

Classification **PUBLIC**

Meeting **June 10th 2013**

Agenda Item **Monitoring Report:
Audit Function**



Recommended Motion:

THAT the Board finds that all provisions of the *Audit Function Executive Limitations Policy* have been complied with.

I hereby submit my monitoring report on your Executive Limitations Policy “Audit Function” according to the schedule set out. I certify that the information contained in this report is true.

I report compliance to all provisions of this policy.

Signed: _____
Chief of Police

Date: _____

Board Policy Statement:

The Chief of Police will not fail to ensure that all practices related to quality assurance and audit functions are in accordance with statutory requirements and generally accepted principles and standards for the professional practice of internal auditing.

Further, without limiting the scope of the foregoing, the Chief of Police will not:

- 1. Fail to establish an internal audit capability for the police service and ensure that appropriate resources are provided to the members performing the function.*
- 2. Fail to ensure that police members involved in audit processes have the knowledge, skills and abilities required to perform the duties required.*
- 3. Fail to establish audit priorities on an annual basis based on a risk assessment or operational priorities of the police service.*
- 4. Fail to develop an internal audit work plan on an annual basis that identifies potential audit projects to be performed during the calendar year it is presented.*
- 5. Fail to present to the Board the internal audit work plan for the current calendar year.*

6. *Fail to present to the Board a consolidated report summarizing the results of the previous year's audits, including any audits conducted externally.*
7. *Fail to inform the Board, as required, of any audit results that may require the immediate attention of the Board.*

Interpretation of the Chief of Police:

It is my interpretation that this limitation policy stipulates that the Durham Regional Police Service (DRPS) shall have at minimum quality assurance capacity internal to the Service, and audit capacity either internally or through contracted external expertise depending on the expertise required to meet statutory requirements, generally accepted principles and standards for the auditing profession. This audit capacity also includes the continuous review, and revision process in relation to Service directives.

Data Support:

1. QUALITY ASSURANCE CAPABILITY

The Durham Regional Police Service (DRPS) has a Quality Assurance Unit (Q.A.) whose responsibility it is to:

1. Conduct internal quality assurance audits
2. Assist in the development and maintenance of directives, the written orders of the Chief of Police for all members. Directives outline processes, procedures, roles and responsibilities and are available to all members of the service through the DRPS intranet.
3. Assist in the development and maintenance of forms
4. Suspect apprehension pursuit review of all Service pursuits, ensuring the timely submission of Fail To Stop Reports and Suspect Apprehension Pursuit Debriefings by the Compliance Officer (Staff Sergeant)

In early 2013 the unit was restructured with existing staff to incorporate a compliance officer and a supervisor to coordinate and ensure consistent and value added products. In addition Service members who have attended the Auditing in a Law Enforcement Organization have been included as resources as needed for 2013.

2. KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES

To perform a comprehensive audit unassisted, auditors must have completed the Ray Jacobson Auditing course. There are 23 members within the Service that have received and successfully completed the Jacobsen "Auditing in a Law Enforcement Organization" course. These members may be called upon to perform internal audits for the Service.

The member assigned to the auditing function in Q.A. received additional training on quality and process improvement applicable to internal auditing from a certified member of ROCG Hobb and Company Consulting in the spring of 2011. It is expected that this training is applied to internal audits, including the proper tracking and documenting of completed audits.

Audits requiring Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) standards are sourced out to recognized, qualified and competent agencies.

3. AUDIT PRIORITIES

Quality Assurance prioritizes audits based on feedback from the Risk Management Committee and the need for assurance of Adequacy Standards and directive procedures. Throughout the year, leadership may identify additional audit priorities; these audits are added to the schedule accordingly. Two audits are conducted on an annual basis: Property Unit and Communications/911 Unit.

The property audit is conducted annually based on the guidelines of the Policing Standards Manual (2000) integrated policy statement LE-020 Collection, Preservation and Control of Evidence and Property, section 5, which recommends that:

Every Chief of Police should ensure that an annual audit of the property/evidence control function is conducted by a member(s) not routinely or directly connected with the property/evidence control function, and report the results to the Board.

In addition, DRPS Directive AO-04-001 Seized and Found Property, section 21, specifies that the Quality Assurance unit shall:

Conduct an annual audit of all property held by the DRPS.

The communication audit is scheduled annually in compliance with DRPS Directive AO-02-002 Communications and Dispatch which states that the Quality Assurance Unit shall:

Conduct an annual audit of the Communications / 911 Unit. The chief of police, in consultation with the Communications / 911 Unit Inspector and the Quality Assurance Unit, shall determine the nature and scope of all such audits.

4. AUDIT PLAN

The Quality Assurance Unit develops an audit schedule for each calendar year. The unit schedules the two audits mentioned above on an annual basis and reviews the requirements for each before beginning the audits. To identify priority audits, the unit solicits feedback from the Risk Management Committee in the previous calendar year. In addition, assurance and compliance audits are selected for areas that have not been recently audited.

