PROJECT SUMMARY

Overview

The University Police Department (UPD) at Texas A&M University has processes and controls in place to provide reasonable assurance that resources are generally used efficiently and effectively to provide a safe environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors. We noted a lack of monitoring and oversight of administrative processes which has led to a number of instances of noncompliance with established administration requirements. Opportunities for improvement were noted in several administrative areas including periodic updating of the department’s goals, objectives and performance measures; obtaining the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) accreditation; maintaining compliance with the UPD policy manual; creating a disaster recovery plan; monitoring firearm repairs; disclosing conflicts of interest; establishing a contract for Basic Police Academy assistance; and ensuring appropriate staffing for Clery Act responsibilities.

UPD provides law enforcement and security services to all components of Texas A&M University including the academic campus and a variety of satellite facilities throughout Brazos County with an annual operating budget of $6.7 million.

Summary of Management’s Response

UPD strives to provide a safe and secure environment through education, the cooperative spirit of all University community members, and the enforcement of laws and regulations. The recommendations detailed in the audit report will further enhance administrative processes of the department. Efforts are underway to address the recommendations. Detailed responses are included in each section.

Scope

The review of the University Police Department focused on the areas of goals, objectives and performance measures; policies
and procedures; revenue management; Clery Act compliance; evidence inventory management; external complaints; training; and information technology. The review focused primarily on activities from June 1, 2010 through May 31, 2011. Fieldwork was conducted from July to September, 2011.
OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESPONSES

1. Monitoring and Oversight

Observation

Insufficient monitoring and oversight of the administrative processes at UPD place the University at risk of noncompliance with applicable laws, policies, regulations, and rules. In addition, the lack of monitoring and oversight increases the risk of departmental resources being used inefficiently and/or inappropriately. In the last year, UPD has experienced turnover in positions responsible for oversight and monitoring of key administrative functions. This coupled with the university-wide required budget cuts in departmental funding over the past few years, has left UPD short-staffed in the administrative area. UPD management chose to focus salaries on direct law enforcement functions instead of administrative functions. The lack of monitoring and oversight of administrative activities helped cause a number of the control weaknesses identified in this report.

Monitoring and oversight are essential components of a strong system of internal controls. Without adequate monitoring and oversight the department’s risk of inefficient and ineffective use of resources and noncompliance with established requirements is increased.

Recommendation

The control environment of UPD should be strengthened by improving the monitoring and oversight by management so that problems and control weaknesses are identified in a timely manner and corrective actions are taken as necessary.

Management’s Response

Monitoring and oversight processes will be enhanced through implementation of the recommendations noted in the audit report. Collectively, the additional management oversight and improvement of processes as detailed in responses two through nine will strengthen the control environment and the department. Additional improvements will be implemented as needs and opportunities are identified. Target date: September 30, 2012.
2. Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures

Observation

| Formal goals, objectives and performance measures have not been updated since fiscal year 2007. |
| UPD has not updated its formal goals, objectives and performance measures since fiscal year 2007 when its strategic plan was created. Goals and objectives provide the department's employees with a clear understanding of what the department wants to achieve. Annual performance measures define the department's expectations for accomplishing its goals and objectives. The UPD policy manual states, “Goals and objectives are always associated with each fiscal year of the University and shall be developed with input from all employees.” The absence of current goals, objectives and performance measures increases the risk that employees do not have a good understanding of what the department wants to achieve and that management does not hold divisions accountable for successful achievement of performance expectations. |

Recommendation

| Comply with the department’s policy manual by periodically updating goals, objectives, and performance measures for the department. Collect data and evaluate the department’s annual performance related to its performance measure targets. |

Management’s Response

| The department’s mission, vision, goals and metrics will be updated and coordinated with the Division of Administration’s Planning for Performance Excellence Initiative currently being conducted. Available data will be evaluated at the end of the fiscal year. Additionally, the policy manual will be updated to reflect current practices. Target date for evaluation of fiscal year 2012 metrics: September 30, 2012. |

3. Accreditation

Observation

| UPD has not put a plan in place to complete the accreditation process. |
| UPD does not have a formal plan in place to ensure it successfully completes the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) accreditation process. In our prior audit in 2006, management stated it was committed to obtaining accreditation through the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA). Since that audit, the department decided instead to pursue the CALEA accreditation. |
3. Accreditation (cont.)

