

# **For Discussion**

1.	Project Update
2.	Lessons Learned
3.	Next Steps
4.	Q&A

© 2019 Crowe LLP



## **Project Update – Objectives & Scope Recap**

### Objectives.

Conduct an internal management and accounting/financial control assessment to evaluate the existing internal controls and business processes to identify any areas of risk for the SUS

#### Scope.

The internal management and accounting controls of the SUS.

## **Project Update – Completed Activities**

We have completed our procedures for all 12 universities within the SUS which included:

- 1) Assessing BOG regulations, university policies, procedures, processes and business requirements.
- 2) Preparing inherent risk assessments arising from our assessment of the above as well as our experience in common risks within higher education
- 3) Distributing risk/control questionnaires to university management and conducting interviews onsite to understand risk management and control practices
- 4) Completing evaluations of each university's risk management and control structure
- 5) Identifying gaps in controls and process improvement opportunities as observations and recommendations which have been discussed with management.
- 6) Submitting draft reports to university management for their written response to our observations and recommendations.



### **Lessons Learned – Observations Noted**

Category	# Observations	# Universities	Risk
Financial Reporting	2	5	Low-Moderate
<b>Information Security/ Data</b> Protection	15	11	Low-Moderate
Third-Party Risk Management	3	2	Low-Moderate
Safeguarding of Assets	4	5	Low-Moderate
Segregation of Duties Concerns	1	1	Moderate

### **Notes on Observations**

- Intended to convey control "improvement opportunities" not significant issues
- None were rated above a Moderate risk level (i.e. a "3" out of "5" on our rating scale)
- IT security/data protection were most prolific relative to other observations

#### **Lessons Learned – Common Trends**

 Overall, our procedures indicated that controls over internal management and accounting controls of the SUS appeared to be in place.

- 2. Biggest threat to control structure resides in:
  - Management override of controls.
  - Varying interpretation of BOG regulations
  - Pressures due to funding limitations

# **Lessons Learned to Date (continued)**

There is an opportunity for establishing a more holistic approach to risk management and controls throughout the SUS. One approach would be a focus on increasing the frequency and content of communications. For example:

- SUS workshops could improve understanding and implementation of best practices in risk management and internal controls
- A series of minor-moderate improvements in financial and information technology
  controls could significantly improve assurance over reliability of data (e.g. guidance on
  data protection considering Sunshine State laws)
- An enhanced focus on third-party risk management would increase transparency and accountability among university service providers (and help manage costs).
- Continuation of initiatives that share information and resources could help address major challenges such as funding limitations and enrollment challenges (e.g. shared services agreements and strategic sourcing initiatives).

© 2019 Crowe LLP



## **Project Next Steps**

1. Obtain universities' responses to our draft report observations and recommendations.

Target: This is underway

2. We will deliver final reports for each university with management's responses for BOG review and comment.

Target: Beginning November 1<sup>st</sup> (pending receipt of management responses)

3. We will address any BOG comments and submit the final report for each of the universities.

Target: November 15th

3. We will submit our summary report to the BOG for review and comment.

Target: November 15<sup>th</sup>

4. We plan to attend the January BOG meeting to address any additional questions or concerns on our report prior to project closure.