Two to four weeks prior to the scheduled audit, the signing authority is contacted to discuss the work plan including the background, purpose and scope of the audit. This is an opportunity to ensure that any concerns, regulations and standards are identified and may be included in the audit. The work plan for the audit is developed following a specific template for signature by the signing officer.

5. AUDIT SCHEDULE (2013)

At minimum, the following audits will be conducted in 2013:

March: Traffic Management (Impaired Driving)

May: Jacobsen Audits

- Annual Reporting (Adequacy Standard)
- Job Posting
- Search Warrant Course
- Elder and Vulnerable Abuse (Adequacy Standard)
- Quartermaster Stores

June: Elder and Vulnerable Persons Abuse (Adequacy Standard and Directive Assurance)

August: Property

October: Communications

6. AUDIT SUMMARY (2012)

In 2012, audits were completed in the following areas:

- Property
- Communications
- Canine
- Sex Offender Registry
- Marked General Patrol Vehicles
- Collision Reporting Centre
- Suspect Apprehension Pursuits
- Ministry Audit

INTERNAL AUDITS

Property

The purpose of this audit was to assess the current procedures in place for the retention and storage of seized property and to test the accuracy of the warehouse database records. A change in leadership of the Property Unit required an inventory to be conducted.

There were two errors found in the test of the 400 barcodes, for an error rate of 0.5%

Communications

The purpose of this audit was to review the Communications cellular telephone procedures, with an emphasis on billing and usage:

- Assess current cell phone practices for compliance with the procedures outlined in Directive AO-02-007 “Cellular Telephones”.
- Determine whether the internal controls are effective in keeping cell phone costs down and members accountable.

- Determine the accuracy and completeness of the monthly reports on cell phone use sent out to the divisional inspectors and unit leaders.

The findings and recommendations are largely administrative in nature and include observations on the transfer of cell phones between members, the tracking of overages, and reporting between the Communications / 911 Unit and unit leaders.

Canine

The purpose of this audit was to:

- To review procedures and the recording of calls for service involving canine support and access the procedures for compliancy with Directive ER-09-001 “Canine [K-9] Unit”.
- To assess the unit’s training procedures against the Canine Unit Training Standard.
- To determine the accuracy and level of accountability in the reporting and debriefing of canine apprehensions requiring a form DRP 43 and any canine contact with police officers (other than in training sessions).
- To assess the Canine Unit’s equipment inventory, at minimum, and determine whether these provisions are in accordance with policy standards.

Actions taken to address the findings and recommendations of the audit include directive revisions and the creation of a Standard Operation Procedure (SOP) manual for the Canine Unit and a Canine (Bite) Debriefing Process.

JACOBSEN AUDITS (JOINT AUDITS)

The Jacobsen Audit course is an avenue for the DRPS to make a preliminary assessment of different areas of the Service. Due to the time restraints of the course, the scope of these audits is limited.

Sex Offender Registry

The auditors concluded that DRPS Directive LE-17-020 “Ontario Sex Offender Registry” is compliant with both the National and Ontario Sex Offender Registry policies.

Recommendations include that the officer in charge of the Offender Management Unit should review all files for quality assurance purposes and review or approve all new and maintenance registrations.

Marked General Patrol Vehicles

Observations from this audit highlighted that the content of an equipment form did not match the requirements of the related directive. Additionally, a recommendation was made that the DRPS adopt a visual equipment storage system.

Collision Reporting Centre (CRC)

The auditors expressed concern that ASSIL may not be in compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), especially around reporting complaints to the DRPS and other reporting obligations. Recommendations include defining the level of background and security screening required for ASSIL employees in policy and that consideration may be given to accommodating limited sized commercial motor vehicles at the CRC.

Suspect Apprehension Pursuits

The auditors found that at December 31st 2011, 25% of officers had not completed the required suspect apprehension pursuit e-learning modules. They also found that in 2011 some debriefings were completed outside of the 21 day time frame and that the Pursuit Review Panel was not convening as specified in the directive.

Management has taken steps to improve the SAP review process as well as providing additional information regarding the specifics of each issue.

EXTERNAL AUDITS

A Ministry Audit was completed; however the results of that audit are not currently available

7. AUDIT RESULTS

A meeting is scheduled with the auditor(s) and the Audit Review Board* after the audit is completed. At this meeting, the auditor(s) present their findings and recommendations and management has the opportunity to comment on the audit. Management then responds in writing to the findings and recommendations in a management action plan. The audit and the management action plan are then brought to a Leadership Group meeting. Progress on the management action plan is reported to the Compliance Officer.

Management may choose to accept, accept in part, or decline any recommendation. If accepting a recommendation, the management response will include an action plan with an anticipated completion date. If declining a recommendation, the management response will include the reasons for declining the recommendation. Finally, if accepting the recommendation in part, the management response will include a reason for the partial acceptance and an action plan for the accepted portion of the recommendation.

The Chief of Police is apprised of annual audit results, including any identified imminent risks to the Service or its members. Through the Chief, the Board is informed of any issues or concerns that require the immediate attention of the Board.

**The Audit Review Board consists of: any Command Member (at minimum the C.A.O.), Manager of Planning, Supervisor of Quality Assurance, and the LG Member responsible for the audit.*