



**AUDIT COMMITTEE
JANUARY 17, 2012
8:30 A.M.**

**MCCORMICK ROOM
30 7TH STREET EAST
SAINT PAUL, MN**

Please note: Committee/Board meeting times are tentative. Committee/Board meetings may begin up to 45 minutes earlier than the times listed below if the previous committee meeting concludes its business before the end of its allotted time slot.

Committee Chair Van Houten calls the meeting to order.

- (1) Minutes of November 15, 2011 (pages 1-7)**
- (2) Review Legislative Auditor report on Metropolitan State University (pages 8-9)
- (3) Review Results of Southwest Minnesota State University Audit (pages 10-27)
- (4) Review External Audit Plan and Approve Any Changes (pages 28-31)**
- (5) Board Committee Goals (pages 32-33)

Members

James Van Houten, Chair
Phil Krinkie, Vice Chair
Dan McElroy
David Paskach
Michael Vekich

Bolded items indicate action required.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
AUDIT COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
November 15, 2011**

Audit Committee Members Present: Trustees James Van Houten, Chair; Philip Krinkie, Dan McElroy, David Paskach, and Michael Vekich.

Audit Committee Members Absent: none.

Others Present: Trustees Brett Anderson, Duane Benson, Cheryl Dickson, Jacob Englund, Alfredo Oliveira and Chancellor Rosenstone.

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities Audit Committee held its meeting on November 15, 2011, at Wells Fargo Place, 4th Floor McCormick Room, 30 East 7th Street in St. Paul. Chair Van Houten called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. and reviewed the agenda.

Approval of the Audit Committee Meeting Minutes

Chair Van Houten reviewed the highlights of the October meeting minutes. He called for a motion to approve the October 18, 2011 audit committee meeting minutes. There was no dissent and the motion carried.

1. Review and Approve Release of Audited Financial Statements 2011 (Action Item)

Trustee Van Houten suggested, and the committee agreed, that the agenda be realigned to accommodate the external auditors who had come to present the audited financial statements.

Ms. Beth Buse, Executive Director of Internal Auditing began by explaining that audit committee members had received advance copies of all thirteen college and university financial statements, as well as the system wide audit and the revenue fund. She explained the contents of the six documents that were handed out to the committee. Those documents included the PowerPoint presentation, Required Communications from LarsonAllen, LLP, a one-page summary of the Net Operating Incomes and a one-page summary of the Composite Financial Index (CFI) for each college and university, a copy of the system wide financials, and a copy of the supplement to the financial statements.

Ms. Buse introduced Mr. Tom Koop, an audit partner with LarsonAllen, Mr. Craig Poppenhagen who was the partner in charge of the revenue fund and Ms. Brenda Scherer who was the audit manager for the college and university audits. She stated that the system had another good year in terms of the financial statements.

Mr. Koop reminded members that their audit responsibility was to express an opinion on fairness of presentation of the system wide financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2011. In support of the audit effort, internal controls were reviewed for material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. He stated that they were engaged to express an

opinion on compliance with federal compliance parameters regarding the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the student financial aid programs. He noted that that opinion would be discussed early in 2012 when the process was completed.

Mr. Koop reviewed the audit scope and coverage of the sytemwide audit. He stated that it was a positive report with no material weakness or significant deficiency in internal controls and no compliance issues.

Ms. Scherer reviewed the process for the system wide financial statement audit. She stated that while there were no internal control issues to report, there were some observations and best practices that came out of the audit, and a formal letter was sent to management. Trustee Van Houten asked how many colleges would have received formal letters. Ms. Scherer responded that almost all of the colleges had one or two comments or best practice suggestions.

Mr. Koop informed the members that the audit opinion on the system wide financial statement, as well as on the revenue fund statement, was unqualified, which was the highest level that could be issued. He added that not only were there no internal control written findings, the auditor's procedures resulted in no auditor generated adjustments. He stated that was notable and a cause for celebration within the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities. Mr. Koop further stated that for the second year in a row, no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses were noted in the system wide audit or at any of the campus level audits.

Mr. Koop noted that the state shutdown caused delays in the flow of information which resulted in increased demands on system office staff, campus staff, as well as staff at the auditing firms. He complimented staff for remaining professional at all times even through that added stress. He further stated that the communications process that was established facilitated the work flow so that quality was maintained throughout the audit process.

Mr. Koop reviewed the three Levels of Financial Management as described by the Government Finance Officers Association's "Financial Management (FM) Tool."

Mr. Koop stated that the challenge going forward would be to maintain the results that had been delivered for the last two years as budget restraints and public scrutiny would demand even more continuous improvement in the future. Mr. Koop stated that in difficult economic times, providing stable service levels, strong leadership, and enabling technology would be key to maintaining a strong financial process.

Mr. Dougherty introduced the financial reporting team and Denise Kirkeby and Methody Popov. He thanked the staff at the system office and at the campuses for the hard work they did to get the system to the great audit results. He reviewed the highlights of the system wide financial performance for the committee.

Mr. Dougherty stated that the system's CFI in the fiscal year just ended was 2.91, essentially flat with the prior year performance. Mr. Dougherty noted that the CFI had been restated in fiscal year 2010. He added that the system's economic performance had

not changed, but that the Higher Learning Commission increased the emphasis on one of the four metrics requiring the need for a surplus condition was a deficit.

Trustee Van Houten stated that our current level of operating reserves might sound like a great deal of money, but it really is just a little more than one month of salaries for the system. Mr. Dougherty agreed and noted that the system had only been operating in a surplus for two years.

Mr. Dougherty reviewed the changes in net operating revenue in the previous fiscal year and the return on net assets. He reviewed the system's 2.91 CFI against Moody's credit rating. He explained that a poor CFI would increase the system's debt costs, or higher interest rates.

Mr. Dougherty compared the system's rating to other universities. He noted that the system was very comparable to the University of Minnesota.

Ms. Buse introduced Mr. Craig Popenhagen, the principal in charge of the Revenue Fund standalone audit. Mr. Popenhagen stated that an unqualified opinion had been issued on the Revenue Fund financial statements. They were fairly stated in accordance with accounting principles. No significant deficiencies or material weaknesses had been identified in internal controls. He stated that the control environment was very strong.

Trustee McElroy asked if there were individual college or university revenue funds that were not operating as well as the whole. Mr. Popenhagen stated that there were and he mentioned Southwest Minnesota State University as one example. Ms. King explained the situation at the university and noted that the university has taken strong action to reduce their revenue fund related expenses and to launch new enrollment and program development strategies. Trustee McElroy asked if it would be possible to see the revenue fund numbers for individual campuses and Ms. King stated that they could provide that information.

