

VERITAU

INTERNAL AUDIT QUALITY ASSURANCE AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME

1.0 Background

Ongoing quality assurance arrangements

Veritau maintains appropriate ongoing quality assurance arrangements designed to ensure that internal audit work is undertaken in accordance with relevant professional standards (specifically the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards). These arrangements include:

- the maintenance of a detailed audit procedures manual
- the requirement for all audit staff to conform to the Code of Ethics and Standards of Conduct Policy
- the requirement for all audit staff to complete annual declarations of interest
- detailed job descriptions and competency profiles for each internal audit post
- regular performance appraisals
- regular 1:2:1 meetings to monitor progress with audit engagements
- induction programmes, training plans and associated training activities
- the maintenance of training records and training evaluation procedures
- agreement of the objectives, scope and expected timescales for each audit engagement with the client before detailed work commences (audit specification)
- the results of all audit testing work documented using the company's automated working paper system (Galileo)
- file review by senior auditors and audit managers and sign-off of each stage of the audit process
- the ongoing investment in tools to support the effective performance of internal audit work (for example data interrogation software)

- post audit questionnaires (customer satisfaction surveys) issued following each audit engagement
- performance against agreed quality targets monitored and reported to each client on a regular basis.

On an ongoing basis, a sample of completed audit files is also subject to internal peer review by a senior audit manager to confirm quality standards are being maintained. The results of this peer review are documented and any key learning points shared with the internal auditors and audit managers).

The Head of Internal Audit will also be informed of any general areas requiring improvement. Appropriate mitigating action will be taken (for example, increased supervision of individual internal auditors or further training).

Annual self-assessment

On an annual basis, the Head of Internal Audit will seek feedback from each client on the quality of the overall internal audit service. The Head of Internal Audit will also update the PSIAS self assessment checklist and obtain evidence to demonstrate conformance with the Code of Ethics and the Standards. As part of the annual appraisal process, each internal auditor is also required to assess their current skills and knowledge against the competency profile relevant for their role. Where necessary, further training or support will be provided to address any development needs.

The Head of Internal Audit is also a member of various professional networks and obtains information on operating arrangements and relevant best practice from other similar audit providers for comparison purposes.

The results of the annual client survey, PSIAS self-assessment and professional networking are used to identify any areas requiring further development and/or improvement. Any specific changes or improvements are included in the annual Improvement Action Plan. Specific actions may also be included in the Veritau business plan and/or individual personal development action plans. The outcomes from this exercise, including details of the Improvement Action Plan are also reported to each client. The results will also be used to evaluate overall conformance with the PSIAS, the results of which are reported to senior

management and the board¹ as part of the annual report of the Head of Internal Audit.

External assessment

At least once every five years, arrangements must be made to subject internal audit working practices to external assessment to ensure the continued application of professional standards. The assessment should be conducted by an independent and suitably qualified person or organisation and the results reported to the Head of Internal Audit. The outcome of the external assessment also forms part of the overall reporting process to each client (as set out above). Any specific areas identified as requiring further development and/or improvement will be included in the annual Improvement Action Plan for that year.

2.0 Customer Satisfaction Survey – 2017


Feedback on the overall quality of the internal audit service provided to each client was obtained in March 2017. Where relevant, the survey also asked questions about the counter fraud and information governance services provided by Veritau. A total of 149 surveys (2016 – 124) were issued to senior managers in client organisations. 32 surveys were returned representing a response rate of 21% (2016 - 33%). The surveys were sent using Survey Monkey and respondents were asked to identify who they were. Respondents were asked to rate the different elements of the audit process, as follows:

- Excellent (1)
- Good (2)
- Satisfactory (3)
- Poor (4)


Respondents were also asked to provide an overall rating for the service. The results of the survey are set out in the charts below:

¹ As defined by the relevant audit charter.


Quality of audit planning / overall coverage




Provision of advice / guidance




Staff - conduct / professionalism




Ability to provide unbiased / objective opinions




Ability to establish positive rapport with customers




Knowledge of system / service being audited




Ability to focus on areas of greatest risk




Agreeing scope / objectives of the audit




Minimising disruption to the service being audited




Communicating issues during the audit




Quality of feedback at end of audit




Accuracy / format / length / style of audit report




Relevance of audit opinions / conclusions



Agreed actions are constructive / practical



Overall rating for Internal Audit service



The overall ratings in 2017 were:

	2017		2016	
Excellent	11	34%	8	27%
Good	19	60%	19	63%
Satisfactory	2	6%	3	10%
Poor	0	0%	0	0%

The feedback shows that the majority of clients continue to value the service being delivered.

