

**California State University, San Bernardino**  
5500 University Parkway  
San Bernardino, CA 92407

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** October 10, 2014

**TO:** Douglas Freer, Vice President for Administration and Finance/CFO

**FROM:** Michael Zachary, University Internal Auditor

**SUBJECT:** University Police Department Internal Controls Follow-Up Audit

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND**

As a result of a special request, this audit was initiated. In early 2014 Robert Gardner, the previous Vice President of Administration and Finance, requested that an audit of the University Police Department (UPD) be added to the existing audit plan for 2013/14. The overall scope of the audit was to follow-up on a prior audit of “Police Services” performed by the Chancellor’s Office (CO) at CSUSB in 2008. The agreed-upon-procedures for this audit were to focus on the current status of the prior audit recommendations in the CO audit report. In August 2014, Douglas Freer, the current Vice President for Administration and Finance requested that the scope be modified to include a review of the current status of the UPD Training Program/Plan and, accordingly that area was added to the scope of audit.

This audit was conducted in accordance with the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors, and included such audit tests that were considered necessary in evaluating the administrative and accounting controls surrounding the areas audited.

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 may not be cost-effective; moreover, an audit may not always detect these limitations.

The following brief summary bullets provide management with an overview of conditions that may require attention. Areas of within the audit scope of review that are not mentioned in the

audit observations and recommendations are considered to be satisfactory. Details of the bulleted observations below, along with audit recommendations follow in the body of this report.

## **PUBLIC SAFETY**

### **➤ General Orders, Policies and Procedures**

General Orders Manual reviews and approvals were not current.

### **➤ Written Agreement for Law Enforcement at the Palm Desert Campus**

An agreement for law enforcement services at the Palm Desert Campus was scheduled to expire.

### **➤ UPD Annual Training Program**

Improvement opportunities existed for the UPD annual training program.

### **➤ Range Qualifications**

Range qualifications were not always current.

### **➤ Firearms Inventory Review**

Inactive firearms in the UPD inventory needed management's attention and possible disposal.

### **➤ Ammunition Inventory Management**

Ammunition inventory needed adjustment, and a procedure for secondary review of inventory balances needed to be implemented.

## **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

### **➤ Campus Emergency Management Plan**

Review and update procedures for the campus emergency management plan (EMP) needed revision. (Note that, as of the date of audit, Emergency Management was not managed by the UPD, and has not been managed by the UPD for a few years, but the topic nonetheless falls within the scope of this audit.)

## **PROPERTY MANAGEMENT**

### **➤ Advisory Regarding Property Recording of Firearms**

Various firearms, including handguns and shotguns, were not recorded in the campus property records. (Note that the Property Management department is not managed by the UPD, but UPD property management procedures were evaluated during the audit to properly address the issue of recording UPD firearms in the CSUSB property records. The topic of property management procedures for the UPD therefore falls within the scope of this audit.)

## **PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF AUDIT**

The primary audit objective was to perform a follow-up audit of the recommendations stated in the 2008 Chancellor's Office (CO) "Police Services" audit of CSUSB, based on a specific request that the audit be added to the existing audit plan for 2013/14. The agreed-upon-procedures for this audit were to focus on the current status of the prior audit recommendations in the CO audit report. Additionally, the scope of audit included various interviews, a review of selected transactions, a separate review of software that may benefit the UPD, and audit tests that were considered necessary to evaluate factual matters audited. In August 2014, Douglas Freer, the current Vice President for Administration and Finance/CFO requested that the audit scope be modified to include a review of the current status of the UPD Training Program/Plan and, accordingly that area was added to the scope of audit.

The scope of audit, as amended, includes reviews of:

- Existing policies and procedures governing the UPD/Public Safety, policy revisions and updates, and any other policy areas that would be appropriate in the circumstances.
- The campus emergency management plan. We noted that in the prior audit from the Chancellor's Office emergency management was organizationally part of the UPD, but as of the date of this audit, the emergency management function reports to Risk Management.
- Data security policies and procedures for RIMS (Records Information Management System) and CLETS (California Law Enforcement Telecommunication System).
- Proper use of vehicle home storage permits for vehicles that were driven home by UPD employees (management).
- UPD major incident reporting policies and procedures for compliance with CSU guidelines.