Mr. Koop presented information on the financial statement audits that his firm conducted for Southwest Minnesota State University, Metropolitan State University, Minneapolis Community and Technical College, and Rochester Community and Technical College. Some of the key points shared by Mr. Koop were as follows:

- Unqualified Opinions issued for all audits.
- No internal control, compliance, material weakness or significant deficiencies.

Trustee Van Houten asked about the loss that occurred with the transfer of the parking lot property from Metropolitan State University back to Minneapolis Community and Technical College. Vice Chancellor King stated that this transaction was not in the performance results that for either the college or the university for fiscal 2011. She stated that it was a neutral transition that created some accounting consequences in the cost based asset accounting system that would have to be reviewed. She noted that the transaction would appear again in the fiscal year 2012 financial statements and she would be prepared at that point to explain how the transaction was booked.

Trustee Van Houten welcomed Mr. Steve Wischmann, partner with the firm of Kern, DeWenter and Viere. Mr. Wischmann presented information on the financial statement

audits that his firm conducted for Hennepin Technical College, Minnesota State University Moorhead, Normandale Community College, Winona State University, Minnesota State University, Mankato, and St. Cloud State University. Some of the key points shared by Mr. Wischmann were as follows:

- Unqualified Opinions issued for all audits.
- No internal control, compliance, material weakness or significant deficiencies.

Trustee Van Houten welcomed Mr. Darrel DeKam, partner with the firm of Baker Tilly Virchow Krause. Mr. DeKam presented information on the financial statement audits that his firm conducted for Bemidji State University, Century College, and Minnesota State Community and Technical College. Some of the key points shared by Mr. DeKam were as follows:

- Unqualified Opinions issued for all audits.
- No internal control, compliance, material weakness or significant deficiencies.

Trustee McElroy asked about the dramatic CFI reduction at Century College. Vice Chancellor King explained that the college had tremendous enrollment increases and they had done a lot of out of pocket construction financing to build classrooms and to buy computers. She added that it had been purposeful spending and that the college was finished with their build outs. Trustee Krinkie asked about the net operating loss at Anoka Technical College. Vice Chancellor King stated that she did not know the specifics about the non-audited colleges, but she thought it was likely a situation similar to Century College.

Chancellor Rosenstone stated that there was a balancing act that had to be done between the prudent management of resources and the management of risk and a greater expenditure of resources to accomplish good ends. He asked Mr. Koop, Vice Chancellor King, Mr. Dougherty and Ms. Buse to comment on how well the system was positioned with respect to that balance.

Mr. Koop stated that the system has a stable CFI which would allow the system to be more transformational. He added that in his opinion, the more sophisticated the financial management process was, the closer the system was able to operate to the edge, because it was in more control. Mr. Koop noted that the system did not have too much in reserves and added that with state shutdowns and dramatic changes in student demographics, the environment could change quickly. He stated that what the system had already accomplished was very solid and positive financially. He encouraged the system to continue moving slowly up the pyramid of financial reporting quality.

Vice Chancellor King stated that the system was facing a lot of downside risk with state appropriation exposure, tuition, inflation, downward pressure on system revenue, and the federal Pell Grant debate which could have a catastrophic impact for the system from a student affordability standpoint. She also noted that the state shutdown proved that the system had very few degrees of freedom from an operating environment standpoint. She stated that the Board of Trustees had been conservative and strongly supportive of improving system ratios, and she stated that she would like to continue to see the system wide number rise. She noted that the system wide number covered a lot of variability between the individual campuses.

Mr. Dougherty shared Vice Chancellor King's views and stated that he was even more committed and energized around the collaboration and cooperation that was happening in the system. He stated that he would like to see the system take more risk and move faster with the Campus Service Cooperative. Mr. Dougherty noted that there was innovation coming from around the system and he offered examples within the cooperative.

Ms. Buse agreed with what had been stated, but she added that there was a need to be competitive in the area of compensation and benefits. She noted that seventy percent of system expenditures were for compensation, which had only grown by one percent in the prior fiscal year. At the same time, the system saw a two percent enrollment growth. She cautioned that given what campuses have been doing to maintain costs over the last couple of years, it would be difficult to sustain growth into the future.

Chancellor Rosenstone acknowledged the need for caution to ensure that the system had the base for the transformative innovations that had been suggested, but also the base to protect the quality of academic programs in light of a long list of risks the system would be facing.

Vice Chancellor King stated that she was extremely grateful to the campuses for their hard work. She stated that this had been a particularly difficult year and noted that the SWIFT conversion had put a tremendous burden on the campuses. Vice Chancellor King stated that there had been outstanding cooperation and good spirits among staff given some very tough deadlines. She extended her congratulations to the presidents and the leadership teams on the campuses, who had been doing the tough day to day management, and paying attention to the internal control environment and the operating environment that enabled the system to produce financial statements without any material comments. She thanked the staff who worked extra hours to get the work done, and who took pride in the quality, accuracy, completeness and professionalism of their work.

Trustee Paskach stated that the reporting was really impressive work. He congratulated the staff and noted that it was clearly a high performing team of people. He asked how the system was able to get to this point. Vice Chancellor King stated that the centerpiece for these results was that they system had a great deal of continuity. She noted that there had been the same auditors and finance staff as well as largely the same Chief Financial Officers and that everyone had been invested in the continuous improvement curve. There had been good communication and shared best practices. She also complimented the audit committee for its commitment and the solid message of expectations.

Trustee Van Houten asked that the external auditor's positive comments be passed on to the appropriate staff. Chair Thiss stated that he had not expected that the high standard set last year would be exceeded, but through continuous improvement, the audit results this year were even more impressive. He stated that it was a marvelous accomplishment and congratulated everyone involved.

Trustee McElroy stated that it would be difficult next year to improve on the near perfect results this year. On the performance side, he added that he was really pleased to see that some of the smallest institutions had among the highest CFIs. He thought that was a testament to good management and to how important these institutions were to the system. He felt that was an important message to share with legislators.

Trustee Van Houten called for a motion to approve the release of the Audited Financial Statements for 2011. *Trustee Vekich made the motion, Trustee Paskach seconded.*

COMMITTEE ACTION:

The Audit Committee has reviewed the fiscal year 2011 audited financial statements and discussed them with representatives of management and the external auditing firms. The committee recommends that the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Based on the review and recommendation of the Audit Committee, the Board of Trustees approves the release of the fiscal year 2011 audited financial statements as submitted.

2. Proposed Amendment to Board Policy 1D.1 Office of Internal Auditing (Second Reading)

Ms. Buse noted that the proposed changes to Board Policy 1D.1 would mainly reflect changes in internal audit standards. She noted that some language had been removed regarding consulting services due to changes in services because of recent budget cuts. She stated that there had not been any changes since the first reading except to continue referencing the system office, rather than the “Office of the Chancellor.”

