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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

September 18, 2008

The Honorable Mark Sanford, Governor

and

Members of the Commission

South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense

Columbia, South Carolina

We have performed the procedures described below, which were agreed to by the governing body and management of the South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense (the Commission), solely to assist you in evaluating the performance of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007, in the areas addressed. The Commission’s management is responsible for its financial records, internal controls and compliance with State laws and regulations. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

The procedures and the associated findings are as follows:

1. **Cash Receipts and Revenues**
   - We inspected selected recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were properly described and classified in the accounting records in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.
   - We inspected selected recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were recorded in the proper fiscal year.
   - We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in the State’s accounting system (STARS) as reflected on the Comptroller General's reports to determine if recorded revenues were in agreement.
   - We made inquiries and performed substantive procedures to determine if revenue collection and retention or remittance were supported by law.
• We compared current year recorded revenues at the subfund and object code level from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the earmarked and restricted funds to ensure that revenue was classified properly in the agency’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($16,400 – earmarked fund and $64,100 – restricted fund) and ± 10 percent.

• We made inquiries of management pertaining to the agency’s policies for accountability and security over permits, licenses, and other documents issued for money. We observed agency personnel performing their duties to determine if they understood and followed the described policies.

  The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

2. Non-Payroll Disbursements and Expenditures

• We inspected selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were properly described and classified in the accounting records in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations, were bona fide disbursements of the Commission, and were paid in conformity with State laws and regulations; if the acquired goods and/or services were procured in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

• We inspected selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were recorded in the proper fiscal year.

• We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in various STARS reports to determine if recorded expenditures were in agreement.

• We compared current year expenditures at the subfund and major object code level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, earmarked and restricted funds to ensure that expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($55,000 – general fund, $12,700 – earmarked fund, and $64,100 – restricted fund) and ± 10 percent.

  The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

3. Payroll Disbursements and Expenditures

• We inspected selected recorded payroll disbursements to determine if the selected payroll transactions were properly described, classified, and distributed in the accounting records; persons on the payroll were bona fide employees; payroll transactions, including employee payroll deductions, were properly authorized and were in accordance with existing legal requirements and processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

• We inspected selected payroll vouchers to determine if the vouchers were properly approved and if the gross payroll agreed to amounts recorded in the general ledger and in STARS.
We inspected payroll transactions for selected new employees and those who terminated employment to determine if the employees were added and/or removed from the payroll in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures, that the employee’s first and/or last pay check was properly calculated and that the employee’s leave payout was properly calculated in accordance with applicable State law.

We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in various STARS reports to determine if recorded payroll and fringe benefit expenditures were in agreement.

We compared current year payroll expenditures at the subfund and major object code level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, earmarked and restricted funds to ensure that expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($55,000 – general fund, $12,700 – earmarked fund, and $64,100 – restricted fund) and ±10 percent.

We compared the percentage change in recorded personal service expenditures to the percentage change in employer contributions; and computed the percentage distribution of recorded fringe benefit expenditures by fund source and compared the computed distribution to the actual distribution of recorded payroll expenditures by fund source. We investigated changes of ±5 percent to ensure that payroll expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Object Code in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

4. Journal Entries, Operating Transfers and Appropriation Transfers
   - We inspected selected recorded journal entries, and all operating transfers and appropriation transfers to determine if these transactions were properly described and classified in the accounting records; they agreed with the supporting documentation, the purpose of the transactions was documented and explained, the transactions were properly approved, and were mathematically correct; and the transactions were processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

   The individual journal entry transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

5. General Ledger and Subsidiary Ledgers
   - We inspected selected entries and monthly totals in the subsidiary records of the Commission to determine if the amounts were mathematically accurate; the numerical sequences of selected document series were complete; the selected monthly totals were accurately posted to the general ledger; and selected entries were processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

   The transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
6. **Reconciliations**
   - We obtained all monthly reconciliations prepared by the Commission for the year ended June 30, 2007, and inspected selected reconciliations of balances in the Commission’s accounting records to those in STARS as reflected on the Comptroller General’s reports to determine if accounts reconciled. For the selected reconciliations, we determined if they were timely performed and properly documented in accordance with State regulations, recalculated the amounts, agreed the applicable amounts to the Commission’s general ledger, agreed the applicable amounts to the STARS reports, determined if reconciling differences were adequately explained and properly resolved, and determined if necessary adjusting entries were made in the Commission’s accounting records and/or in STARS.

   The reconciliations selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

7. **Appropriation Act**
   - We inspected agency documents, observed processes, and/or made inquiries of agency personnel to determine the Agency’s compliance with Appropriation Act general and agency specific provisos.

