the CO to the campuses, in written policy, and communicate this to the campuses.
Management Response

We concur. The roles and responsibilities for systemwide PS have been drafted as a PS Technical Letter that contains a framework for communicating information. This recommendation will be implemented by June 30, 2013.

INFORMATION SHARING

The process for sharing systemwide policies and other information and resources needed improvement.

We found that:

- In general, CSU systemwide policies such as executive orders could be accessed online, but PS Technical Letters were not accessible due to a concern that policies surrounding PS were sensitive in nature.

- Although an index of systemwide PS policies and procedures was provided to new police chiefs, there was no reference to relevant Integrated California State University Administrative Manual policies, such as those relating to accounting and administrative controls and information systems access.

- Campus police personnel interviewed indicated a desire for a centralized intranet site to allow campus police chiefs and administrators to communicate and share information and best practices.

GC §13402 and §13403 state that management is responsible for establishing and maintaining a system of internal administrative controls, which includes documenting the system, communicating system requirements to employees, and assuring that the system is functioning as prescribed and is modified, as appropriate, for changes in conditions. Further, administrative controls are the methods through which reasonable assurance can be given that measures adopted by state agency heads to safeguard assets and promote operational efficiency are being followed.

The systemwide chief law enforcement officer stated that the police chiefs were provided a flash drive that included police-related policies and protocols, and it was his belief that this method of communication was sufficient at this time.

Lack of centralized and accessible policies and procedures and other resources relating to PS increases the risk that campuses will be unaware of federal, state, and CSU requirements, and increases the risk of inconsistent treatment and handling of issues.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the CO determine the feasibility of creating a centralized intranet site or other method to consolidate relevant systemwide policies and procedures relating to PS, including PS Technical Letters, and to allow campus police departments to communicate and share information.
Management Response

We concur. An intranet site has been created, and it contains consolidated information concerning policies, procedures, discussion boards, and other ways to share communication.
# APPENDIX A:
# PERSONNEL CONTACTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Chancellor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin F. Quillian</td>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zachary Gifford</td>
<td>Associate Director, Systemwide Risk Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate Johnson</td>
<td>Systemwide Chief Law Enforcement Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Minnick</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Chancellor, Systemwide Risk Management and Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Redmond</td>
<td>Senior Director, Chancellor’s Office Fiscal Controls and Special Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California State University, Dominguez Hills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie J. Hagan</td>
<td>Interim President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emelda Becerra</td>
<td>Manager, Budget, Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Bergmann</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Boish</td>
<td>Manager, Compensation and Training, Human Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Cummins</td>
<td>Manager, Benefits and Workers Compensation, Human Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustin Faustino</td>
<td>Coordinator, Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hall</td>
<td>Police Lieutenant, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kinoshita</td>
<td>Detective, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Lujan</td>
<td>Director of Infrastructure, Network, Telecommunications and Help Desk Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Marsh</td>
<td>Lead Locksmith, Physical Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homaira Masoud</td>
<td>Budget Manager, Budget, Planning and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susie Mirasol</td>
<td>Assistant to the Chief of Police, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Perez</td>
<td>Police Officer, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena Raymundo-Yusuf</td>
<td>Manager, Accounting Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Reddick</td>
<td>Dispatcher, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Rodriguez</td>
<td>Vice President, Administration and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonya Stabb</td>
<td>Sergeant, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcee Teng</td>
<td>Payroll Manager, Payroll Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Velez</td>
<td>Chief of Police, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Wall</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Administration and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Whitehouse</td>
<td>Sergeant, Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California State University, East Bay</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Morishita</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Brothwell</td>
<td>Deputy Vice President, Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Contreras</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator, University Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Edwards</td>
<td>Adjutant to the Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Gonzales</td>
<td>Sergeant, University Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Graney</td>
<td>Director, Compliance and Internal Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Grima</td>
<td>Facilities Reservations Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hodges</td>
<td>Chief of Police, University Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattie Johnson</td>
<td>Dispatcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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California State University, East Bay (cont.)
Rozilla Lal Dispatcher
Omar Miakhail Sergeant, University Police
Stan Skipworth Interim Chief of Police
Martha Wallace Administrative Analyst, University Scheduling
Jeniffer Wellington Information Technology Consultant
Brad Wells Vice President, Administration and Finance, and Chief Financial Officer