Trustee Van Houten called for a motion to approve the proposed amendment to Board Policy 1D.1 Office of Internal Auditing. *Trustee Vekich made the motion, Trustee Krinkie seconded.*

COMMITTEE ACTION

The Audit Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

RECOMMENDED MOTION

The Board of Trustees approves the amendment to Policy 1D.1 Office of Internal Auditing.

3. Board Committee Goals (Information Item)

Ms. Buse suggested that the committee consider researching best practices of other audit committees as a goal for the year. She suggested that it might be a study of the audit approaches of other systems as well as the private industry. She noted that this type of study might be timed well as a succession planning tool given the significant audit committee rotation that would be coming in the next fiscal year.

Ms. Buse laid out the timing of the study. She stated that she could come back to the committee in January with a more specific plan as well as a start on the research. She reminded members that there would be a discussion in January about financial statement audits. She added that the committee could have the conclusion and final discussion in

June before the rotation of committee members occurred.

Trustee Paskach asked if the study could identify audit practices or best practices that would allow the audit committee to achieve the financial management level of enabling transformation. Ms. Buse stated that she was thinking the study might be more broad than only the financial piece. Trustee Van Houten stated that the committee goal could help the committee make decisions about the new audit plan and risk assessment. He noted that the committee would then have benchmarks which would give insights to leave behind for the next audit committee.

Trustee Van Houten asked President Szymanski and President Johns for their view of the project. President Szymanski thanked the committee for the work that it had done to provide assurance on campuses. She stated that she looks for ways to use the best practices that others have pioneered on her university, and she believed the project would be helpful from that prospective. President Johns stated that he thought looking at what other systems were doing would be very important for the system.

Vice Chancellor King reminded the committee that the audit committee would be having a discussion about the financial statement strategy for the next three to six years, which would require a decision by March to get the work underway. She wanted to make sure that the two projects would synchronize. Trustee Van Houten agreed, but stated that finding that the committee might not be working optimally, would be advantageous even if it were discovered after the plan was in place.

Ms. Buse stated that the research could be done in two phases. The research necessary to assist the committee with the decisions it needed to make about the financial statement process could be ready by January, and the broader conversation could take place in June.

Trustee Krinkie noted that it might be prudent for the audit committee to focus on any issues that might arise from the SWIFT conversion. Ms. King stated that she had had conversations about designing some special scope work for the fiscal year 2012 work, to go specifically to the conversion. She further stated that she had been in communication with the State Finance Commissioner about future adaptations for the accounting system. Ms. Buse agreed and stated that they could certainly consider the impacts of the SWIFT conversion as part of the audit risk assessment. She further noted that the Office of the Legislative Auditor had issued a user security report on the SWIFT implementation. She stated that she would keep in touch with the external auditors and what they need in preparation of the audit of fiscal 2012, as well as the internal plan.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Audit Committee

Date of Meeting: January 17, 2012

Agenda Item: Review Legislative Auditor report on Metropolitan State University

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

This audit was conducted by the Office of the Legislative Auditor.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Beth Buse, Executive Director, Office of Internal Auditing
David Poliseno, Legislative Audit Manager
Sue Hammersmith, President, Metropolitan State University

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- The public release of this audit report is scheduled for the January 17, 2012 audit committee meeting. Therefore, the contents may not be disclosed publicly prior to that time.

Background Information:

- The Office of the Legislative Auditor conducted this audit on its own authority.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD INFORMATION

**REVIEW LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR REPORT ON
METROPOLITAN STATE UNIVERSITY**

BACKGROUND

The public release of this audit report is scheduled to occur at the January 17, 2012 audit committee meeting. Therefore, the contents may not be disclosed publicly prior to that time. Copies of the final report will be available at the audit committee meeting. Additional copies of the final report are scheduled to be available from the Office of the Legislative Auditor web site: www.auditor.leg.state.mn.us starting on January 17, 2012.

Date Presented to the Board of Trustee: January 17, 2012

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Audit Committee

Date of Meeting: January 17, 2012

Agenda Item: Review Results of Southwest Minnesota State University Audit

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

Review results of Southwest Minnesota State University audit conducted by the Office of Internal Auditing.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Beth Buse, Executive Director, Office of Internal Auditing
Eric Wion, Deputy Director, Office of Internal Auditing
Ron Wood, Interim President, Southwest Minnesota State University

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- We reviewed internal controls and compliance over selected activities for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 through September 30, 2011.
- Except for some supplemental receipts, the university generally had adequate internal controls. For items tested, the university generally complied with MnSCU policies and finance-related legal provisions. We identified eight audit findings.

Background Information:

- In October 2011 the audit committee approved the Fiscal Year 2012 Internal Auditing Annual Audit Plan. As part of that plan, the Office of Internal Auditing conducted an internal control and compliance audit of Southwest Minnesota State University.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD ACTION

REVIEW RESULTS OF SOUTHWEST MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY AUDIT

See attached report

Date Presented to the Board of Trustee: January 17, 2012



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

Southwest Minnesota State University – Internal Control and Compliance Audit

Office of Internal Auditing
Reference Number 2012-01-001

Public Release Date – January 6, 2012

Members of the MnSCU Board of Trustees
Chancellor Steven J. Rosenstone
President Ronald A. Wood

This report presents the results of our selected scope internal control and compliance audit of Southwest Minnesota State University for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 through September 30, 2011. It contains eight findings and recommendations to assist university management in improving business processes, controls, and accountability.

The results of the audit were discussed with university leadership and staff on December 20, 2011.

We appreciate the excellent cooperation and assistance that we received from university employees.

Beth Buse, CPA, CIA, CISA
Executive Director

Audit Scope

We reviewed internal controls and compliance over the following activities for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 through September 30, 2011:

- local bank accounts
- employee business expense reimbursements
- procurement (included purchasing card activity), disbursement, and equipment inventory
- receipt collections

Conclusion

Except for some supplemental receipts, the university generally had adequate internal controls. For items tested, the university generally complied with MnSCU policies and finance-related legal provisions. We identified eight audit findings:

Findings

1. The university did not have adequate controls to ensure receipts from several supplemental revenue sources were safeguarded and properly deposited.
2. The university did not have a policy to determine who has the authority and when it is appropriate to waive facility and equipment rental fees.
3. Business office cashiers shared accounting sessions and cash drawers.
4. The university did not properly retain all source documents to support receipts from the Mustang Zone.
5. The university did not adequately manage its asset inventory records and fiscal year 2011 physical inventory counts were not performed by an independent person.
6. The university did not comply with some procedural requirements for purchasing card transactions.
7. A university employee was inappropriately reimbursed for expenses previously incurred and paid for by a university purchasing card.
8. The university did not define the scenarios and limits in which employees can use personal credit cards to make university-related purchases and submit business expense reimbursement requests.