- The status of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between CSUSB and the Palm Desert Campus with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("Palm Desert Police Department"), and the City of Palm Desert.
- The status of training specifically for CPR and First Aid, in accordance with training and re-training requirements defined by the California Emergency Medical Services Authority (CEMSA) and/or the commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST).
- Ammunition inventory tracking procedures.
- Firearms/weapons inventory tracking procedures.
- Firearms qualifications requirements for all sworn officers.
- The status of the current UPD Training Program/Plan.

---

## AUDIT OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### PUBLIC SAFETY

#### General Orders, Policies and Procedures

General Orders Manual reviews and approvals were not current.

The UPD maintains a broad set of policies and procedures that are called the “General Orders Manual” which, in the Auditor’s opinion are adequate for operations. However we noticed opportunities for improvement in the review and approval of the General Orders (GO) and the GO Manual overall. Based on review of the GO Manual index, we saw that the last complete review of the GO Manual was in February 2012, although a few of the GOs were more recent, such as the Dispatch Services Guidelines, the Evidence and Property Control Procedures, the Communications Center procedure, and a few others. CSU policies indicate that reviews and updates should be annually or more frequently, as necessary.

Executive Order (EO) 1046, *The California State University Police Services and Public Safety Program*, dated January 1, 2010, states, in part, that the President is delegated the responsibility for implementing and maintaining a campus public safety policy and procedure manual. Campus police departments maintain and update the manual annually.

GC §13403 states that the elements of a satisfactory system of internal accounting and administrative control shall include an *effective system of internal review*.

The UPD General Orders Manual, *Introduction*, dated October 25, 2013, states that the General Orders Manual will be reviewed annually and updated as necessary to insure it remains in compliance with the standards established by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, Inc., and changes in State and Federal laws as well as collective bargaining agreements.

State Administrative Manual (SAM) §20050 calls for the establishment and maintenance of internal accounting and administrative controls. Furthermore, it states that policy and procedural or operational manuals that are either *not currently maintained* or are non-existent could be indicative of a poorly maintained or vulnerable control system.

Written policies and procedures that are not current increase the risk of non-compliance with government and CSU requirements and the potential for weaknesses in the internal control environment.

## **Recommendation 1**

We recommend that:

- a. The UPD review, update and approve general orders as necessary, and reflect the date of review in a central and conspicuous location in the document structure, such as on a cover sheet, index, or table of contents. The reviews should continue annually, or more frequently as necessary, as stated in CSUSB and systemwide policy.
- b. Distribute the updated GOs to all sworn officers and maintain on file signed acknowledgments from all sworn officers for the updated GOs.

## **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan will be to:

- a. Review, update and approve the set of general orders and record the date of review conspicuously in the set of documents. The reviews will continue annually, or more frequently, as necessary.
- b. Distribute the updated UPD General Orders to all sworn officers and maintain on file signed acknowledgements of receipt of the updated GOs from all sworn officers.

**Implementation Date: March 31, 2015**

## **Written Agreement for Law Enforcement at the Palm Desert Campus**

An agreement for law enforcement services at the Palm Desert Campus was scheduled to expire.

In 2009 CSUSB entered into an agreement (Memorandum of Understanding, or MOU) with the County of Riverside, on behalf of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department ("Sheriff's Department" or "Palm Desert Police Department"), and the City of Palm Desert, to provide police services to the CSUSB Palm Desert Campus (PDC) as part of the Palm Desert's Police Department's patrol of the City of Palm Desert. The MOU was approved by the Palm Desert City Council in September 2009, and notification by letter was sent to Dean Fred Jandt in October 2009. The "*Term*" clause in the MOU did not provide specific start and end dates, but it states, "The term of this agreement shall remain in effect for a period of five (5) years, or until terminated by either party, after giving written notice 30 days in advance of the intended date of termination." Further, the *Term* clause did not provide an option for extensions of the

agreement, which are normally in one-year increments. Notably, this MOU for law enforcement services was originally implemented based on a recommendation included in the previous Chancellor's Office audit of the University Police Department in 2008.

