

# DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITS MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Gregory A. Hook, CPA Legislative Auditor

May 2, 2024

Senator Guy J. Guzzone, Chair Senate Budget and Taxation Committee Miller Senate Office Building, 3 West Wing 11 Bladen Street Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Delegate Benjamin S. Barnes, Chair House Appropriations Committee Lowe House Office Building, Room 121 6 Bladen Street Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Senator Guzzone and Delegate Barnes:

The Office of Legislative Audits (OLA) has reviewed the actions taken by Morgan State University (MSU) to resolve the five repeat findings in our September 22, 2022 audit report. This review was conducted in accordance with a requirement specified in the April 2023 *Joint Chairmen's Report* (JCR), page 192. The JCR required that, prior to the release of \$500,000 of its administrative appropriation for fiscal year 2024, MSU must take corrective action on all repeat audit findings on or before November 1, 2023. The JCR language further provided that OLA submit a report to the budget committees listing each audit finding along with a determination that each finding was corrected. The OLA report is required to be submitted to allow 45 days for the budget committees to review and release the funds prior to the end of the fiscal year.

The September 22, 2022 audit report of MSU contained five repeat audit findings (findings 1, 2, 3, 7, 8) that were addressed by nine recommendations. In accordance with the April 2023 JCR requirement, MSU provided a status report to OLA, dated November 27, 2023, which indicated it had fully corrected four of the findings and all but one recommendation (**Exhibit 1**). We have edited MSU's status report to remove certain vendor information, as allowed by our policy.

We reviewed the MSU status report and related documentation, performed limited tests and analyses of the information, and held discussions with MSU personnel as necessary to assess the implementation status of the related recommendations. Our review did not constitute an audit conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

This public letter differs from the confidential letter previously provided to the addressees, as detailed information and exhibits necessary for the budget committees to review and comment on the relevant information has been redacted. This redaction was undertaken in accordance with the State Government Article Section 2-1224(i), of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

Based on our review, for the component parts of four non-cybersecurity-related findings we determined that MSU had resolved certain elements of Finding 1 and Finding 2, but had not yet taken sufficient actions to correct Findings 3 and 7. Specifically, although MSU had implemented certain elements of the recommendations related to Findings 3 and 7, the actions to date did not address the entirety of the findings (Exhibit 2). Although, we concluded that corrective action is still in progress (Exhibit 3), we did find that the actions taken to date demonstrate a significant effort on MSU's part to implement the audit recommendations.

After discussing our review results, MSU generally agreed with the accuracy of the information presented. We wish to acknowledge the cooperation extended to us during the review by MSU. We also wish to acknowledge MSU's willingness to address the audit issues and implement appropriate corrective actions. We trust our response satisfactorily addresses the JCR requirement. Please contact me if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Gregory A. Hook, CPA Legislative Auditor

Gregory a. Hook

Senator Clarence K. Lam, Senate Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Delegate Jared Solomon, House Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Members and Staff Senator William C. Ferguson IV, President of the Senate Delegate Adrienne A. Jones, Speaker of the House of Delegates Governor Westley W. Moore Comptroller Brooke E. Lierman

Treasurer Dereck E. Davis

Attorney General Anthony G. Brown

Kweisi Mfume, Board of Regents Chairman, MSU

David K. Wilson, President, MSU

Abraham Mauer, Director of Internal Audits, MSU

David Lachina, Interim Executive Vice President of Finance and Administration, MSU

Deborah Flavin, Associate Vice President of Finance and Administration, MSU Victoria L. Gruber, Executive Director, Department of Legislative Services Kelly K. Norton, Policy Analyst, Department of Legislative Services



Office of the President

November 27, 2023

Mr. Gregory A. Hook, CPA Legislative Auditor Office of Legislative Audits The Warehouse at Camden Yards 351 West Camden Street, Suite 400 Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Hook:

As requested in your letter dated November 13, 2023, please find enclosed our status report detailing the corrective actions that have been taken to implement the recommendations for all the repeat findings in the September 22, 2022 audit report. We believe that we have resolved each finding; however, we are requesting a short extension through April 2024 to fully resolve Issue 7d. Please know that we take the recommendations very seriously and want to ensure we address each component comprehensively.

Thank you for your partnership and continued support.

Kind regards,

David K. Wilson President

Enclosure

cc: Senator Clarence K. Lam, M.D., Senate Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Delegate Jared Solomon, House Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Members Senator Guy J. Guzzone, Chair, Senate Budget and Taxation Committee Delegate Benjamin S. Barnes, Chair, House Appropriations Committee Honorable Helene T. Grady, Secretary, Department of Budget and Management Victoria L. Gruber, Executive Director, Department of Legislative Services Abraham Mauer, Director, Internal Audit and Management Review, MSU

### **Student Accounts Receivable**

## Finding 1

MSU did not adequately monitor the vendor responsible for disbursing student refunds to ensure the refunds were properly issued and unissued refunds were returned.