CONTENTS	PAGE
I. Background	2
II. Audit Objectives, Scope, Methodology and Conclusion	3
III. Audit Findings and Recommendations	5
IV. University Response	12

The audit team was led by Melissa Primus and included the following audit staff: Carolyn Gabel, Craig Fautsch, Kim McLaughlin, and Marita Hickman

Section I: Background

Southwest Minnesota State University (SMSU) was founded in 1963 and is located in Marshall, Minnesota. It is one of seven public universities comprising the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU). Current enrollment is approximately 3,700 students and it employs about 240 faculty. SMSU offers nearly 50 baccalaureate majors and also offers several graduate degrees. The university is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and North Central Association of Colleges.

Each year the university prepares financial statements that are audited by an external auditing firm. The university received its ninth consecutive unqualified or “clean” financial statement opinion in 2011. This opinion is issued when the financial statements are free of material misstatements and are represented fairly in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

SMSU was selected for an internal control and compliance audit because it ranked high on our annual audit risk assessment conducted during 2011. Contributing factors included the length of time since their last internal control and compliance audit, a net operating loss of over \$1 million and a low composite financial indicator (CFI) in fiscal year 2010. Finally, as a university, it tends to have more financial activity and more complex and diverse operations.

Southwest Minnesota State University’s fiscal year 2011 operating revenues were approximately \$22 million, of which \$13 million was tuition. Its fiscal year 2011 operating expenses were approximately \$47 million, of which \$31 million were salaries and benefits.¹

¹ Southwest Minnesota State University’s *Annual Financial Report For the Years Ended June 30, 2011 and 2010*

Section II: Audit Objectives, Scope, Methodology, and Conclusion

Audit Objectives

The objectives for this audit were to answer the following questions for each activity included in the audit scope:

- Were internal controls adequate to ensure the university safeguarded receipts and other assets, properly paid vendors and employees in accordance with management's authorization, produced reliable financial accounting information, and complied with finance-related legal requirements?
- For the items tested, did the university comply with significant finance-related legal requirements over financial activities, including state laws, regulations, contracts, and applicable policies and procedures?

Audit Scope

Our audit reviewed the following university activities for fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012 through September 30, 2011:

- local bank accounts
- employee business expense reimbursements
- procurement (including purchasing card activities), disbursement, and equipment inventory
 - operating and administrative expenses
 - equipment expenses
- receipt collections
 - tuition, fees, room and board
 - other supplemental receipts - sales and services

Audit Methodology

To answer these questions, we interviewed university staff and reviewed relevant documentation, including policies, procedures, or guidelines, and internal control documentation prepared for financial statement purposes to gain an understanding of the university's controls related to the financial operations in our scope. We considered risks of fraud and errors and potential noncompliance with finance-related legal requirements. We analyzed accounting and purchasing card data to identify unusual transactions or significant changes in financial operations. We reviewed security access over the accounting systems to identify the transactions university staff can initiate, approve or process to determine whether access is based on need and duties are adequately separated. In addition, we selected a sample of transactions and reviewed supporting documentation to test whether the university's controls were effective and if the transactions complied with laws, regulations, policies, and contract provisions.

Audit Conclusion

Except for some supplemental receipts, the university generally had adequate internal controls to ensure it safeguarded receipts and other assets, properly paid vendors and employees in accordance with management's authorization, produced reliable financial accounting information, and complied with finance-related legal requirements. We identified control weaknesses over supplemental receipts, purchasing cards, employee business expenses, and equipment inventory as discussed in the following findings and recommendations.

For items tested, the university generally complied with MnSCU policies and finance-related legal provisions. However, the university did not comply with some MnSCU requirements as discussed in the following findings and recommendations.

Section III – Audit Findings and Recommendations

Receipt Collections

1. The university did not have adequate controls to ensure receipts from several supplemental revenue sources were safeguarded and properly deposited.

The university did not have adequate controls to ensure receipts from supplemental revenue sources were safeguarded and properly deposited. The university business office collects many receipts, such as tuition and fees, directly from students. Other supplemental receipts, such as receipts from athletic, theatre, and planetarium events, student application or transcript fees, or facilities and equipment rental fees, are collected elsewhere at the university and later delivered to the business office to be deposited. We found the following weaknesses when reviewing these supplemental revenue processes.

- The university lacked methods to reconcile actual receipts to what should have been collected for some supplemental revenue sources. For example, pre-numbered receipts or other tools were not used to determine how many student transcript or application fees were paid compared to actual cash collected. In other cases pre-numbered receipts or other tools were available for reconciliation purposes; however, the reconciliations were not performed by an independent employee or evidence of the reconciliation was not retained.
- The university did not have a process to ensure some fees were properly invoiced. In one example, a stand-alone system was used for scheduling resources while a second system was used for invoicing customers for the use of those resources. The university did not reconcile the two systems to ensure that all events were invoiced. In another example, outstanding accounts receivable were not reported to the business office so collection could be pursued.
- The university did not deposit receipts in a timely manner. For example, receipts from 9 of the 10 athletic events tested were deposited 3 to 19 days after the event, receipts from 4 of 5 theatre events tested were deposited 6 to 12 days after the event, and a facility and equipment rental receipt was deposited 20 days after it was collected. MnSCU Policy 7.5 Financial Institutions and Investments, and university procedure require daily deposits of receipts totaling \$250 or more. Receipts collected on the weekend should be delivered to the business office and deposited the next business day.
- Safe combinations were not changed in a timely manner. Several areas, including the business office, had safes to secure receipts. However, safe combinations were not changed when employees or student workers left and no longer required knowledge of the safe combination.
- One cash collection point did not adequately secure receipts. Receipts were placed on top of a desk until they were delivered to the business office to be deposited.

- The university had not recently assessed the need for starting cash balances or conducted periodic unannounced counts. Several areas have a starting cash balance so they are able to provide change when someone pays for an item. A starting cash balance is no longer needed in some cases while others may need a starting cash balance established. For example, in one area, an employee used personal funds for a starting cash balance when needed. Finally, the university did not conduct periodic and unannounced starting cash counts to help ensure cash has not been misappropriated.

Without adequate controls over supplemental receipts the university is at increased risk that receipts may be lost or stolen.