Education Code §67381 states that local law enforcement agencies shall enter into written agreements with campus law enforcement agencies if there are colleges or university campuses located in the jurisdictions of the local law enforcement agencies. The Education Code further states that each written agreement 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.

Failure to promptly renew and implement campus agreements for PDC law enforcement services increases the risk that the anticipated assistance and response may not be adequate to meet campus needs.

## **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that the campus either renew and implement the MOU for law enforcement services at PDC with the appropriate parties, or select an alternative that ensures there will be appropriate law enforcement services for PDC. Additionally, we recommend that if the MOU is renewed, then the Term clause should be written to specifically identify start and end dates of the agreement, as well as including options for (one-year) extensions of the agreement.

## **Management Response**

We concur. Law enforcement services at PDC are ongoing. Our action plan will be renew and implement the MOU for law enforcement services at PDC, or select an alternative method to continuously provide law enforcement services to PDC. If the MOU is renewed, we will request that the "Term" clause include start and end dates, and an option for extensions of the agreement.

**Implementation Date: March 31, 2015**

## **UPD Annual Training Program**

Improvement opportunities existed for the UPD annual training program.

After reviewing existing training programs and software used, we concluded the following:

- There are both individual and department-wide training programs, but the departmental training programs are not fully compliant with Systemwide policy. The departmental training plan (program) is posted in the UPD accessible areas for sworn officers, and it covered SEMS/NIMS/ICS, Handgun Tactics, Title 9, Tasers, Protesting Groups, Active Shooter, and Officer Involved Shooting. In the Auditor's opinion, those topics do not fully address the Systemwide requirements stated as: the use of force, weapon qualifications, active incidents/active shooter/rapid deployment response, and access to sensitive data.
- The UPD has a training committee, training manager, two training officers, and four field training officers. The training committee consists of the training manager and two training officers. However we noted that the training committee was less formal than is necessary. The training committee met on an ad hoc basis, and there were no minutes of meetings or calendar records of meeting sessions as evidence of the ad hoc training committee meetings. Additionally there were no letters of appointment for individuals serving on the training committee.

Noncompliance with systemwide training requirements and informal training committee commitments increases the risk of inadequate training for UPD sworn officers and management.

EO 1046, *CSU Police & Public Safety Policy Guidelines*, dated January 15, 2010, states that Police Chiefs *must* establish an annual training program for their department to ensure compliance with department operational policies and other CSU requirements. At a minimum, these programs *must* cover the following areas: use of force, weapon qualifications, active incidents/active shooter/rapid deployment response, and access to sensitive data. Additional training may be required to meet Peace Officer Standards and Training and/or accreditation standards.

Systemwide Risk Management & Public Safety Technical Letter PS 2010-02, Technical Letter re: *CSU Police Services Minimum Training Requirements*, dated July 26, 2010, states that Police Chiefs *shall* establish an annual training program to ensure compliance with department operational policies and CSU mandates in the following areas at a minimum: policies dealing with the use of force, weapon qualifications, active incidents/active shooter/rapid deployment response, and access to sensitive data. Additional training may be required to meet Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and/or accreditation standards.

CSUSB UPD General Order 2-6, §III.A., *Training*, dated June 30, 2008, states that the Department will have a training committee, which will assist in developing and evaluating training needs and will serve as a focal point for input from different Department components. The training committee will be comprised of the following individuals, who will be appointed at

the Chief's discretion: Lieutenant of Operations, Designated Sergeant or Officer, Senior Field Training Officer, Communications Supervisor, and Senior Investigator.

### **Recommendation 3:**

We recommend that the UPD:

- a. Review the Department Training Plan/Program and update it as necessary to clearly include all elements of the Systemwide requirements for a campus-based sworn officer training program.
- b. Formalize Training Committee activities by documenting minutes of meetings, and time, place, and dates of meetings.
- c. Ensure that members officially on the Training Committee are provided with letters of appointment, signed and dated by the Chief, and showing dates of the appointment period.

