SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS **COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Paul Angulo



FROM: County Auditor-Controller

SUBJECT: Internal Audit Report 2012-315: Riverside County Office on Aging Follow-up

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Receive and file Internal Audit Report 2012-315: Riverside County Office on Aging Follow-up.

BACKGROUND: We have completed a Follow-up Audit of Riverside County Office on Aging. Our audit was limited to reviewing actions taken as of April 12, 2012, to correct the findings noted in our original audit report (2011-003) dated April 6, 2011. The original audit report contained three findings, all of which required corrective action and; therefore, were reviewed as part of this audit. For an indepth understanding of the original audit, please refer to Internal Audit Report 2011-003 at www.auditorcontroller.org.

(Continued on page 2)

		County Auditor-C			
FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$ 0	In Current Year Budget:		l/A
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:		l/A
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:		l/A
SOURCE OF FUNDS: N/A				Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	
				Requires 4/5 Vote	
C.E.O. RECOM	MENDATION:				

Sioson

County Executive Office Signature

Prev. Agn. Ref.:

Dep't Recomm_TACHMENTS FILED Consent
WITH THE CLERK OF TREBOARD

District:

Agenda Number:

Form – 11 - Internal Audit Report 2012-315 Riverside County Office on Aging Follow-up June 18, 2012
Page 2

BACKROUNG continued:

The follow-up audit found of the three findings which required corrective action, two findings were fully corrected one finding was partially corrected. We will conduct a desk review on the one finding that was partially corrected within one year.



County of Riverside

INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

2012-315

Riverside County Office on Aging Follow-up Audit

June 18, 2012

Office of

Paul Angulo, CPA, MA-Mgmt.

County Auditor-Controller

4080 Lemon Street P.O. Box 1326 Riverside, CA 92502-1326



COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

County Administrative Center 4080 Lemon Street, 11th Floor P.O. Box 1326 Riverside, CA 92502-1326 (951) 955-3800 Fax (951) 955-3802



Paul Angulo, CPA, MA-Mgmt. AUDITOR-CONTROLLER

June 18, 2012

Ed Walsh, Director Riverside County Office on Aging 6296 River Crest Drive, Suite K Riverside, CA 92507-0738

Subject: Internal Audit Report 2012-315: Riverside County Office on Aging Follow-up Audit

Dear Mr. Walsh,

We have completed a Follow-up Audit of Riverside County Office on Aging. Our audit was limited to reviewing actions taken as of April 12, 2012, to correct the findings noted in our original audit report (2011-003) dated April 6, 2011.

We conducted our audit in accordance with the International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing. These standards require we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance our objective, as described in the preceding paragraph, is achieved. Additionally, the standards require we conduct the audit to provide sufficient, reliable, and relevant evidence to achieve the audit objectives. We believe the audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

The original audit report contained three findings, all of which required corrective action and; therefore, were reviewed as part of this audit. For an in-depth understanding of the original audit, please refer to Internal Audit Report 2011-003 at www.auditorcontroller.org.

This follow-up audit found of the three findings:

- Two findings were corrected
- One finding was partially corrected

Detailed statuses of the findings identified in the original audit are provided in the body of this report. We will conduct a desk review on the one finding that was partially corrected within one year.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance extended to us by staff of the Office on Aging during this follow-up audit. Their assistance contributed significantly to the successful completion of the audit.

Paul Angulo, CPA, MA-Mgmt.

Auditor-Controller

By: Rachelle Román, MPA Chief Internal Auditor

cc: Board of Supervisors **Executive Office** Grand Jury

Information Security and Records Retention

Finding 1:

User accounts remain active beyond employees' termination.

We determined that 11 (31%) of 35 users reviewed no longer work at the Office on Aging although they still had system access. Only authorized personnel should have access to information systems. When accounts are left open unnecessarily, information assets are vulnerable to theft, unauthorized modification or deletion.

Recommendation 1

Provide IT administrators with verifiable authorization for the closure of user accounts immediately upon employees' termination of employment.

Current Status: Corrected

In review of 36 employees who were terminated or retired during the follow-up audit review period, we identified the Office on Aging took appropriate action to close their user accounts.

Finding 2:

(SAT) Security Awareness Training is not in compliance with county and state requirements.

- 1. SAT is not administered within 30 days of employee hire date. Only six (27%) of 22 sampled employees completed the initial training within 30 days of hire.
- 2. Employees and subcontractors do not repeat SAT annually as required. Of 25 employees reviewed, one person (4%) completed SAT a second time. The remaining 24 (96%) had only one instance of Security Awareness Training.
- 3. Subcontractor SAT is not monitored. Contract monitoring reports do not include a training and education module for review.

Recommendation 2.1

Ensure new employees, volunteers, and subcontractors complete Security Awareness Training within 30 days of their start date.

Recommendation 2.2

Ensure existing employees, volunteers, and subcontractors repeat SAT on an ongoing basis (at least annually).

Recommendation 2.3

Include a training and education module in contract monitoring.

Current Status: Partially Corrected

The results of our review indicate the Office on Aging does not ensure all employees and volunteers who handle personal, sensitive, or confidential information complete SAT within 30 days of their start date. Office on Aging has agreed to add SAT to their new hire orientation package and establish a method to schedule and monitor annual security awareness training.

We will conduct a desk review on this partially corrected item within one year.

Office on Aging has revised procedures for monitoring subcontractors to ensure compliance with security awareness training required under the contract between the Office of Aging and the California Department of Aging. Our review of three sub-contractor monitoring reports identified a 100 percent compliance of the subcontractors' active employees had received the required training.

Finding 3:

Current records retention and destruction practices do not comply with BOS Policy A-43 (County Records Management and Archives Policy):

- 1. Disposition Certificates are not used. The Office on Aging uses email messages instead of the county approved destruction of records forms that are specially designed to mitigate legal ramifications.
- 2. The destruction of records is not properly authorized. The deputy director authorizes the destruction of records via email; however, there is no proof that the deputy is authorized to act on behalf of the director in the destruction of records.
- 3. Financial records are not being retained (at least five years) according to the county's General Records Retention Schedule. Based on the date of the email provided (10/05/09) and the date of records to be destroyed (through FY 05), the General Records Retention Schedule was not adhered to.

Current Status: Corrected

Office on Aging is now in compliance with BOS Policy A-43 and utilizes the Records Disposition Certificate Form 784, which is designated for use by County departments to dispose of their own records. The Department submitted a new Authorized Signature List with the effective date of July 1, 2011, to County Records Management to authorize the Deputy Director to approve the destruction of records. Review of current Records Disposition Certificates identifies proper authorized personnel approving the destruction of records. In addition, we noted financial documents were being retained properly and the date of records to be destroyed was being adhered to the General Records Retention Schedule.