Recommendation

- *The university should identify all supplemental revenue sources, assess the adequacy of controls, and implement controls to ensure receipts are properly safeguarded and deposited. Also, receipt processes and controls should be documented. Controls should ensure:*
 - *deposits are complete and reconcile to supporting documentation*
 - *receipt reconciliations are completed by an independent person*
 - *fees are properly billed*
 - *receipts are deposited timely*
 - *safe combinations are changed periodically or as needed*
 - *receipts are physically secured*
 - *starting cash balances are adequate and periodic unannounced counts occur*

2. The university did not have a policy to determine who has the authority and when it is appropriate to waive facility and equipment rental fees.

The university does not have a policy to determine who has the authority and when it is appropriate to waive rental fees when individuals or groups not affiliated with the university reserve and use university facilities and equipment. Our audit identified rentals where fees were waived; however, it was not clear whether the person approving the waiver was authorized and whether the waivers were appropriate. For example, an individual not affiliated with the university was able to use university space and equipment for a wedding reception and the rental fees were waived. In addition to the costs of acquiring and maintaining space and equipment, the university incurs direct personnel costs for such an event.

The university has equipment and facilities, such as its ballroom, conference rooms, athletic facilities and classrooms, it schedules for university and non-university use. University groups have access to the facilities and equipment at no cost while others are assessed rental fees, as published on the university's web site. The university has a two-tier fee structure that includes a tier for non-profit organizations and a tier for all other community members and groups. The rental fees are intended to help recover indirect and direct costs such as personnel costs.

Without a written policy, it is not clear who has the authority and under what circumstances it is appropriate to waive rental fees. As a result, the university and its employees may be at risk of violating Minnesota statutes or MnSCU policies and procedure related to employee code of conduct and ethics.

Recommendation

- *The university should adopt a written policy that clearly defines who has the authority and in what circumstances facility and equipment rental fees may be waived.*

3. Business office cashiers shared accounting sessions and cash drawers.

Cashiers in the university's business office shared the same cash drawers and accounting system cash sessions. Although a primary cashier typically collected and recorded most receipts, they were not required to log off the system and change cash drawers when a backup cashier filled in.

Requiring cashiers to log on and off their cash sessions and maintain separate cash drawers allow management to hold cashiers responsible for transactions they record and any cash shortages in their drawers. These controls also protect cashiers from false accusations if cash shortages occur. The university would have difficulty investigating missing cash if it cannot determine who recorded transactions or handled each cash transaction.

Recommendation

- *The university should prohibit business office cashiers from sharing cash drawers and improve accountability by requiring cashiers to log into separate cash sessions.*

4. The university did not properly retain all source documents to support receipts from the Mustang Zone.

The university disposed of source cashiering receipt documentation for its Mustang Zone after only a few months. The Mustang Zone is a retail operation operated by the university's Student Center.

To comply with Minnesota Statutes and ensure it maintains records necessary to provide full and accurate documentation of official activities, the university has a retention schedule that defines how long it must retain various types of information. This schedule requires receipt documentation to be retained for the current year plus the three previous years.

Preserving public financial records is an important responsibility. It helps management to demonstrate its appropriate use of public resources and protects employees from accusations of error, illegality, and noncompliance. Without documentation, the university is unable to support

the propriety of the transactions.

Recommendation

- *The university should review its records retention schedule and ensure it properly retains documentation to support its financial activities and complies with records retention requirements.*

Equipment Inventory

5. The university did not adequately manage its asset inventory records and fiscal year 2011 physical inventory counts were not performed by an independent person.

The university was not sure that it completed an entire physical inventory count for assets greater than \$10,000 in fiscal year 2010 and 2011. For the items that were inventoried in 2011, the university had not updated the asset inventory system. As a result, the asset inventory system is out-of-date. While conducting the audit we identified some assets over \$10,000, including a garden tractor, front end loader and postage machine, the university had not recorded in the asset inventory system.

The university did not conduct a complete physical inventory for assets valued at less than \$10,000, including sensitive items, for over three years. As a result, the asset inventory system included many older items that no longer existed including items that had been gone for many years. Also, it did not record some sensitive assets, like computer equipment, valued at less than \$10,000 to the asset inventory system.

Finally, the university did not have an independent person perform the physical inventory counts in fiscal year 2011. Instead, most items were counted by the department in which the asset resided.

MnSCU Procedure 7.3.6 Capital Assets requires institutions to perform an annual physical inventory for items valued at least \$10,000 and every three years for other inventory such as sensitive items that may be more susceptible to theft. Failure to complete periodic and full physical inventories with independent staff increase the risk that lost or stolen assets would not be detected in a timely manner and inventory records may be inaccurate.

Recommendation

- *The university should implement controls to ensure periodic physical inventories are completed in compliance with MnSCU Procedure.*
- *The university should implement controls to ensure assets are added or removed from the asset inventory system in a timely manner when items are acquired, sold, donated, or disposed.*

- *The university should ensure physical inventories are completed by an independent person.*

Purchasing Cards

6. The university did not comply with some procedural requirements for purchasing card transactions.

The university issued purchasing cards to about 90 staff. Purchasing cards were used in over 5,700 transactions totaling about \$790,000 between October 2009 and October 2011. Some purchasing card transactions did not comply with procedural requirements.

- Special expense approvals were not always obtained as required by MnSCU Procedure 7.3.3 Purchasing Cards. The procedure allows purchasing cards to be used for travel expenses (excluding individual meals) and food or meal purchases for athletic teams, student activities and business meetings. However, procedure also requires approval via the special expense process prior to incurring the obligation. The university did not obtain prior approval for individual or team travel or team meals paid using university purchasing cards.
- The university did not delegate authority to each cardholder to incur expenses as required by MnSCU Procedure 7.3.3. Delegation of authority provides written authority for an employee to make purchases and obligate the university to the specified limits on the purchasing card. The university process to obtain a purchasing card includes applying for a purchasing card and signing a university cardholder agreement but not obtaining written delegated authority.
- The university did not provide merchant category blocking for three of its purchasing cards as required by MnSCU Procedure 7.3.3. Merchant category blocking allows the university to prevent its cards from being used to make purchases from certain categories of merchants. For example, alcohol cannot be purchased with a purchasing card so merchant blocking would prevent a purchase from a merchant classified as a liquor store. The university indicated it removed the default merchant category blocking for these three cardholders when Procedure 7.3.3 was revised to allow for the purchase of team meals with a purchasing card. However, the university did not manually add merchant category blocking back to those cards for unallowable purchases.
- The university does not always obtain supervisory review for purchasing card transactions as required by MnSCU Procedure 7.3.3. Faculty serving as department chairs sometimes reviewed and approved purchase card transactions of their peers even though the faculty's supervisor is an academic dean. In many cases, the department chair may be in the best position to review transactions for appropriateness and compliance; however, the authority and responsibility of department chair versus academic dean for reviewing purchasing card transactions will likely need clarification.

