



SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO

INTERNAL AUDIT DEPARTMENT

May 28, 2008

Sheriff Drew Alexander
Summit County Sheriff
53 University Ave., 4th floor
Akron, OH 44308

Sheriff Alexander:

Attached are the results of the second Follow-up Audit regarding the issues that were identified in the Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division Preliminary Audit report dated December 5, 2005, and the issues that remained partially or not implemented with the first follow-up audit dated March 28, 2007.

SECOND FOLLOW-UP AUDIT SUMMARY

The primary focus of this follow up was to provide the Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division with reasonable assurance, based on the testing performed, on the adequacy of the system of management control in effect for the audit areas tested. Management controls include the processes for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations, including systems for measuring, reporting, and monitoring performance. Management is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective controls that, in general, include the plan of organization, as well as methods, and procedures to ensure that goals are met.

Our follow up was conducted in accordance with Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and accordingly included such tests of records and other auditing procedures as we considered necessary under the circumstances. Our procedures include interviewing staff, reviewing procedures and other information and testing internal controls as needed to assess compliance with the stated management action plans.

The follow-up process should monitor and ensure that management actions have been effectively implemented or that senior management has accepted the risk of not taking action. Follow-up by internal auditors is defined as a process by which they determine the adequacy, effectiveness, and timeliness of actions taken by management on reported engagement observations.

Factors that should be considered in determining appropriate follow-up procedures are:

- The significance of the reported observation.
- The degree of effort and cost needed to correct the reported condition.
- The impact that may result should the corrective action fail.
- The complexity of the corrective action.
- The time period involved.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance received during the course of this follow-up audit. If you have any questions about the audit or this report, please feel free to contact me at (330) 643-2655.

Sincerely,

Bernard F. Zaucha
Director, Internal Audit

**Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division
Second Follow-up Audit**

Auditors:

Lisa Skapura, Assistant Director; Mira Pozna, Deputy Director; Anthony Boston, Internal Auditor; Meredith Merry, Internal Auditor

Objective:

To determine if management has implemented their management action plans as stated in the previously issued Preliminary Audit report.

Scope:

An overview and evaluation of policies, processes, and procedures implemented by the department/agency as a result of management actions stated in the management action plans during the Preliminary Audit process.

Testing Procedures:

The following were the major audit steps performed:

1. Review the final preliminary audit 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 Preliminary Audit.
3. Review any departmental/agency response documentation provided to IAD with management action plan responses following the Preliminary 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. Review the final first follow-up audit report.
8. Review applicable support to evaluate management actions.
9. Determine implementation status of management action plans.
10. Complete the second follow-up report noting status of previously noted management actions.

Summary

Of the seventeen issues and corresponding management action plans noted in the Preliminary Audit Report, the Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division fully implemented fifteen and partially implemented two.

Based on the above noted information, IAD believes that the Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division has made progress towards the implementation of their corrective management action plans.

Security Follow-Up:

Security follow-up issues noted during fieldwork are addressed under separate cover in the accompanying report in compliance with Ohio Revised Code §149.433²⁴⁸.

**Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division
Second Follow-up Audit
Comments**

The Internal Audit Department (IAD) conducted a Second Follow-up Audit of the Summit County Sheriff's Office Administration Division. The original Preliminary Audit was approved by the Summit County Audit Committee on December 8, 2005, and the First Follow-up Audit Report was approved on March 28, 2007.

Listed below is a summary of the issues noted in the Preliminary Report and their status. Each issue number is in reference to the preliminary report:

Management Action Plans Fully Implemented:

- Issue 2 - Upon review of the Sheriff's General Policies and Procedures, it was noted that there are no IT disaster recovery procedures or procedures for the job functions of the Support Services Administrator.
- Issue 3 - Upon review of the personnel files selected for detailed testing of the HR file requirements, the following issues were noted:
 - a) Four of 25 personnel files tested did not contain an application or resume. Upon follow up, IAD noted that the resume of the Director of Administration - Legal was added to her file.
 - b) Four of 24 applicable personnel files tested did not contain a 2003 performance evaluation. One of the 25 files was not applicable because the employee was hired after 2003.
 - c) Nine of 24 applicable personnel files tested did not contain a 2004 performance evaluation. One of the 25 files was not applicable because the employee was hired after 2004. Upon follow up, IAD noted that the Secretary II is in the process of establishing a standardized memo and a worksheet directed towards assisting supervisors with performance evaluations. The memo and worksheet gives the employee's hire date and promotion date, which allows the employee's supervisors to conduct evaluations accordingly. Per the Secretary II, the memos and worksheets will be sent out monthly.
 - d) Three of 20 applicable personnel files tested did not contain an I-9. Five of the files were not applicable due to their hiring before November 1, 1986, which is the effective date set by the Immigration and Naturalization Act. Upon follow up, IAD noted that the I-9 of the Director of Administration - Legal was added to her file. In addition, two memos were sent out to the remaining two employees stating that they were required to fill out an I-9 form for their file.
 - e) There was no signature on the mass employee sign-off sheet for three of 25 employees indicating the receipt and understanding of the Summit County Sheriffs Office General Policy and Procedure manual. Upon follow up, IAD noted that a Deputy, whose signature was missing, signed that he received and reviewed the General Policy and Procedure manual.
- Issue 4 - It was noted upon review of the Sheriff's Office General Policies and Procedures that there was no standard listing indicating the required documentation to be maintained in the Sheriff's Office personnel files.

- Issue 5 - Upon review of the personnel files, IAD noted confidential information in seven of the 25 files selected for testing. Per the Director of Administration-Personnel, there should be no confidential information contained in the personnel files.
- Issue 6 - Upon review of the narrative created through discussion with the Director of Administration-Finance in relation to the Furtherance of Justice (FOJ), Law Enforcement Trust Fund (LETF), Federal Law Enforcement Trust Fund (FLETf), and the Prisoner Transportation Account (PTA) it was noted that there is a lack of segregation of duties. The Director of Administration - Finance, approves all vouchers, receipts funds, prepares deposits, enters deposits on a log, deposits funds, performs bank reconciliations, and is a signatory on the accounts. Per the Director of Administration-Legal, she reviews all expenditures given to her to determine if the expenditure is appropriate from these funds. Upon review of support documentation for a travel expenditure from the FOJ account, it was noted that the Director of Administration-Finance had signed a check payable to herself. IAD noted that the Sheriff approved the Part I and II travel forms and there was adequate documentation supporting the expenditure, however, it is still a lack of segregation of duties.
- Issue 7 - Upon review of the Summit County Sheriff's General Policies and Procedures IAD noted that they do not contain procedures regarding the FOJ account.
- Issue 8 - Upon review of the expenditures made from the FOJ, they appeared reasonable as to the purpose. However, detail testing of the 128 expenditures reflected the following:
 - a) There were eleven Part II Request for Estimated Expense forms missing from the support package attached to the expenditure sheets.
 - b) There were three expenditures that were reimbursed that did not contain adequate documentation (i.e. invoice/receipts). Upon follow up, IAD obtained an affidavit in reference to check number 2353. It was noted that the affidavit was not notarized; therefore, IAD was unable to ensure the date of the affidavit.
 - c) There were nine instances where expenses were reimbursed based on Part I estimated expense forms. Prior to fieldwork completion, IAD obtained and reviewed an inter-office memo from the Director of Administration-Finance. Per the memo, "it will be our policy that no advanced payments will be expended unless there is a prior approval of the Sheriff or Chief before it is paid". IAD also obtained and reviewed the FOJ "Request for Funds" form from the Director of Administration-Finance. Per the Director of Administration-Finance, this form will be used to authorize the advancement of funds prior to expenditure and will require two authorized signatures.
 - d) There were seven employees who were reimbursed a per diem rate for meal(s). Per review of the attached seminar documentation, it was noted that meals were included in the seminar registration fee.
 - e) One employee used their credit card to pay for another employee's travel expenses and was personally reimbursed for the expenditure.
 - f) There was one employee who was reimbursed for two expenses (one travel and one lunch, occurring on two separate dates) both expenses were reimbursed on one travel reimbursement form.
 - g) There was a reimbursement to one employee for the out-of-town meal per diems of seven deputies (\$1,120).