Confidentiality Notice – Elements of Finding 1 have been deemed to be cybersecurity-related and subject to redaction in the publicly available report.

#### **Recommendation 1a**

We recommend that MSU perform independent reviews to ensure the vendor properly issued refunds to students and returned any amounts not disbursed (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 1a			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>	Completed	<b>Completion Date:</b>	September, 2023
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	The University has imple recommended by the Office of the Bursar has implemented vendor returns any amount documented. More specific independently reconciled an third-party student refund material Management Information of the property and any amounts not (e.g., student did not enter the deposit or a check went stale timeframe).	of Legislative Audits (O a process to independent not disbursed to student cally, reports from the documented — University and System (FMIS)—uthorized by the University disbursed are returned the correct bank routing	LA). The Office of atly ensure that the ats. This review is three systems are exity ERP system, State of Maryland's to ensure student sity were disbursed to the University number for direct

#### **Recommendation 1c**

Redacted cybersecurity recommendation.

Status of Recommendation 1c			
Status as of 11/1/2023   Select Status   Completion Date:			
Please provide details of corrective action taken.		een redacted by OLA.	

## Finding 2

MSU did not independently verify the propriety of adjustments to student room and board charges, certain of which were not processed in accordance with MSU policy.

### **Recommendation 2a**

We recommend that MSU ensure that adjustments to student room and board charges are properly supported and subject to an effective independent supervisory review for propriety after being recorded in MSU's automated records (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 2a			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>	Completed	<b>Completion Date:</b>	August, 2022
•	The University has implemented to adjustments to student room and both subject to an effective independent being recorded in the automated sy who is independent of the business the automated system to post adjustments which were exe the current audit period) through the by ensuring those adjustments were accurately computed and posted. Tonly after the transactions were experted system output reports. The indocumented sufficiently. This revisemester.	pard charges are properly t supervisory review for ystem. More specifically is process and does not ustments, has reviewed cuted in the Fall 2021 (in the Spring 2023 semester are properly authorized, whis independent review the system and dependent review is	r supported and propriety after a supervisor, have access in all room and i.e., the start of rs for propriety supported, and was conducted and is based on effective and

## Finding 3

Reviews of changes to student residency status were either not documented or not independent; and certain changes were not subject to review because system output reports used for this purpose were incomplete.

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that MSU ensure that independent documented supervisory reviews of student residency changes are performed using output reports that include all changes made (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 3			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>	Completed	<b>Completion Date:</b>	May, 2023
-	its process to ensure that indestudent residency changes are all changes made in the employee who is independent reports reflecting residency in the automated system, appropriate, comply with the review was documented and	ependent documented supervise eperformed using output reportation automated system. More system of the process has generated status changes which were extended and has ensured that those he policy, and are properly status covers the Spring 2021 through the covers the	sory reviews of orts that include pecifically, an I system output ecuted by staff e changes are upported. This gh Spring 2023

## **Contracts and Disbursements**

## Finding 7

MSU did not procure certain goods and services in accordance with its policies and procedures, and did not ensure related goods and services were received and amounts invoiced were proper.

#### **Recommendation 7a**

We recommend that MSU competitively procure and execute contracts in accordance with its policies and procedures (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 7a				
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>		Completion Date:	October, 2023	
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	steps to ensure that the U contracts in accordance we examples follow below.  Installed a new procestaff who have special procurement complianted.  Strengthened the train professionals to help a More specifically, so received certifications participate in the Sameetings, which coverstrategies for assure reinforces the procure meetings regularly and an even procure obtained, procurement emergency procurement emergency procurement.	aing and development programmensure compliance with policies everal buyers have undergous from the Maryland Procurer enior Procurement Advisor common procurement policy ing compliance. In additional ement policy and audit required incorporates them to business the ted tools, templates, and business that the proper procured, governing agreement (e.g., ntract) is complied with an ant is in the best interest cents strictly adhere to the policidentify contracts that need tracks contract and expendit	eures and executes procedures. A few ented professional tise in the area of m for procurement es and procedures. Sone training and ment Academy and y Group (SPAG) y requirements and ion, management uirements at staff ess processes. Siness processes to ement method was a ICPA or master d authorization is of the State, and the cy requirements. It is to be rebid or	

