

Summit County Court of Common Pleas
General Division
2nd Audit Follow-up General Report

Prepared For:

Honorable Judge Amy Corrigan Jones
Audit Committee

Approved by Audit Committee
September 16, 2019



Summit County
Internal Audit Department
175 South Main Street
Akron, Ohio 44308

Lisa L. Skapura, Director
Jon Keenan, Deputy Director
Brandon Schmidt, Senior Auditor
Amanda Winkelman, Staff Auditor

Summit County Court of Common Pleas
General Division
2nd Audit Follow-up – General Report

Auditors:

Lisa Skapura, Director; Jon Keenan, Deputy Director; Brandon Schmidt, Senior Auditor; and Amanda Winkelman, Staff Auditor.

Objectives and Methodology:

To determine if management has implemented their management action plans as stated in the previously issued audit reports.

Follow-up audits are not required to be conducted under GAO Yellow Book Standards. Due to the nature of this engagement (e.g., following up on issues noted in the prior audit reports with limited planning/assessment of risk and no new issues identified), this audit follow-up was not conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

Scope:

An overview and evaluation of policies, processes, and procedures implemented by the department/agency because of management actions stated in the management action plans during the prior audit process.

Testing Procedures:

The following were the major audit steps performed:

1. Review the prior audit final reports to gain an understanding of IAD issues, recommendations, and subsequent management action plans completed by the audited department/agency.
2. Review the work papers from the prior audit.
3. Review any departmental/agency response documentation provided to IAD with management action plan responses following the prior audit.
4. Identify management actions through discussions/interviews with appropriate departmental personnel to gain an understanding of the updates/actions taken.
5. Review applicable support to evaluate management actions.
6. Determine implementation status of management action plans.
7. Complete the audit follow-up report noting the status of previously noted management actions.

Summary:

Of the seven (7) issues and the corresponding management action plans noted in the first audit follow-up report which required follow-up action, the Court of Common Pleas – General Division (Common Pleas) fully implemented five (5), partially implemented one (1) and did not implement one (1) management action plans.

Based on the above-noted information, IAD believes the Common Pleas has made a positive effort towards implementing the management action plans as stated in response to the issues identified in the preliminary audit and no further follow up is needed.

Summit County Court of Common Pleas
General Division
2nd Audit Follow-up – General Report

Listed below is a summary of the issues noted in the audit follow-up report and their status. Each issue number is in reference to the previously-issued audit report:

Items Not Requiring Follow-up:

Previously Implemented:

Issue 1 - Upon review of policy and procedure manuals for completeness and accuracy, IAD noted the following:

- General Division Policy and Procedures Manual
 - The manual has not been formally approved by management.
 - The manual includes incorrect references to legislation.

- Psycho-Diagnostic Policy and Procedures Manual
 - The manual includes incorrect references to legislation.

Issue 2 - Upon review of policies and procedures, IAD noted insufficient policies and procedures over IT asset inventory.

Issue 4 - Upon discussion with Psycho-Diagnostic personnel and review of the Psycho-Diagnostic Billing Policy, IAD noted one employee responsible for invoicing and receiving payments, creating an improper segregation of duties.

Issue 6 - Upon detail testing of Banner expenditures, IAD noted three (3) of twenty-two (22) instances where a prior year purchase order was used for payment.

Issue 8 - Upon discussion with the Special Projects Officer and Director of IT, Common Pleas does not maintain a list of asset disposals (general and IT); therefore, IAD was unable to perform detail testing to verify proper approval of disposed assets (e.g., via Executive Order).

Issue 10 - Upon review of payroll approval and sign-off in Kronos, IAD noted eight (8) out of eight (8) pay periods with improper approval (e.g., one employee approving and signing-off or no separate approval), creating an improper segregation of duties.

Issue 11 - Upon detail testing of evidence inventory, IAD noted three (3) out of five (5) instances where evidence was maintained in the vault; however, the Summit County Online Records System (SCORS) did not denote the same.