3.0 Self Assessment Checklist – 2017

CIPFA prepared a detailed checklist to enable conformance with the PSIAS and the Local Government Application Note to be assessed. The checklist was originally completed in March 2014 but has since been reviewed and updated annually. Documentary evidence is provided where current working practices are considered to fully or partially conform to the standards.

In most areas the current working practices are considered to be at standard. However, a few areas of non-conformance have been identified. None of the issues identified are however considered to be significant. In addition, in some cases, the existing arrangements are considered appropriate for the circumstances and hence require no further action.

The following areas of non-conformance remain unchanged from last year:

<u>Conformance with Standard</u>	<u>Current Position</u>
Does the chief executive or equivalent undertake, countersign, contribute feedback to or review the performance appraisal of the Head of Internal Audit?	The Head of Internal Audit's performance appraisal is the responsibility of the board of directors. The results of the annual customer satisfaction survey exercise are however used to inform the appraisal.
Is feedback sought from the chair of the audit committee for the Head of Internal Audit's performance appraisal?	See above
Where there have been significant additional consulting services agreed during the year that were not already included in the audit plan, was approval sought from the audit committee before the engagement was accepted?	Consultancy services are usually commissioned by the relevant client officer (generally the s151 officer). The scope (and charging arrangements) for any specific engagement will be agreed by the Head of Internal Audit and the relevant client officer. Engagements will not be accepted if there is any actual or perceived conflict of interest, or which might otherwise be detrimental to the reputation of Veritau.
Does the risk-based plan set out the - (b) respective priorities of those pieces of audit work?	Audit plans detail the work to be carried out and the estimated time requirement. The relative priority of each assignment will be

<u>Conformance with Standard</u>	<u>Current Position</u>
	considered before any subsequent changes are made to plans. Any significant changes to the plan will need to be discussed and agreed with the respective client officers (and reported to the audit committee).
Are consulting engagements that have been accepted included in the risk-based plan?	Consulting engagements are commissioned and agreed separately.
Does the risk-based plan include the approach to using other sources of assurance and any work that may be required to place reliance upon those sources?	Reliance may be placed on other sources of assurances where this is considered relevant. However, the Head of Internal Audit will only rely on other sources of assurance if he/she is satisfied with the competency, objectivity and reliability of the assurance provider.

4.0 External Assessment

As noted above, the PSIAS require the Head of Internal Audit to arrange for an external assessment to be conducted at least once every five years to ensure the continued application of professional standards. The assessment is intended to provide an independent and objective opinion on the quality of internal audit practices.

Whilst the new Standards were only adopted in April 2013, the decision was taken to request an assessment at the earliest opportunity in order to provide assurance to our clients. The assessment was conducted by Gerry Cox and Ian Baker from the South West Audit Partnership (SWAP) in April 2014. Both Gerry and Ian are experienced internal audit professionals. The Partnership is a similar local authority controlled company providing internal audit services to a number of local authorities.

The assessment consisted of a review of documentary evidence, including the self-assessment, and face to face interviews with a number

of senior client officers and Veritau auditors. The assessors also interviewed an audit committee chair.

The conclusion from the external assessment was that working practices conform to the required professional standards. Copies of the detailed assessment report were provided to client organisations and, where appropriate, reported to the relevant audit committee.

5.0 Improvement Action Plan

Last year's quality assurance process identified the following required changes and improvements:

Change / improvement	Progress to date
The internal peer review highlighted the need for further training to be provided on sampling and testing.	Completed

No specific changes to working practices have been identified in 2017. However, to enhance the overall effectiveness of the service, the following areas are considered to be a priority in 2017/18:

- Further development of in-house technical IT audit expertise
- Implementation of the data analytics strategy (stage 1) and investment in new capabilities
- Improved work scheduling, clearer prioritisation of objectives for individual assignments to enable them to be managed within budget, and better communication and agreement with clients on timescales for completion of audit work.

6.0 Overall Conformance with PSIAS (Opinion of the Head of Internal Audit)

Based on the results of the quality assurance process I consider that the service generally conforms to the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, including the *Code of Ethics* and the *Standards*.

The guidance suggests a scale of three ratings, 'generally conforms', 'partially conforms' and 'does not conform'. 'Generally conforms' is the

top rating and means that the internal audit service has a charter, policies and processes that are judged to be in conformance to the Standards. 'Partially conforms' means deficiencies in practice are noted that are judged to deviate from the Standards, but these deficiencies did not preclude the internal audit service from performing its responsibilities in an acceptable manner. 'Does not conform' means the deficiencies in practice are judged to be so significant as to seriously impair or preclude the internal audit service from performing adequately in all or in significant areas of its responsibilities.