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

San Diego State University
Elliot Hirshman President
Micki Binnall Access Control Systems Coordinator, Public Safety
John Browning Chief of Police, Public Safety
Valerie Carter Director, Audit and Tax
Sabrina Cota Records Supervisor, Public Safety
Nancy Demich Assistant to the Vice President for Emergency Planning and Special Projects, Business and Financial Affairs
Vincent Dequito Detective, Public Safety
Shawndalyyn Duncan Lead Dispatcher, Public Safety
Michael Frawley Lieutenant, Public Safety
APPENDIX A: PERSONNEL CONTACTED

San Diego State University (cont.)
Chanin Harrison  Budget Manager, Public Safety
Lorretta Leavitt  Associate Vice President, Financial Operations
Joshua Mays  Lieutenant, Public Safety
Jessica Rentto  Associate Vice President, Administration
Deborah Richeson  Director of Auxiliary Services, Public Safety
Sally Roush  Vice President, Business and Financial Affairs
Lamine Secka  Captain, Public Safety

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Jeffrey D. Armstrong  President
Marc Benadiba  Assistant Director, Fiscal Services/Payroll Services
Betty Burns  Business Services Assistant, Police Department
Cindy Campbell  Associate Director, Police Department
Marlene Cramer  Business Services Coordinator, Police Department
Lori Hashim  Commander, Police Department
George Hughes  Chief of Police
Mark Hunter  Associate Vice President, Facilities
Kelly Kapner  Assistant to the Chief of Police, Police Department
Lawrence Kelley  Vice President, Administration and Finance
Rich Lara  Police Officer, Police Department
Fred Mills  Records Manager, Police Department
Dave Ragsdale  Director, Environmental Health and Safety
Rick Ramirez  Associate Vice President, Finance
MEMORANDUM

DATE:       June 4, 2013

TO:         Larry Mandel
            University Auditor

FROM:       Benjamin F. Quillian
            Executive Vice Chancellor and
            Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT:    Audit Report # 12-58 Police Services System-wide

In response to the “Incomplete Draft” report dated April 19, 2013, we are providing the
enclosed revised management response related to Recommendation # 1, 2 and 3.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

BFQ: mpr

Attachment

[Redacted]

Charlene Minnick, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Risk Management and Public Safety
Nathan Johnson, Chief Law Enforcement Officer
Michael Redmond, Senior Director CO Budget and Special Initiatives
GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the chancellor's office (CO):

a. Review, update, and/or clarify existing PS systemwide policies that have been identified as needing updating or clarification.

b. Develop and implement systemwide policies addressing weapons and crowd management, protests, and demonstrations.

Management Response

We concur.

PS Systemwide policies needing updating have been identified. These policies will be revised, updated and/or migrated to ICSUAM as deemed appropriate by September 30, 2013.

The policy addressing crowd management has been implemented. Other policies will be implemented by June 30, 2013.

The policy addressing weapons has been drafted and is being vetted with the campus police chiefs and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Risk Management and Public Safety. Due to meet and confer issues, we anticipate this policy will be completed by August 30, 2013.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Recommendation 2

We recommend that the CO address the roles and responsibilities for systemwide PS, including the framework for communicating information from the CO to the campuses, in written policy, and communicate this to the campuses.

Management Response

We concur.
The roles and responsibilities for Systemwide PS have been drafted as a PS Technical Letter and contains a framework for communicating information. This recommendation will be implemented by June 30, 2013.

INFORMATION SHARING

Recommendation 3

We recommend that the CO determine the feasibility of creating a centralized intranet site or other method to consolidate relevant systemwide policies and procedures relating to PS, including PS Technical Letters, and to allow campus police departments to communicate and share information.

Management Response

We concur.

An intranet site has been created, and it contains consolidated information concerning policies, procedures, discussion boards and other ways to share communication. This recommendation has been implemented.
June 17, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Larry Mandel
   University Auditor

FROM: Timothy P. White
      Chancellor

SUBJECT: Draft Final Report 12-58 on Police Services, Systemwide

In response to your memorandum of June 17, 2013, I accept the response as submitted with the draft final report on Police Services, Systemwide.

TPW/amd