Note: The university had a similar issue with faculty business expense reimbursements.

Recommendation

- *The university should ensure employees obtain prior special expense approval when using purchasing cards for any travel expenses or meals purchased for business meetings, team or student activities.*
- *The university should provide written delegation of authority to each purchasing card holder.*
- *The university should implement merchant category blocking for all purchasing cards.*
- *The university should ensure that supervisors review faculty purchasing card transactions and employee business expense reimbursements; in addition, it should clarify the responsibility of department chairs versus academic deans for reviewing purchasing card transactions for appropriateness and compliance.*

Employee Business Expense Reimbursements

7. A university employee was inappropriately reimbursed for expenses previously incurred and paid for by a university purchasing card.

The university paid for some travel expenses twice when the expenses were incurred and paid with a purchasing card and then also paid as an expense reimbursement to an employee. The expenses were paid from Professional Development Funds and we were told the employee thought he needed to fill out an employee business expense form to account for the use of the funds. As result, the employee was improperly reimbursed \$408.85.

Recommendation

- *The university should seek reimbursement from the employee for the expense reimbursement made in error.*
- *The university should consider additional methods to prevent or detect employee reimbursement requests for expenses paid with a university purchasing card.*

8. The university did not define the scenarios and limits in which employees can use personal credit cards to make university-related purchases and submit business expense reimbursement requests.

The university did not have a policy or other guidelines to define the situations, types of purchases, or dollar limits of university-related purchases an employee can make using a personal credit card that the employee will subsequently submit as an employee business expense request. We identified one employee who was reimbursed over \$38,000 for purchases made on a personal credit card during the audit period. The reimbursements included approximately \$22,000 for travel-related expenses, including airline tickets for students going on a group trip, and over \$10,000 for supplies. These purchases appeared to be appropriate use of university funds.

Without specific policies or procedures that establish guidelines and limits for use of personal credit cards, employees may make purchases and obtain reimbursement for items that circumvent key procurement controls and purchasing requirements. The university may want to consider requiring large purchases or routine purchases be made using the university's traditional procurement process or require employees to use a university purchasing card.

Recommendation

- *The university should define the scenarios and limits for employees' use of personal credit cards for university-related purchases. It should consider whether large purchases or routine purchases should be made using the university's traditional procurement process or require a university purchasing card.*



SOUTHWEST MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
RONALD A. WOOD, INTERIM PRESIDENT

January 3, 2012

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Members of the Board of Trustees
Chancellor Steven J. Rosenstone
Ms Beth Buse, Executive Director Internal Auditing
30 7th St. E., Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-7804

Dear Chancellor Rosenstone, Trustees and Ms Buse:

Southwest Minnesota State University (SMSU) is appreciative of the professionalism of the team that recently completed the Compliance Audit covering the fiscal years 2010 and 2011 and the first three months of FY 2012. The compliance audit followed immediately after our annual financial audit in which we continued to have an unqualified audit with no findings.

The compliance audit was very useful in assisting us to identify both strengths and weaknesses in our operation. Attached is a response to the findings and steps being taken to correct areas of weakness. We believe that the audit also demonstrates two levels of weakness at the system level.

The first is with respect to the policy and procedure defining the use of purchasing cards. While we found ourselves not in compliance with aspects of the system policy/procedures as they apply to purchasing cards, we do believe we are in compliance with the intent of the purchasing card use. We believe the current policy attempts to create a one size fits all approach to a complex system. It requires a layer of paper work that creates an unnecessary redundancy of work with a very limited reduction in risk. Additional comments are found in the attached findings response.

The second is with respect to concept of the compliance audit. The last SMSU compliance audit was 1998. Considerable system policy and procedure changes have occurred over the last thirteen years. A tremendous amount of employee turnover has occurred at the system office and the University over the last 13 years. Finally, four different Presidents have led the institution since 1998. Time creates incremental changes in practice that moves an organization away from policy/procedure. New policies are often open to interpretation in practice which create variances over time. It would be my hope that

a maximum of four years be the longest period of time between Compliance Audits in the future. It keeps an institution on track and helps point out deficiencies in university and system policies.

SMSU is proud of its fiscal responsibility and the clean financial audits received over the last decade. We have learned much from the recent system compliance audit and will be instituting University policies/procedures to insure that we are in compliance with system policies and procedures identified as findings.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ronald A. Wood". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized initial 'R'.

Ronald A. Wood, PhD
Interim President

/cra



**Southwest Minnesota State University
Response to Internal Control and Compliance Audit
December 2011 - January 2012**

1. The university did not have adequate controls to ensure receipts from several supplemental revenue sources were safeguarded and properly deposited.

Southwest Minnesota State University (Southwest Minnesota State University) management agrees with this finding, recognizes these deficiencies and accepts these recommendations regarding supplemental revenues.

Southwest Minnesota State University management will work with each of the supplemental revenue areas to develop procedures that will allow for security of receipts, proper billing, timely depositing and reconciling of transactions by the business office independently of those accepting the receipts. These written procedures will become part of the Business Control Cycles.

Southwest Minnesota State University will incorporate a practice of using pre-numbered receipts or other tools for reconciliations.

Departments have been told that no invoicing is to be done except by the business office. To emphasize this written procedure will be created and posted on the business office website and distributed to all departments. This is important for proper account receivable record keeping. A method of reconciling between the EMS system and ISRS will also be implemented to assure that all scheduled activities have been invoiced.

The Business Office has emphasized timely deposits to departments but as the audit shows has not been successful in accomplishing this. Written procedures will be created and posted on the business office website and distributed to all departments. This will become part of the written procedures for each of the supplemental revenue areas. We will emphasize timely depositing with all supervisors and directors of those areas also.

Discussions regarding safe combinations with each supplemental revenue area have begun. Southwest Minnesota State University agrees this is especially important in areas with multiple turnovers. The safe in the Business Office was put into operation in 2002. Since that time the Business Office has had just one employee with safe access leave the Business Office. That employee is still employed by the University. An individual actually needs two room keys, one safe key and the safe combination before they can open the safe. The employee who had the business office safe combination does not have access to the three keys to get to the safe. We did inquire with the local company who can change safe combinations regarding the business office safe and the local company was hesitant to change the combination due to its type. We will investigate other options.

The security of cash collections will become part of written procedures for each area that has cash/receipt collection points. Cash and other receipts should be secured at all times.

Telephone (507) 537-7678 • FAX (507) 537-7154
1501 State Street, Marshall MN 56258-1598 • www.SMSU.edu

Cash banks will be reviewed for necessity. We recognize that unannounced audits have not taken place on a regular basis or for some time and will become part of written procedures and assigned to a specific position.

