OPERATIONAL AUDIT

COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For the period January 1, 2009 through February 29, 2012





Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector Gary A. Jones, CPA, CFE

Audit Report of the Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training

For the Period January 1, 2009 through February 29, 2012

This publication, issued by the Oklahoma State Auditor and Inspector's Office as authorized by 74 O.S. § 212, has not been printed, but is available on the agency's website (<u>www.sai.ok.gov</u>) and in the Oklahoma Department of Libraries Publications Clearinghouse Digital Collection, pursuant to 74 O.S. § 3105.B.



2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405.521.3495 • Fax: 405.521.3426

January 30, 2013

TO THE COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING

This is the audit report of the Council on Law Enforcement Education and Training for the period January 1, 2009 through February 29, 2012. The goal of the State Auditor and Inspector is to promote accountability and fiscal integrity in state and local government. Maintaining our independence as we provide this service to the taxpayers of Oklahoma is of utmost importance.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the assistance and cooperation extended to our office during our engagement.

Sincerely,

Sany after

GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

Background	The Council on Law Enforcement Education agency established in 1963. The Council supports serving its communities, including enhanci- education and training which promotes competency within the ranks of Oklahoma law of The System's operations are governed by 70 O. Oversight is provided by a thirteen member Of The agency is funded through annual appropria Legislature, penalty assessment fees collected f law enforcement license fees, self defense act li Council members are:	orts Oklahoma law ng public safety professionalism enforcement. S. § 3311. Council serving th ttions of monies by from county and m	enforcement in by providing and enhances ree-year terms. the Oklahoma unicipal courts,	
	 Director Norman McNickle. Sheriff John Whetsel. Major Todd Blish. Chief Bill Citty. Director Stan Florence. Chief Byron Cox. Chief Byron Cox. Chief Jason O'Neal. Chief Bob Ricks. Chief Michael Robinson. Jason Smith, Sgt. At Arms. Ed Smith Director Darrell Weaver Sheriff Bob Wilder. Table 1 summarizes the agency's sources and u 2010 and 2011 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2 	uses of funds for st	Vice-Chair Member Member Member Member Member Member Member Member Member Member	
	Table 1-Sources and Uses of Funds for S	Table 1-Sources and Uses of Funds for SFY 2010 and SFY 2011		
	Sources: State Appropriations Private Investigator/Sec. Guard Licenses CLEET Penalty Assessment Fee Repayment of Loans Other Grants, Refunds, & Reimbursements Application Deposits Use of Recreation Equipment & Facilities Sale of Surplus Property Total Sources	$\begin{array}{c} 2010\\ \$4,335,354\\ \$0\\ \$1,834,011\\ \$0\\ \$0\\ \$17,500\\ \$13,172\\ \underline{\$1,319}\\ \underline{\$6,201,376}\end{array}$	2011 \$3,916,990 \$122,719 \$1,907,501 \$2,397 \$276,725 \$14,600 \$10,052 <u>\$0</u> <u>\$6,250,783</u>	
	Uses: Personnel Services Travel Administrative Expense Property, Furniture and Equipment Total Uses	\$3,038,227 \$48,211 \$1,231,716 <u>\$2,055,376</u> <u>\$6,373,531</u>	\$2,861,512 \$25,575 \$1,265,768 <u>\$2,122,066</u> <u>\$6,274,921</u>	

Source: Oklahoma PeopleSoft Accounting System (unaudited, for informational purposes only)

Purpose, Scope, and

Sample Methodology

This audit was conducted in response to 74 O.S. § 212, which requires the State Auditor and Inspector's Office to audit the books and accounts of all state agencies whose duty it is to collect, disburse or manage funds of the state.

The audit period covered was January 1, 2009 through February 29, 2012.