UPD began the CALEA accreditation process in September 2009. There are five general phases in the accreditation process: enrollment; self-assessment; on-site assessment; commission review and decision; and maintaining compliance and reaccreditation. UPD has until September 2012 to complete the self-assessment phase.

CALEA accreditation enhances the department’s status in that it demonstrates that the department has met an established set of internationally recognized standards for law enforcement.

Recommendation

Create a formal plan with milestones and deliverables that ensure completion of the accreditation process. The plan should also include the resources necessary to ensure completion.

Management’s Response

A team consisting of patrol supervisory and administrative personnel will be assembled to develop a plan to complete the accreditation process. The plan will include an estimated timeline, milestones, deliverables, and identify needed resources. The plan will be submitted to management for review. Target date for completion and review of plan: March 31, 2012.


Observation

UPD is not consistently following requirements set forth in its policy manual. Specific areas of noncompliance include:

- UPD has not performed a complete, annual inventory of the evidence rooms by an independent party. The policy manual states, “Annually, the Chief or his designee shall order an unannounced audit/inspection of the property and evidence storage areas by a supervisor not routinely or directly connected with the control of property.”

- The external complaint log was not updated with the disposition of the complaints and it was not designed to capture the date the investigation was completed. The policy manual states, “A complaint log shall be kept for all complaints received. The complaint log shall include the following information: tracking number; date received; complainant; allegation; employee; date assigned; investigator; and final
4. Compliance with UPD Policy Manual (cont.)

disposition.” The policy manual also states, “All investigations shall be completed within 30 days of assignment.” However, without logging the date the investigation was completed, UPD cannot document that investigations are being handled timely.

Additionally, for three formal complaints reviewed, the Chief did not notify the complainant in writing of the disposition of the complaint. The policy manual states, “Upon completion of the investigation, the Chief shall by letter notify the complainant of the following: the general findings and conclusion of the investigation; that appropriate corrective or disciplinary action is being taken if the allegation is sustained; and that the investigation is officially closed.”

- Outside employment is not monitored to ensure that employees are consistently completing the External Employment and Consulting Application and Approval Form annually. Through interviews it was determined that 10 employees should have completed approval forms for fiscal year 2011. There was no form on file for 6 of the 10 (60%) employees. Management was unaware that one of the employees had external employment. For the other five employees, there was confusion about whether or not a form should be completed. Two of these employees provide security for apartment units and the other three were adjunct instructors for the Texas Engineering Extension Service (TEEX). The policy manual states, “Employees desiring to engage in off-duty employment must prepare a written External Employment and Consulting Application and Approval Form.”

- Training for security and administrative employees is not monitored. Only training that is related to TCLEOSE (Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards & Education) certifications is monitored. The policy manual states, “The authority and responsibility for all training, for both sworn and civilian personnel, shall be vested in the Training Section of the department. The duties of the Training Section include... (11) Maintaining accurate employee records of all training... Attendance at all training schools or sessions shall be documented and records maintained, by the Training Coordinator in the employee’s personnel file, which shall be updated immediately upon successful completion of a training program.”

The majority of the information found in the policy manual is required to obtain and maintain CALEA accreditation. According to CALEA Standards for Law Enforcement Agencies, CALEA
Accreditation “strengthens the agency’s accountability through a continuum of standards that clearly define authority, performance and responsibilities and can limit an agency’s liability and risk exposure because it demonstrates that internationally recognized standards for law enforcement have been met.”

Recommendation

Review departmental policies as outlined in the UPD Policy Manual and update as necessary. Train all employees on established procedures and monitor to ensure compliance.

Management’s Response

The UPD Policy Manual will be reviewed and updated as necessary including the items discussed below.

- Evidence room spot checks are now performed by a staff member independent of evidence property and are unannounced. Evidence room inventory procedures will be reviewed for consistency with CALEA standards and modified as needed. This will include a full inventory of money, jewelry, drugs, and weapons. Target date: February 28, 2012.

- The external complaint log format has been updated to record the dates investigations were completed and date of notification of disposition to the complainant and is in use. The policy manual will be modified to reflect current processes. Target date: December 31, 2011.

- Outside employment forms have been completed for fiscal year 2012. An annual notification will be sent to employees to submit requests for the new fiscal year and as a reminder to submit throughout the year for changes. Target date: Complete.