2. The university did not have a policy to determine who has the authority and when it is appropriate to waive facility and equipment rental fees.

Southwest Minnesota State University agrees with this finding and is in the process of writing a policy clearly defining authority and circumstances for acceptable waiving of rental fees. The policy will state that any approved waivers or reductions of fees will be in writing and will state who may approve those waivers or reductions. The University clearly does not want to put its employees at risk of violating policies and procedures.

3. Business office cashiers shared accounting sessions and cash drawers.

Southwest Minnesota State University agrees with this finding. We recognize that during lunch breaks or other short breaks the cashier did not sign off her cash drawer and the backup cashier would use the same drawer. Although receipts are time stamped and it could be determined who was cashiering at a certain time there are inherent risks in regards to cash shortages. The Business Office will develop additional procedures for cash drawer usage.

4. The university did not properly retain all source documents to support receipts from the Mustang Zone.

Southwest Minnesota State University agrees with this finding. The University over the past year has been and continues to be in the process of updating and reviewing its record retention procedures. The University prefers that all original documentation is retained by the Business Office and given to the Business Office as part of the deposit procedure when possible and appropriate. We will review these original receipts with the Mustang Zone and determine the best procedure to use. We will also review the Student Center record retention procedures to be sure original receipts are listed and have the appropriate years of retention listed.

5. The university did not adequately manage its asset inventory records and fiscal years 2011 physical inventory counts were not performed by an independent person.

Southwest Minnesota State University agrees with this finding. The University recognizes that it did not meet requirements in various aspects of inventory procedures. Southwest Minnesota State University has not had consistency in inventory assignments and management. In the past three years we have had to assign the inventory duties to three different individuals because of staffing changes and prior to that there were multiple changes also. Proper inventory management has been a casualty of budget cuts.

Southwest Minnesota State University management will make this a top priority over the next few weeks and will continue to review and monitor inventory on an ongoing basis. As of the beginning of January 2012, the physical inventory duties are being reassigned to a different individual who will have time to complete the physical inventory on an annual basis. The current inventory procedures will be updated and completed in more detail to assist this individual. Business Office staff has already begun cleaning up prior year issues. The Information Technology Department is assisting the Business Office staff in making access to the sensitive item moves and deletions on a timelier basis.

6. The university did not comply with some procedural requirements for purchasing card transactions.

Southwest Minnesota State University agrees with this finding. Southwest Minnesota State University management recognizes that it did not require special expense forms for all travel paid by purchasing cards nor

did it issue Delegation of Authority (DOA) forms for those issued purchasing cards. These policy requirements were overlooked by management per the policy changes last year. Delegations of Authorities will be processed for all those with current purchasing cards. A Delegation of Authority will become part of the process for obtaining a card.

Although we recognize the statement in policy that requires a special expense form for travel paid by a purchasing card, it seems to contradict the reason to use a purchasing card. A purchasing card should make the process easier yet we have just now created a requirement that does not exist if the purchase is made by purchase order or by a travel expense reimbursement or advance and settlement. We would like further discussion on this item to take place between the system office, internal audit, and purchasing card users.

The Southwest Minnesota State University Purchasing Director has already begun the process of working with US Bank on the merchant category code blocking. Blocks have been added back to those on which they were removed entirely. We will continue to refine this so that correct blocking is obtained.

Southwest Minnesota State University management agrees that we have allowed the persons with responsibility for budget approval to approve the transactions for faculty. These individuals may not be the Deans. If Deans must approve the expenditures for all faculty regardless of where the funds are from or who is responsible for them, multiple layers of signature authority will need to be obtained. The added benefit for this additional layer of approval is minimal as the Dean may have no understanding of the reason for the expense or if the expense was appropriate for the department.

7. A university employee was inappropriately reimbursed for expenses previously incurred and paid for by a university purchasing card.

Southwest Minnesota State University agrees with the finding. The university has already requested reimbursement from the employee and the employee has deposited a check with our cashiers on December 19, 2011 to be applied to the duplicated reimbursement.

The Business Office is implementing processes to assist in the monitoring of employee purchasing card and employee expense forms. The staff who processes these items will also meet to assist in developing additional procedures that will be beneficial to this review such as queries that could match like expenses.

8. The university did not define the scenarios and limits in which employees can use personal credit cards to make university-related purchases and submit business expense reimbursement requests.

Southwest Minnesota State University senior management will consider establishing guidelines for reimbursement of expenditures that occur through the employee expense reimbursement process rather than through the traditional purchasing process. The individual mentioned in the audit findings is no longer in the position they were when these purchases were made and processes for the replacement individual will be defined.

Guidelines for departmental purchases that are established will be added to the Southwest Minnesota State University Purchasing Website. The positing of these guidelines will be made known to all employees.

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Audit Committee

Date of Meeting: January 17, 2012

Agenda Item: Review External Audit Plan and Approve Any Changes

Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring

Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

According to Board Policy 1A2, Part 5, Subpart E, the Audit Committee oversees the work of external auditors. The audit contracts for seven individual college and university audits have expired.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Beth Buse, Executive Director, Office of Internal Auditing
Laura King, Vice Chancellor - CFO

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- The Office of Internal Auditing and the Finance Division recommend contracting for financial statement audits of seven institutions for two years (fiscal years 2012 and 2013).
- The Office of Internal Auditing and the Finance Division recommend amending the principal auditor contract with CliftonLarsonAllen one year, to expire after the fiscal year 2013 audit.

Background Information:

- The current contract with the principal auditor, CliftonLarsonAllen, requires that the system contract for individual financial statement audits of colleges and universities so that at least 60% of the system-wide financial activity is covered by individual college and university audits.
- There are five colleges and two universities whose contracts have expired. This group collectively accounts for 24% of system assets and system operating expenses (based on fiscal year 2011 data).

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

BOARD INFORMATION
REVIEW EXTERNAL AUDIT PLAN AND APPROVE ANY CHANGES

In January 2005, the Board of Trustees approved a Strategic Plan for External Audit Services. The plan provided contracting with CPA firms to conduct annual financial statements audits of the larger colleges and universities. The plan provided that the annual audit of the system-level financial statements would be augmented with the stand-alone audits of twelve colleges and universities. In January 2009, the Board of Trustees approved an amendment to the strategic plan for external audit services; Normandale Community College was added to the annual audit cycle for fiscal years 2010 and 2011. This group of stand-alone audits was intended to account for approximately 60% of system-wide financial activity and, thus, improve the cost-effectiveness of the system-level audit. In addition, the plan included contracting for financial internal control and compliance audits of colleges without financial statement audits through the Office of the Legislative Auditor.