Sample methodologies can vary and are selected based on the audit objective and whether the total population of data was available. Random sampling is the preferred method; however, we may also use haphazard sampling (a methodology that produces a representative selection for non-statistical sampling), or judgmental selection when data limitation prevents the use of the other two methods. We selected our samples in such a way that whenever possible, the samples are representative of the populations and provide sufficient evidential matter. We identified specific attributes for testing each of the samples. When appropriate, we projected our results to that population.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. This report is a public document pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act (51 O.S. § 24A.1 et seq.), and shall be open to any person for inspection and copying.

Objective 1 - Determine if the Agency's internal controls provide reasonable assurance that revenues and expenditures were accurately reported in the accounting records, and financial operations complied with 62 O.S. § 34.57.C, 62 O.S. § 34.57.E, 70 O.S. § 3311v1.B.13, 70 O.S. § 3311v1.L.3, 70 O.S. § 3311v1.M.3, 20 O.S. § 1313.2.D, 21 O.S. § 1290.14.B.4, 59 O.S. § 1456.C, and 59 O.S. § 1750.6.B4.

Conclusion	The Agency's internal controls provide reasonable assurance that revenues and expenditures were accurately reported in the accounting records.
	Financial operations complied with the following statues:
	• 62 O.S. § 34.57.C – funds are adequately safeguarded prior to deposit;
	• 62 O.S. § 34.57.E – transfers from the clearing account to other accounts or funds should be made monthly and no money shall be disbursed from the clearing account;
	• 70 O.S. § 3311v1.B.13 – 100% of Sales and Service Collections are transferred to the CLEET Training Center Revolving Fund;
	• 70 O.S. § 3311v1.L.3 and 70 O.S. § 3311v1.M.3 – 100% of the Canine Fee collections are transferred to the CLEET fund;

	 20 O.S. § 1313.2.D – From the Municipal and County fee collections 60.53% are transferred to the CLEET fund, 33.64% are transferred to CLEET Training Center Revolving fund, and 5.83% are transferred to the State General fund; 	
	• 21 O.S. § 1290.14.B.4 – 100% of Self Defense Act (SDA) fee collections were transferred to the Firearms Instructors Revolving fund;	
	 59 O.S. § 1456.C and 59 O.S. § 1750.6.B.4 – 100% of the Polygraph License fee collections are transferred to the State General Fund. Prior to November 1, 2010, 100% of Private Security collections were transferred to the State General fund. Beginning November 1, 2010, the amount to be transferred to either the State General fund or the Private Security Revolving fund is based on the type of license fee. 	
Methodology	To accomplish our objective, we performed the following:	
	• Obtained and understanding of internal controls related to the receiptin and expenditure processes through discussions with Agency personne observation, and review of documents;	
	• Tested controls which included:	
	• Reviewing a random sample of 25 deposits from the period to ensure the check amount on the deposit slip traces to the Agency's receipt log and mail log, the deposit slip traces to the depository form, the deposit occurred within one working day of the receipt date, and the corresponding receipt books consisted of pre-numbered hand-written receipts;	
	 Observing the locked safe in the file room to ensure funds received after 3:00 P.M. are adequately safeguarded; 	
	• Reviewing a random sample of 10 monthly reconciliations from the period to ensure the reconciliation spreadsheets trace and agree to OST Monthly Agency Statements and the OSF Clearing Account report and funds were transferred from the clearing account on a monthly basis;	
	• Reviewing a random sample of 25 vouchers from the period to ensure the supporting invoice was properly approved and mathematically accurate, and the expenditure was reasonable and properly coded.	
	• Haphazardly selected three months from the audit period, recalculated the amount of net collections for each category (County, Municipal, SDA, Private Security, Polygraph, Sales and Services, Canine, and Miscellaneous) and traced the amount to an OSF CORE journal entry to ensure the necessary percentage of collections was transferred to the correct fund on a monthly basis	

There were no exceptions noted as a result of these procedures.

correct fund on a monthly basis.



OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR 2300 N. LINCOLN BOULEVARD, ROOM 100 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105-4896

WWW.SAI.OK.GOV