- a. Issue 9 - Upon review of the expenditures made from the LETF, they appeared reasonable as to the purpose. However, detail testing of the 72 expenditures reflected the following:
 - a) There were eight reimbursement checks written prior to the actual expenditure. Prior to fieldwork completion, IAD obtained and reviewed an inter-office memo from the Director of Administration-Finance. Per the memo, "it will be our policy that no advanced payments will be expended unless there is a prior approval of the Sheriff or Chief before it is paid". IAD also obtained and reviewed the LETF "Request for Funds" form from the Director of Administration-Finance. Per the Director of Administration-Finance, this form will be used to authorize the advancement of funds prior to expenditure and will require two authorized signatures.
 - b) There were two travel expenditures missing a Part II Request for Estimated Expense form.
 - c) There was one expenditure that did not contain any supporting documentation.

- Issue 10 - IAD noted that the annual report sent to the County Auditor is dated February 25, 2005. Per O.R.C. § 2933.43 (Procedure for seizure and forfeiture of contraband), the Sheriff's Office is required to file a "report covering each calendar year" with the County Auditor (Fiscal Office) no later than the 31st day of January of the next calendar year and the Attorney General no later than March 1st.

- Issue 11 - IAD noted the Summit County Sheriff's Office General Policy and Procedures states that the 2004 Annual Forfeiture and Fine Report, which is sent to the Attorney General, should be sent no later than April 1st. However, per O.R.C. § 2933.43, the annual report must be filed no later than March 1st.

- Issue 12 - Upon review of the eleven FLETf expenditures selected for detailed testing, the following issues were noted:
 - a) There were two reimbursement checks written prior to the actual expenditure. Prior to fieldwork completion, IAD obtained and reviewed an inter-office memo from the Director of Administration-Finance. Per the memo, "it will be our policy that no advanced payments will be expended unless there is a prior approval of the Sheriff or Chief before it is paid". IAD also obtained and reviewed the FLETf "Request for Funds" form from the Director of Administration-Finance. Per the Director of Administration-Finance, this form will be used to authorize the advancement of funds prior to expenditure and will require two authorized signatures.
 - b) There were two travel expenditures missing a Part II Request for Estimated Expense form.
 - c) There was one expenditure that did not contain any supporting documentation.

- Issue 13 - Upon discussion with the Director of Administration and review of the Summit County Sheriff's Policies and Procedures Manual, there are no formal written policies and procedures in regards to the Prisoner Transportation Account.

- Issue 14 - Upon review of the monthly expenditure reports that are required to be filed with the Fiscal Office according to O.R.C § 325.07, they should include the case number, court in which the service was rendered, and the point from which a transportation vehicle was used. IAD noted that the court in which the service was rendered was not documented on the reports.

- Issue 15 - Upon review of the 20 expenditures in 2004 selected for detailed testing of the Prisoner Transportation Account, IAD noted the following:
 - a) There was no supporting documentation for \$20.00 worth of prisoner meals for 1 of 14 applicable prisoner extraditions.
 - b) Receipts and any unexpended monies were not returned within three days of the deputy's return in three of 14 applicable prisoner extraditions. Per discussion with the Director of Administration-Finance and review of the Estimated and Actual Expense forms given to deputies for prisoner extraditions, all receipts and unexpended monies are to be returned within three days after their return.
 - c) There was no date documented on the expenditure cover sheet or expense form indicating the date receipts and any unexpended monies were returned by the deputies in five of 14 applicable prisoner extraditions. The total amount advanced for three of the five extraditions was not entirely spent; therefore, IAD utilized the date the receipt was prepared by the Director of Administration-Finance. However, they were still prepared after the three-day return requirement. In one of the five extraditions, the deputies spent more than the advanced amount, which was properly supported by receipts, therefore they were reimbursed for the additional amount spent. IAD utilized the date the reimbursement check was written, however it was still written after the three-day receipt return requirement. For the remaining extradition, there was no date documented on the expenditure cover sheet, expense form, or the receipt.
 - d) Of the 14 applicable prisoner extraditions, there were 10 extraditions where the deputies returned unexpended monies. Upon review of the dates on the deposit slips and bank statements for the 10 extraditions, IAD noted that the deposits in all 10 instances were not made in accordance with O.R.C § 9.38.