## Recommendation 7d We recommend that MSU verify that all goods and services have been received (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 7d			
Status as of 11/1/2023	In Progress	<b>Estimated Completion Date:</b>	April, 2024
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	has developed a robust received before pays professionals with speciating organizational implementing various by the end of April 202 has moved towards pextent practicable. As work. The Technical progression of work by contract are met. A Cotthe solicitation which deliverables; to ensure projects over \$500,00 Surveillance plan (QA and effective, to entrequirements of the correctional Representations.)	ently installed a new Director of st plan to help ensure all goods ment is authorized. This incrediffic expertise, assigning rest structures, administering a train business processes, all of which 24. More specifically, the procure procurement-based contracting, a result, deliverables are required. Representatives (TR) are required to the contract Line Number (CLN) structure aligns to the payment of invoice invoices are only paid for word will be required to have a CSP) to ensure the contractor's Quality of the contract. A designation letter will be tree outlining responsibilities, receipt of deliverables before	and services are cludes recruiting ponsibilities and ing program, and will be completed ement department to the maximum ed for payment of ed to oversee the quirements of the ture is included in es and associated ex performed. All quality Assurance C plan is working rdance with the per provided to the as it relates to

## **Information Systems Security and Control**

## Finding 8

Redacted cybersecurity-related finding.

Confidentiality Notice – Finding 8 has been deemed to be cybersecurity-related and subject to redaction in the publicly available report.

Status of Recommendation 8a			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>			
Please provide details of corrective action taken.		e been redacted by OLA	

Status of Recommendation 8b			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>	Select Status	<b>Completion Date:</b>	
Please provide details of corrective action taken.		e been redacted by OLA	

Status of Recommendation 8c			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2023</b>	Select Status	<b>Completion Date:</b>	
Please provide details of corrective action taken.		e been redacted by OLA.	

## Status of Repeat Findings in OLA's September 22, 2022 Audit Report on Morgan State University (MSU)

Prior Recommendations Pertaining to Repeat Findings	Status Based on OLA Review
Student Accounts Receivable	
We recommend that MSU     a. perform independent reviews to ensure the vendor properly issued refunds to students and returned any amounts not disbursed.	Resolved
c. Redacted cybersecurity-related recommendation.	Status Redacted <sup>1</sup>
We recommend that MSU     a. ensure that adjustments to student room and board charges are properly supported and subject to an effective independent supervisory review for propriety after being recorded in MSU's automated records.	Resolved
3. We recommend that MSU ensure that independent documented supervisory reviews of student residency changes are performed using output reports that include all changes made.	Not Resolved (In Progress)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Specific information of the current status of this cybersecurity-related finding has been redacted from the publicly available document in accordance with State Government Article, Section 2-1224(i) of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

## Status of Repeat Findings in OLA's September 22, 2022 Audit Report on the Morgan State University (MSU)

	Prior Recommendations Pertaining to Repeat Fin	ndings Status Based on OLA Review
	with its policies and procedures.  Macts and Disbursements  We recommend that MSU  a. competitively procure and execute contracts in with its policies and procedures.	accordance Not Resolved (In-Progress)
	d. verify that all goods and services have been rec	ceived. Not Resolved (In-Progress)
Inform	nation Systems Security and Control	
8.	a. Redacted cybersecurity-related recommendation	n. Status Redacted <sup>2</sup>
	b. Redacted cybersecurity-related recommendation	n. Status Redacted <sup>2</sup>
	c. Redacted cybersecurity-related recommendation	n. Status Redacted <sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Specific information of the current status of this cybersecurity-related finding has been redacted from the publicly available document in accordance with State Government Article, Section 2-1224(i) of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

## OLA's Assessments Regarding Repeat Non-cybersecurity Related Findings and Recommendations That Were Not Resolved

### **Prior Report Recommendation – Finding 3**

We recommend that MSU ensure that independent documented supervisory reviews of student residency changes are performed using output reports that include all changes made (repeat).

#### **Status: Not Resolved**

Our review disclosed that MSU had assigned the supervisory review of student residency changes to an independent employee. However, this employee left MSU in August 2023, and MSU could not provide adequate documentation of reviews performed prior to the employee's departure. MSU advised us that, in December of 2023, a new employee was hired who would be responsible for performing the review going forward. However, as of January 25, 2024, the employee had not yet performed a review of student residency changes.

### **Prior Report Recommendation – Finding 7**

We recommend that MSU

- a. competitively procure and execute contracts in accordance with its policies and procedures (repeat), and
- d. verify that all goods and services have been received (repeat).

#### Status: Not Resolved

Our review disclosed that, as indicated in its status report, MSU developed certain new templates and forms to help ensure that procurements were made in accordance with its policies and procedures, and that goods and services were received prior to payment. MSU also hired a new Director of Procurement in October 2023. We were advised by the Director that the new templates and forms have not yet been fully implemented, but should be by October 2024.

We reviewed three contracts totaling \$8.9 million which were procured between August 2022 and November 2023, including one contract totaling \$1 million procured through an intergovernmental cooperative purchasing agreement. However, consistent with our original audit report finding, we found that MSU did not verify that its use of a contract procured by another entity, such as this contract, was in the best interest of MSU, and that the original contract was awarded after an appropriate procurement process as required by MSU's procurement policies and procedures.