### **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan will be to:

- a. Review and update the Department Training Plan/Program such that it clearly includes all elements of the Systemwide requirements for a campus-based sworn officer training program.
- b. Formalize Training Committee activities by documenting minutes of meetings, and time, place, and dates of meetings.
- c. Ensure Training Committee members are provided with letters of appointment, signed and dated by the Chief, and showing dates of the appointment period.

**Implementation Date: December 31, 2014**

### **Range Qualifications**

Range qualifications were not always current.

The audit of range qualifications records began with a review of information in the LEA Data Technologies database information on firearms qualifications. We found that the database was

not entirely reliable, and there were difficulties with organizing the data in a manner that the UPD wanted it to be displayed.

As an additional audit procedure, we made inquiries regarding other software that might be useful and appropriate, and found that the UPD had substantial information showing that the TIMS system (Training Information Management System) software had capabilities that might be more useful for the UPD firearm training (and other training) record purposes. TIMS is a software module that integrates with the existing RIMS system (Records Information Management System) using the same database, security, and user profiles. Additionally RIMS is currently used for police reports, and tracking all assets within the UPD.

Since the LEA database records were not reliable, we instead relied upon the hard-copy range qualifications data for audit testing. Test results of the 13 sworn officers shown on the agency roster report, for various periods from October 2011 through September 2014 showed discrepancies and gaps in range qualification training for every sworn officer. Each of the 13 sworn officers tested had gaps in training for at least 4 months, and one officer had no hard-copy range records whatsoever. According to UPD and other policies, training gaps are limited to 3 months, and all training must be supported by hard-copy range qualification records. We noted that CSU Systemwide policy requires semiannual qualification, but the UPD General Orders Manual requires the more stringent quarterly qualification. Even at the less stringent semiannual training level, audit tests showed that 10 of the 13 sworn officers had gaps in range qualification training for 6 months or more.

EO 756, *Authorized Weapons, Weapons Training, and Use of Weapons in CSU Police Departments*, dated September 21, 2000 states that qualified campus Peace Officers who are armed shall receive semiannual training in the legal and operations aspects of firearms and shall complete the requirements to remain qualified on each weapon they use. EO 756 further states that officers shall receive training in and qualify with, all types of firearms they may be required to use in the performance of their law enforcement duties. A written record of semiannual training and firearms qualifications shall be maintained for each officer. Only those officers who meet the training and qualification requirements of the campus police department for demonstrated proficiency in the use of firearms shall be allowed to carry or use firearms.

The UPD General Orders Manual, §3-2, *Firearms and Shotgun Procedures*, §F, Firearms Training and Qualification, dated September 11, 2012, states that each officer shall demonstrate their proficiency in the care and use of department approved duty firearms at least quarterly.

Failure to ensure quarterly weapons qualifications increases the risk that officers would not be fully qualified to respond to incidents, and would increase the campus' risk for litigation.

#### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that the UPD:

- a. Evaluate and consider the potential advantages of using the TIMS system as contrasted with the existing LEA system. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of both with the VP for Administration and Finance/CFO for additional guidance.
- b. Improve upon the frequency of firearms training qualification for all sworn officers.
- c. Evaluate and consider the value of revising the UPD General Order 3-2 quarterly requirement for firearms range qualification to align with the Systemwide requirement of semiannual range qualification. Also discuss this issue with the VP for Administration and Finance/CFO for further guidance.

#### **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan will be to:

- a. Evaluate the potential advantages of using the TIMS system for UPD training recordkeeping, and discuss any such decisions with the VP for Administration and Finance/CFO.
- b. Improve upon the frequency of firearms training qualification for all sworn officers.
- c. Evaluate the value of revising General Order 3-2 to more closely align with Systemwide requirements for semiannual training, and discuss any such decisions with the VP for Administration and Finance/CFO.

**Implementation Date: March 31, 2015**

#### **Firearms Inventory Review**

Inactive firearms in the UPD inventory needed management's attention and possible disposal.