- Training records for security and administrative employees will be reviewed annually. This portion of the policy manual will be reviewed and updated to reflect current procedures. Target date: May 31, 2012.

- Training or communication of updates and areas warranting additional compliance efforts will be provided. Target date: May 31, 2012.
5. Firearm Repairs

Observation

UPD does not have a formal process in place for monitoring firearm repairs. Firearms are inspected annually and at each weapons qualification session that typically occurs quarterly. The annual inspection includes a full break-down of the weapon, and the quarterly inspection consists of ensuring the weapon is functioning properly. Inspections of handguns are documented; however, rifle and shotgun inspections are not documented.

According to management, deficiencies noted during inspections are typically corrected at the time of the inspection; however, without consistent documentation of the inspections and subsequent repairs, there is no record to document that repairs were made. Additionally, if an officer determines that his/her firearm is in need of repair, there is no formal process in place for him/her to request to have it repaired. Management indicated that the officer is required to take the firearm needing repair to the Weapons Coordinator or an authorized firearms instructor for inspection. The department did not have any documentation of these types of inspections and repairs.

Lack of documented inspections and repairs increases UPD’s risks should a gun malfunction and it be determined to be in need of repair. According to the UPD Policy Manual, a record will be maintained of each firearm that will include the last date of inspection as well as any notes regarding the firearm.

Recommendation

Establish a formal process for requesting/initiating and monitoring a firearm repair. Document the chain of custody of the firearm and any notes about the repair as well as the time it took from notification to completion of the repair. Maintain documentation of repairs along with annual and range inspections for each firearm in inventory at UPD.

Management’s Response

A web-based process is being developed to request and maintain firearm repairs. The online process will document the date the repair is requested, notes about the repair, and date of completion. Chain of custody of the firearm will also be documented.
5. Firearm Repairs (cont.)  

A form similar to the handgun inspection form currently in use has been developed to document rifle and shotgun inspections. Use of the form will begin January 1, 2012. Target date: January 31, 2012.

6. Disaster Recovery Planning

Observation

There is no disaster recovery plan in place for the UPD CAD/RMS databases.

The department has not created a disaster recovery plan for the CAD/RMS (Computer Automated Dispatch/Record Management System) databases which contain the mission-critical information UPD needs to maintain operations on a daily basis. Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 202.24 addresses requirements for business continuity planning including specific elements of a disaster recovery plan. Texas A&M University Standard Administrative Procedure 29.01.M1.32, Information Resources - Disaster Recovery Planning, requires a documented disaster recovery plan be maintained for all mission-critical resources. Failure to properly prepare for the loss of mission-critical IT services can result in excessive downtime and costs that negatively affect the department’s ability to fulfill its responsibilities.

Recommendation

Establish a departmental disaster recovery plan for mission-critical information systems as part of the departmental business continuity plan. The disaster recovery plan should be documented, tested and updated on a periodic basis and approved by the Chief or his designated representative.

Management’s Response

UPD has recently added a position of a Senior Information Technology Professional II. The position is expected to be filled in January 2012. This position will assist in preparing a disaster recovery plan for the CAD/RMS databases. The plan will be documented, include measures for periodic testing and updating, and be approved by UPD management. Target date for plan completion: April 30, 2012.
7. Clery Act Responsibilities

Observation

**UPD has not identified a backup for Clery Act responsibilities.**

UPD does not have an identified backup for performing Clery Act responsibilities when the primary person is unavailable. According to the Code of Federal Regulations 34CFR668.46 the institution must log in information within two business days of the report to the campus police unless that disclosure is exempted. The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting also suggests that the institution have more than one person responsible for making entries in the log in case of personnel changes or work absences. Without a backup for Clery Act responsibilities, UPD risks noncompliance with reporting requirements if the responsible officer is out for more than two consecutive days.

Additionally, information on the UPD website was outdated and contained non-Clery Act reports that may be perceived as Cleary Act information by a reader.

Recommendation

| Identify and train a backup person for Clery Act reporting. Periodically monitor the UPD web site to ensure that information published is up-to-date. For clarity, consider grouping all Clery Act-related items on the UPD website in a similar location. |

Management’s Response

| A backup position for Clery Act reporting has been assigned and trained. To remain current on departmental procedures, the backup position will perform Clery Act duties once a month. Target date: Completed. Non-Clery Act reports have been removed from the website. If additional reports are added in the future, they will be grouped separately from Clery Act items. Target date: Completed. |

8. Contract for Basic Police Academy Assistance

Observation

**No formal agreement is in place for UPD’s assistance with the TEEX Basic Police Academy.**

Currently there is no written agreement between Texas Engineering Extension Service (TEEX) and UPD documenting each party’s deliverables, responsibilities and liabilities with regard to UPD’s assistance in providing teaching services to TEEX’s
8. Contract for Basic Police Academy (cont.)