- Issue 17 - Upon discussion with the Assistant Director of Administration over Sheriff's Sales and review of the June 2004 deposits for the Civil Division Account, IAD noted that deposits are not made on a timely basis. Per the Assistant Director of Administration, deposits are made on Wednesdays and Fridays and taken to the bank by two deputies. Per an inter-office memo from the Director of Administration/Finance, all bank deposits for the Civil Division should be transported by two deputies. IAD noted that in June 2004, there should have been nine total deposits. Upon review of the deposits in June 2004, however, there was only one deposit made on 06/18/04. In addition, upon review of the 2003 management letter dated 09/10/04, from Ernst and Young, the Sheriff's Office was noted as not making deposits in a timely manner. The funds for the Sheriff's Sale account were noted as being held from one week up to one month after initially being collected. Per an e-mail from the Director of Administration-Finance, in response to the management letter recommendation, she stated that the Assistant Director of Administration agreed to make deposits on a daily basis and that she hoped to have the new procedures in place by September 20, 2004. Upon review of the deposits made in October 2004, however, IAD noted that there was only one deposit made on October 22, 2004. This is a violation of O.R.C § 9.38.

Management Action Plans Partially Implemented

- Issue 1 - The following issues were noted with the Sheriff's General Policies and Procedures:
 - a) IAD noted that the Sheriff's General Policies and Procedures were inconsistently numbered and contained missing pages throughout the manual. Cover pages of procedures contained numbering which agreed to the table of contents but the pages following the cover page contained numbering that did not agree. Therefore, IAD was unable to determine if the procedures were complete.
 - b) Cover pages of procedures had the Sheriff's approval yet the effective date was before the term of Sheriff Alexander, January 2001, and they did not contain a date of revision. It was also noted that in some instances, the status of the procedure was listed as "new", however; the effective date was also before the Sheriff's term in office.
 - c) Chapter headings on procedures were inconsistent with the table of contents chapters.

First Follow-up

IAD spoke with the Sergeant/Operations who is responsible for monitoring all of the Sheriff's Office procedures. Per the Sergeant/Operations on 10/27/06, the Sheriff's Office is currently in the process of re-writing and revising several of the General Policies and Procedures. The Sergeant/Operations was unable to put an exact time frame for the completion of this ongoing project, however, he stated that it will take at least one year to complete. The Sheriff's goal is to meet the standards of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). Per the Sergeant/Operations, on 10/10/06, and review of the Sheriff's General Policies and Procedures, the Sheriff-Administration have created and revised several policies and procedures. IAD did not obtain the policies and procedures because they were voluminous.

Second Follow-up

IAD obtained and reviewed a binder containing policies and procedures. Per the Administrative Assistant, the Sheriff's Office is currently in the process of re-writing and revising several of the General Policies and Procedures and simultaneously converting the numbering system. Although IAD was able to trace and agree several final policies and procedures, the binder is not complete as this is an ongoing project.

- Issue 16 - Upon discussion with the Assistant Director of Administration, and review of the Summit County Sheriff's Policies and Procedures Manual, there are no formal written policies and procedures in regards to the cash collection process for Sheriff's Sales in the Civil Division.

First Follow-up

IAD obtained and reviewed draft policies and procedures for the Civil Division from the Asst. Director of Administration on 11/29/06. Per an email from the Asst. Director of Administration on 12/21/06, the procedures will be implemented by 7/1/07.

Second Follow-up

On 5/2/08, IAD obtained and reviewed draft policies and procedures for the Civil Division from the Assistant Director of Administration, which stated pending further review, the policy and procedure should be enacted. IAD deems this management action plan as partially implemented.