We reviewed weapons/firearms inventory, types of weapons, and who they were assigned to. Our review of firearms inventory, types of weapons, and who they were assigned to showed that there were two .38 caliber revolver firearms that were shown as "inactive." Upon further review we found that the weapons had been in the armory inventory, inactive, for years. These firearms were not on the Chief's authorized list of firearms for uniformed sworn personnel, nor was there

a special authorization (exception) on file for the firearms. We also noted that there was no .38 caliber ammunition in inventory for the firearms. Discussions with management and staff disclosed that the firearms were substantially obsolete, although they were in perfect working order, tested, and very well maintained. Management stated that there was no practical need for the .38 caliber weapons, and they could easily be sold or otherwise disposed of.

The UPD General Orders Manual, §3-2, *Firearms and Shotgun Procedures, Policy Statement*, dated September 11, 2012, states that only weapons and ammunition authorized by the department will be used by department personnel in law enforcement responsibilities. The authorized firearms for uniformed sworn personnel are shown as: the Heckler and Koch .45 caliber pistol, the Bushmaster Ar-15 .223 caliber rifle, and the Remington 870 Shotgun.

The International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA), §7.2.2, *Firearms and Ammunition*, states, in part, that a written directive will specify the types of firearms and ammunition approved for use by the agency (CSUSB). The directive should specify the type, caliber, barrel length and other characteristics of authorized firearms, as well as expressly prohibit unauthorized weapons and ammunition.

### **Recommendation 5**

We recommend that UPD management consider disposal of the two .38 caliber firearms shown as “not assigned” in the firearms inventory listing.

### **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan will be to evaluate the best methods for disposal of the obsolete .38 caliber firearms, and then dispose of them expediently.

**Implementation Date: November 30, 2014**

### **Ammunition Inventory Management**

Ammunition inventory needed adjustment, and a procedure for secondary review of inventory balances needed to be implemented.

We reviewed ammunition inventory for all of 2013, and for January through September 15 of 2014, noting that ammunition is both a high-risk and a high-cost item. Only one discrepancy was noted, but it affected balances forward for more than 6 months. The March 1, 2014 inventory record showed an ending balance of 7,860 units of .223 caliber rifle rounds. However the recalculated total was actually 7,760 units. The balance on the ledger for March 2014 was

overstated due to a calculation error. As a result of the calculation error, the inventory balances for March 2014, and all of the carry-forward balances to subsequent periods, through September 2014, were overstated.

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.

Incorrect ammunition inventory records can potentially increase the risk of loss and liability.

### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend that:

- a. The ammunition inventory ledgers should be corrected for the .223 caliber rounds.
- b. A procedure for secondary review of inventory balances should be implemented.

### **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan is:

- a. We corrected the overstated inventory balance of .223 caliber rounds when notified of the error.
- b. We will implement a procedure for secondary review of ammunition inventory balances.

### **Implementation Date: October 30, 2014**

Follow-Up: We noted that the UPD adjusted the inventory balances shortly after notification.

## **EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT**

### **Campus Emergency Management Plan**

Review and update procedures for the campus emergency management plan (EMP) needed revision.

At the commencement of the audit, we noted that the EMP had not been formally reviewed and updated since January 2009. In 2009 the EMP was updated based on an audit recommendation from the Chancellor's Office. However, we observed during this audit that the Emergency

Manager reviewed and updated the EMP, as approved by the Vice President for Administration and Finance, with a final revision date of June 2014. (Note that, as of the date of audit, Emergency Management was not managed by the UPD, and has not been managed by the UPD for a few years, but the topic nonetheless falls within the scope of this audit.)

We noted that, although the EMP was reviewed and update in June 2014, multiple updates were overlooked prior to the 2014 update. Contrary to previously existing CSU systemwide policies (EO 1013 and EO 921), there were no documented reviews and updates of the EMP between January 2009 and June 2014. Additionally, the current June 2014 update did not include a specific method of update required by EO 1056, which calls for a signed and dated acknowledgement to be attached to the campus EMP.

EO 1056, *California State University Emergency Management Program*, dated March 7, 2011, states, in part, that the campus President is responsible for implementation and maintenance of an emergency management program on campus and for ensuring the following management activity is accomplished in support of the campus emergency management program: Develop 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. Documentation of review, update and distribution must be in the form of a signed and dated written acknowledgement that is attached to the master campus emergency plan.

Failure to maintain a current and complete EMP increases the risk of inadequate response to emergencies, and demonstrates noncompliance with CSU systemwide policies.

### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that management ensure that:

- a. Updates to the EMP follow the requirements outlined in EO 1056 with regard to timing of the updates: *annually or more frequently as needed*.
- b. Documentation of review, update and distribution must be in the form of a signed and dated written acknowledgement that is attached to (included in) the EMP.

### **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan will be to:

- a. Follow the requirements of EO 1056 precisely for the timing of EMP updates.

- b. Ensure that documentation of review, update and distribution will be in the form of a signed and dated written acknowledgement that is attached to (included in) the EMP.

**Implementation Date: December 31, 2014**

## **PROPERTY MANAGEMENT**

### **Advisory Regarding Property Recording of Firearms**

Various firearms, including handguns and shotguns, were not recorded in the campus property records.

Existing CSUSB written procedures did not require that firearms be recorded in the property records. However, the ICSUAM recommends that campuses refer to guidance in both the Capital Assets Guide, and in the CSU Administration of University Property Guidelines (Property Guidelines) which is still in the developmental stage. The Capital Assets Guide is silent on the specific handling of firearms, but the Property Guidelines indicate that all university police firearms should be recorded in the property records, as non-capitalized equipment that must be tracked. It is clear that the direction of CSU systemwide policy is to record all university police firearms in the property records. (Note that the Property Management department is not managed by the UPD, but UPD property management procedures were evaluated during the audit to properly address the issue of recording UPD firearms in the CSUSB property records. The topic of property management procedures for the UPD therefore falls within the scope of this audit.)

The *CSU Administration of University Property Guidelines, §3.2, Non-Capitalized Equipment*, states, in part, that examples of non-capitalized equipment include, but are not limited to, university police firearms. The Guidelines further state, in part, that, at a minimum, non-capitalized equipment that must be tracked and tagged based on the above definition of non-capitalized equipment are: (1) university police firearms.

Tracking of high risk equipment, such as university police department firearms has the potential for mitigating risk and decreasing liability.

### **Recommendation 8**

We recommend that Property Management:

- a. Schedule a project to record all UPD firearms in the property records.

- b. Update the CSUSB Property Management Handbook to include the mandatory recording of firearms in the property records.

### **Management Response**

We concur. Our action plan will be to:

- a. Schedule a project to record all UPD firearms in the property records.
- b. Update the CSUSB Property Management Handbook to include the mandatory recording of firearms in the property records.

### **Implementation Date: March 31, 2015**

Follow-Up: We noted that, shortly after the audit of the property records for UPD, Property Management had updated the Property Management Handbook to include the mandatory recording of firearms in the property records.

### **AUDIT FOLLOW-UP AND CLOSURE:**

The Auditor considers this audit closed, and encourages management to appropriately address the observations and recommendations contained in this report. We plan to revisit the UPD, Emergency Management, and Property Management in about 90 days to evaluate implementation of the audit recommendations.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 909-537-3430, or via e-mail.

- c: Tomás Morales  
M. Monir Ahmed  
Richard Blackburn  
Jimmy Brown  
Sharon Brown-Welty  
Debbie Burns  
Walter Duncan  
Kathy Hansen  
Beth Stanton

---

**APPENDIX A:  
PERSONNEL CONTACTED**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Tomás Morales	President
M. Monir Ahmed	Associate Vice President Finance, Administration and Finance
Richard Blackburn	Emergency Manager, Aux. & Bus. Services & Risk Management
James Bradford	Sergeant, University Police Department (UPD)
Jimmy Brown	Chief of Police, UPD
Sharon Brown-Welty	Dean, Palm Desert Campus
Debbie Burns	Assistant Vice President, Aux. & Bus. Services & Risk Management
Walter Duncan	Lieutenant, UPD
Charlene Earl	Administrative Support Coordinator, Property Management
Douglas Freer	Vice President for Administration and Finance/CFO (Current)
Robert Gardner	Vice President for Administration and Finance/CFO (Prior)
Kathy Hansen	Director, Procurement & Support Services, Purchasing
Scott Kovach	Support Services Supervisor, UPD
Beth Stanton	Purchasing Manager, Purchasing
Erik Sylvestri	Officer, UPD