Basic Police Academy. UPD provides officers to serve as instructors for the academy. The officers teach during their regular work hours and as a result, they do not receive additional compensation from TEEX nor does the UPD assess a fee to TEEX for the officers’ time.

Texas A&M University Rule 25.07.M1, Contract Administration, states “Written contracts shall be executed whenever Texas A&M University enters into a binding agreement with another party that involves any stated or implied consideration.” Management was unaware that a contract needed to be in place because the current understanding with TEEX, which also includes other law enforcement agencies within the Brazos Valley, has been in place for several years.

In addition, UPD does not track the number of officers or hours spent teaching at the academy. Management was unaware that UPD officers were being requested to teach at the academy more frequently than officers at other Brazos Valley law enforcement agencies. If the terms of the agreement are not stated explicitly, there is an increased risk for disagreements and misunderstandings.

Recommendation

Ensure a written agreement is in place between UPD and TEEX outlining duties and responsibilities of each with regards to the Basic Police Academy. UPD should monitor the number of officers and hours spent teaching at the academy to ensure compliance with provisions of the agreement.

Management’s Response

A memorandum of understanding will be put in place between UPD and TEEX to outline the respective parties’ duties and responsibilities regarding the Basic Police Academy. Compliance with the agreement provisions will be monitored. Target date for completion of the memorandum of understanding: January 31, 2012.

9. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Observation

Annual conflict of interest disclosures are not required by management. 

UPD does not have a formal process in place to require annual conflict of interest disclosures from employees so that management can manage any conflicts which may exist. There
are several married couples within the department as well as other related parties such as siblings and cousins. Currently, disclosure of internal conflicts is up to the employee. Management stated they manage the conflicts through scheduling to ensure that related parties do not supervise one another. However, in some cases, the highest ranking officer on duty for a particular shift may not typically be a supervisor. In these situations, the highest ranking officer has indirect supervision over all functions of the department such as police, dispatch and security. While this indirect supervision does not include the ability to affect an employee’s pay or performance, there can be other departmental issues related to a perceived act of preferential treatment.

Management works with University Human Resources any time a question arises about supervision and related parties, but has not considered the risk of indirect supervision without the ability to affect pay or performance. Ensuring unbiased actions, in fact and appearance, are important in maintaining the integrity of UPD and its staff.

**Recommendation**

- Implement a formal process for obtaining employee disclosures of conflicts of interest. These disclosures should be updated annually.

**Management’s Response**

- *To ensure that management is aware of related parties and potential conflicts of interest, a form will be developed for employees to disclose related parties and potential conflicts of interest. The form will be updated annually. Target date for completion of form by department personnel: March 31, 2012.*
BASIS OF REVIEW

Objective

The objective of this audit was to review the processes and controls in place within the University Police Department to determine if resources are used efficiently and effectively to provide a safe environment for students, faculty, staff and visitors. Also, determine if Department operations are in compliance with laws, policies, regulations and rules.

Criteria

Our audit was based upon standards as set forth in the System Policy and Regulation Manual of the Texas A&M University System; the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act; the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) Standards; the Treadway Commission’s Committee of Sponsoring Organization’s Internal Control – Integrated Framework (COSO); and other sound administrative practices. This audit was conducted in conformance with the Institute of Internal Auditors’ “International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing.”

Additionally, we conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Background

The University Police Department (UPD) is the primary police authority for Texas A&M University. It provides law enforcement and security services to all components of Texas A&M University including the academic campus and a variety of satellite facilities throughout Brazos County. The mission of UPD is to provide a safe and secure environment through education, the cooperative spirit of all University community members, and the enforcement of laws and regulations.
The Department has 133 authorized positions including 70 state-certified police officers, 42 security officers, 13 communication officers and 8 administrative support personnel. The fiscal year 2011 annual budget was $6.7 million. The Department maintains a fully staffed investigations division, a crime prevention unit, a recruiting unit, a training division, and an Emergency Communications Center.
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