Issue 13 - Upon detail testing of arbitrated cases, IAD noted one (1) of two (2) instances where the report and award was not filed within twenty (20) days after the hearing, in accordance with Local Rule 10.14.

Items Requiring Follow-up:

MANAGEMENT ACTION PLANS FULLY IMPLEMENTED

Issue 3 - Upon detail testing of Psycho-Diagnostic Clinic payments received, IAD noted sixteen (16) of eighteen (18) instances where payments were not timely deposited, in accordance with ORC §9.38.

Upon detail testing of Psycho-Diagnostic Clinic payments received, IAD noted no issues.

Summit County Court of Common Pleas
General Division
2nd Audit Follow-up – General Report

Issue 5 - Upon review of the jury management fee spreadsheet, IAD noted no tracking for the date payments are received; therefore, detail testing could not be performed to verify timely deposit.

IAD obtained a jury management fee spreadsheet and upon detail testing of the jury management fees, IAD noted no issues.

Issue 7 - Upon discussion with the Administrative Human Resource Specialist, IAD noted no employee specifically assigned to receive purchases. This creates the potential for the same employee to order and receive goods, causing an improper segregation of duties. In addition, IAD noted the packing slip is not signed-off on upon receipt.

IAD noted a policy was created related to the segregation of duties over receiving goods. Additionally, upon detail testing of supply orders, IAD noted no issues.

Issue 12 - Upon detail testing and discussion with Assistant Director of Operations, IAD was unable to confirm if the legal education requirement for arbitrators was met, in accordance with Local Rule 10.03 (B). Additionally, upon discussion, it was noted the list of current arbitrators is outdated.

IAD noted the education requirement for arbitrators was removed. Additionally, IAD noted the list of arbitrators has been updated.

Issue 14 - Upon detail testing of arbitrated cases, IAD noted the following:

- Two (2) out of two (2) instances where IAD could not verify the accuracy of payments made to the arbitrators as a result of insufficient supporting documentation.
- Two (2) out of two (2) instances where a certification of fees form was not completed.

Additionally, IAD noted no policy regarding payments made to arbitrators.

IAD noted no issues related to the accuracy of payments and the certification of fees form from the prior audit follow-up. Additionally, IAD obtained a policy regarding payments made to arbitrators and upon review, IAD noted no issues.

MANAGEMENT ACTION PLANS PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED:

Issue 9 - Upon detail testing of asset inventory, IAD noted the following:

- Four (4) of twenty-five (25) and eight (8) out of twenty-five (25) instances where IAD was unable to locate the IT and general asset, respectively, in Common Pleas' office areas.
- Four (4) of twenty-five (25) and four (4) of twenty-five (25) instances where the IT and general assets, respectively, located in Common Pleas' offices did not agree to the respective asset inventory listings.

IAD noted an IT Asset Inventory policy was created during the last audit follow-up.

Upon detail testing of IT asset inventory, IAD noted the following:

- *Two (2) out of twenty (20), or 10%, instances where IAD was unable to locate the IT asset within the Common Pleas.*
- *Two (2) out of twenty (20), or 10%, instances where the IT asset located within the Common Pleas did not agree to the IT asset inventory listing.*

Summit County Court of Common Pleas
General Division
2nd Audit Follow-up – General Report

MANAGEMENT ACTION PLANS NOT IMPLEMENTED:

Issue 15 - Upon discussion, IAD noted a Local Rule has not been adopted, governing appointments made by the court, including procedures to ensure an equitable distribution of appointments among all persons on the appointment list, in accordance with Rules of Superintendence, Rule 8.

IAD obtained correspondence between Common Pleas personnel and Presiding Judge related to establishing a local rule; however, upon discussion with Common Pleas personnel, IAD noted a local rule has not been adopted in accordance with Rules of Superintendence, Rule 8.