   We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

8. **Closing Packages**
   - We obtained copies of all closing packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2007, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Comptroller General. We inspected them to determine if they were prepared in accordance with the Comptroller General’s GAAP Closing Procedures Manual requirements and if the amounts reported in the closing packages agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

   Our findings as a result of these procedures are presented in Closing Packages in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

9. **Status of Prior Findings**
   - We inquired about the status of the finding reported in the Accountant’s Comments section of the State Auditor’s Report on the Commission resulting from our engagement for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, to determine if Agency had taken corrective action.

   Our findings as a result of these procedures are presented in Closing Packages in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.
The Honorable Mark Sanford, Governor
and
Members of the Commission
South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
September 18, 2008

We were not engaged to and did not conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the specified elements, accounts, or items. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Governor and of the governing body and management of the South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Richard H. Gilbert, Jr., CPA
Deputy State Auditor
ACCOUNTANT’S COMMENTS
SECTION A – VIOLATIONS OF STATE LAWS, RULES OR REGULATIONS

Management of each State agency is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls to ensure compliance with State Laws, Rules or Regulations. The procedures agreed to by the agency require that we plan and perform the engagement to determine whether any violations of State Laws, Rules or Regulations occurred.

The conditions described in this section have been identified as violations of State Laws, Rules or Regulations.
OBJECT CODE

During our testing of payroll, we noted that the Commission compensated one employee using an incorrect expenditure object code. The employee was employed as a temporary employee and was being compensated from expenditure object code 0158 – “Classified Positions.” Since the employee was a temporary employee their compensation should have been recorded using expenditure object code 0171 – “Temporary Positions.”

Section 2.1.6.10 of the Comptroller General’s Statewide Accounting and Reporting (STARS) Manual defines the expenditure object codes.

We recommend the Commission develop and implement procedures to ensure that employees are paid from the correct expenditure object code.
During our review of the Commission’s closing packages we noted several exceptions as described below:

**Operating Leases Closing Package**

During our review of the Operating Leases Closing Package we noted that the total future minimum lease payment amount reported on the closing package was overstated by $1,493. The Commission incorrectly calculated the effect of future scheduled rent increases when determining the future minimum payment amount.

Section 3.19 of the Comptroller General’s Office GAAP Closing Procedures Manual, states, “The minimum lease payment is the minimum payment that the lessee must pay to the lessor during the fiscal year as specified in the lease agreement.”

We recommend that the Commission follow procedures outlined in the GAAP Closing Package manual to ensure that the Operating Leases Closing Package is complete and accurate.

**Capital Assets Closing Package**

During our review of the Capital Assets Closing Package we noted that the closing package was not submitted in a timely manner. Comptroller General’s Closing Procedures Manual, section 3.9, Capital Assets and Accumulated Depreciation procedures states, “Return the Forms to the Comptroller General’s Office no later than September 20.” Based on our review, we noted that the closing package was prepared and approved on October 1, 2007.

We recommend the Commission follow the guidelines set in the Comptroller General’s Closing Package Instructions to ensure that all applicable Closing Packages are accurately completed and submitted timely.
Compensated Absences Closing Package

During our review of the Compensated Absences Closing Package, we noted that the total compensated absences amount for all governmental funds was understated $54,178. The understatement occurred because of an error in the hourly rate used to calculate the compensated absences liability for one employee and an error in the formula used to calculate the liability column of the annual leave liability report.

The Comptroller General’s Closing Procedures Manual, Section 1.7, Summary of Agencies Responsibilities states, “Each agency’s executive director and finance director are responsible for submitting to the Comptroller General’s Office closing package forms and/or financial statements that are: Accurate and prepared in accordance with instructions, Complete, and Timely.”

We recommend the Commission follow the guidelines set in the Comptroller General’s Closing Package Instructions to ensure that all applicable Closing Packages are accurately completed and submitted timely.
SECTION B - STATUS OF PRIOR FINDINGS

During the current engagement, we reviewed the status of corrective action taken on the finding reported in the Accountant’s Comments section of the State Auditor’s Report on the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, and dated October 2, 2007. We determined that the Commission has taken adequate corrective action on each of the findings except Closing Packages.
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE
November 25, 2008

Mr. Richard H. Gilbert, Jr., CPA  
Deputy State Auditor  
Office of the State Auditor  
1401 Main Street, Suite 1200  
Columbia, SC 29201

Re: Preliminary Draft of Audit Report Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2007

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

This letter will acknowledge receipt of the above document and will acknowledge that our review of the report has been completed. The following corrective actions will be taken in regard to the audit findings:

1. **Object Codes:** All vouchers will be carefully reviewed in an effort to correct any incorrect object codes.

2. **Closing Packages** All Personnel directly and indirectly responsible for completing closing packages will be informed of the policies and procedures for individual Closing Packages. Necessary action will be taken to ensure accuracy in the future.

You are authorized to release the final version of this report. A copy of this letter is provided on the enclosed diskette.

Very truly yours,

Patton Adams
4 copies of this document were published at an estimated printing cost of $1.49 each, and a total printing cost of $5.96. Section 1-11-125 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended requires this information on printing costs be added to the document.