In 2010, by mutual agreement the contractual arrangement with the Legislative Auditor ended. Mr. James Nobles, the Legislative Auditor, challenged the Audit Committee to consider the value and role of obtaining annual financial statement audits for individual colleges and universities. He based his challenge, in part, on questioning whether there were external audiences for whom these audits were prepared. Given limited resources, he wondered whether these resources should be focused on financial internal control and compliance audits.

In October 2011, the Audit Committee approved the Office of Internal Auditing audit plan that includes a new approach for auditing financial internal control and compliance at colleges and universities. This approach is based on an annual audit risk assessment that includes limited college and university audits but rather focuses audit resources on auditing financial internal control and compliance cycles. The current audit plan includes audits of Southwest Minnesota State University, state university payroll, and ISRS user level security.

The contract with the Minnesota State College and University system's principal auditor, CliftonLarsonAllen, LLP, requires that the system contract for individual financial statement audits of colleges and universities so that at least 60% of the system-wide financial activity is covered by individual college and university audits. One year remains on the current three-year contract.

Table 1 shows an analysis of financial activity for the 13 colleges and universities with financial statement audits. The seven colleges and universities with expired contracts accounted for approximately 24% of system financial activity in fiscal year 2011.

**Table 1: Financial Analysis of Colleges and Universities with Financial Statement Audits
(in thousands)**

	% System Assets	% System Operating Expenses	Institution Net Assets	Institution Operating Expenses
<u>Contracts expiring after FY 2013 audits</u>				
Bemidji State University	3.76%	4.24%	70,296	79,160
Minnesota State Community & Technical College	2.19%	3.09%	40,962	57,668
MSU, Mankato	10.70%	9.93%	200,101	185,430
MSU Moorhead	5.28%	5.10%	98,732	95,159
St. Cloud State University	9.33%	10.71%	174,542	199,914
Winona State University	8.45%	6.77%	157,979	126,342
Subtotal - 1st cycle	39.71%	39.82%	742,612	743,673
<u>Contracts that expired after the FY 2011 audit</u>				
Century College	3.02%	4.21%	56,443	78,617
Hennepin Technical College	2.19%	2.96%	40,895	55,246
Metropolitan State University	3.00%	3.48%	56,123	65,079
Minneapolis Community & Technical College	5.27%	3.99%	98,484	74,517
Normandale Community College	3.24%	3.54%	60,561	66,053
Rochester Community & Technical College	3.61%	2.87%	67,451	53,505
Southwest Minnesota State University	3.60%	2.53%	67,248	47,322
Subtotal - 2nd cycle	23.91%	23.58%	447,205	440,339
Total - 13 Stand-alone Audits	63.62%	63.40%	\$1,189,817	\$1,184,012

Below are reasons that we recommend that the system continue with financial statement audits for the 13 colleges and universities listed in Table 1 for fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

- The 13 colleges and universities have been on different contractual cycles than the principal auditor, it is difficult to make changes in audit coverage until all contracts are aligned to expire at the same time.
- A number of shared services initiatives are currently being implemented and others are being planned, an evaluation will be necessary to determine where audits are appropriate in the future.
- The change in how the system is obtaining financial internal control and compliance audits was implemented in fiscal year 2012, it is too early to know the impact of this change.

Recommended Next Steps:

To allow for flexibility in contracting for financial statement audits in the future, the Office of Internal Auditing will proceed with the following steps:

- January and February 2012 – The Office of Internal Auditing and the Finance Division will prepare a request for proposal (RFP) to solicit interest from external audit firms for financial statement audits for the two universities and five colleges with expired contracts for fiscal years 2012 and 2013.

The Office of Internal Auditing, Finance Division, and the seven institutions will evaluate the proposals to develop a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The evaluation criteria will include: qualifications, understanding of objectives, work plan and cost.

- April 2012 – The Board of Trustees will take action on a recommended motion for the appointment of external audit firms for the seven institutions.
- The Office of Internal Auditing and the Finance Division will work with the principal auditor (CliftonLarsonAllen) on amending their contract for one year, to expire after the fiscal year 2013 audit.

Over the next two years the Office of Internal Auditing will:

- Evaluate the impact of changes in the audit approach for auditing financial internal control and compliance of colleges and universities,
- Evaluate the impact to colleges and universities on the shared services initiative,
- Further research practices in other systems across the country. Our research thus far shows that we are unique in how we obtain audited financial statements for the system. We need to further evaluate how systems obtain audit coverage to more fully compare the difference in the external audit approach, and
- Develop alternatives for presidents and other system leaders to discuss and evaluate.
- By January 2014, recommend an external audit plan for the future.

RECOMMENDED COMMITTEE ACTION:

The Audit Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees adopt the following motion:

RECOMMENDED MOTION

The Board of Trustees endorses the recommendations offered by the Executive Director of Internal Auditing and Vice Chancellor – CFO regarding the next steps for future external audits for colleges and universities.

Date Presented to the Board of Trustees: January 17, 2012

**MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Agenda Item Summary Sheet

Committee: Audit Committee

Date of Meeting: January 17, 2012

Agenda Item: Board Committee Goals

- Proposed Policy Change Approvals Required by Policy Other Approvals Monitoring
- Information

Cite policy requirement, or explain why item is on the Board agenda:

Each committee of the Board of Trustees is asked to bring forward a goal that they have selected for further study for fiscal year 2012. The committee will periodically review progress on its goals.

Scheduled Presenter(s):

Beth Buse, Executive Director, Office of Internal Auditing

Outline of Key Points/Policy Issues:

- An update on the Audit Committee's goal will be discussed.

Background Information:

- The Audit Committee's goal for the year is to research best practices of other audit committees, including audit approaches of other higher education systems as well as private industry. The Audit Committee discussed this goal in November 2011.
- The study will be helpful as a succession planning tool given the significant audit committee rotation that will be occurring in fiscal year 2013.
- A timeline for completing research and discussing possible recommendations will be June 2012.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES**

INFORMATION ITEM
BOARD COMMITTEE GOALS

The Audit Committee’s goal for the year is to research best practices of other audit committees, including audit approaches of other higher education systems as well as private industry. The Audit Committee discussed this goal in November 2011.

A timeline for completing the study includes:

- January 2012 – discuss external audit plan, will include results of research on other higher education systems on obtaining college and university audited financial statement audits.
- April 2012 – discuss results of research of audit committee best practices in other higher education systems and the private sector.
- June 2012 – discuss recommendations to consider in the future that may enhance performance and effectiveness of the audit committee.

Date Presented to the Board of Trustee: January 17, 2012