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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

October 24, 2002

The Honorable Mark Sanford, Governor
and
Commission Members
South Carolina Commission for the Blind
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 for the Blind (the Commission), solely to assist you in evaluating the performance of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2001, 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. We tested selected recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were properly described and classified in the accounting records and internal controls over the tested receipt transactions were adequate. We also tested 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 from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year to determine the reasonableness of collected and recorded amounts by revenue account. The individual transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
2. We tested selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were properly described and classified in the accounting records, 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; and if internal controls over the tested disbursement transactions were adequate. We also tested 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 to those of the prior year to determine the reasonableness of amounts paid and recorded by expenditure account. The individual transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

3. We tested selected recorded payroll disbursements to determine if the tested 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 internal controls over the tested payroll transactions were adequate. We tested 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 also tested payroll transactions for selected new employees and those who terminated employment to determine if internal controls over these transactions were adequate. 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 performed other procedures such as comparing current year recorded payroll expenditures to those of the prior year; comparing the percentage change in recorded personal service expenditures to the percentage change in employer contributions; and computing the percentage distribution of recorded fringe benefit expenditures by fund source and comparing the computed distribution to the actual distribution of recorded payroll expenditures by fund source to determine if recorded payroll and fringe benefit expenditures were reasonable by expenditure account. The individual transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

4. We tested selected recorded journal entries and all operating and appropriation transfers to determine if these transactions were properly described and classified in the accounting records; they agreed with the supporting documentation, were adequately documented and explained, were properly approved, and were mathematically correct; and the internal controls over these transactions were adequate. The individual transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
5. We tested 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 the internal controls over the tested transactions were adequate. The transactions selected for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

6. We obtained all monthly reconciliations prepared by the Commission for the year ended June 30, 2001, and tested 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 they were accurate and complete. 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 for testing were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

7. We tested the Commission’s compliance with all applicable financial provisions of the South Carolina Code of Laws, Appropriation Act, and other laws, rules, and regulations for fiscal year 2001. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

8. We reviewed the status of the deficiency described in the finding reported in the Accountant’s Comments section of the State Auditor’s Report on the South Carolina Commission for the Blind resulting from our engagement for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000, to determine if adequate corrective action has been taken. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

9. We obtained copies of all closing packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2001, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Comptroller General. We reviewed them to determine if they were prepared in accordance with the Comptroller General’s GAAP Closing Procedures Manual requirements; if the amounts were reasonable; and if they agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.
10. We obtained a copy of the schedule of federal financial assistance for the year ended June 30, 2001, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Auditor. We reviewed it to determine if it was prepared in accordance with the State Auditor's letter of instructions; if the amounts were reasonable; and if they agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance in the Accountant's Comments section of this report.

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 areas, 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 South Carolina Commission for the Blind and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Thomas L. Wagner, Jr., CPA
State Auditor
ACCOUNTANT’S COMMENTS
SECTION A - MATERIAL WEAKNESS AND/OR VIOLATION OF STATE LAWS, RULES OR REGULATIONS

The procedures agreed to by the agency require that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the requirements of State Laws, Rules, or Regulations occurred and whether internal accounting controls over certain transactions were adequate. Management of the entity is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls. A material weakness is a condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the specific internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that errors or irregularities in amounts that would be material in relation to the financial statements may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. Therefore, the presence of a material weakness or violation will preclude management from asserting that the entity has effective internal controls.

The condition described in this section has been identified as a material weakness or violation of State Laws, Rules, or Regulations.
In our testing of the Agency’s schedule of federal financial assistance (SFFA), we noted that the Agency has reported two grants with negative ending cash balances of $23,960 and $130,165 since fiscal year 1991. These grants have negative ending cash balances because grant expenditures exceeded federal receipts. In our discussions with Agency personnel, we discovered that the expenditures were not reimbursed by the federal grantor because the requests for reimbursement were not submitted in accordance with the grants’ time requirements. Because these expenditures have not been reimbursed, the Agency has been carrying a deficit cash balance in its federal accounts related to these grants. Further, the existence of these negative cash balances resulted in an overstatement of the Agency’s grants receivable balance as reported on the year-end closing package.

Sound accounting practices require that agencies properly monitor the terms of all federal grant awards including reimbursement time requirements. Also, the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) Closing Procedures Manual instructs agencies to record grant receivables if the funds meet all eligibility requirements and are available. Funds are considered available if they are received one month after fiscal year-end.

We recommend that the Agency cover the deficit cash balance in its federal accounts by using appropriate non-federal funds. Further, the Agency should adjust its SFFA to properly close these grants. Finally, we recommend that the Agency properly monitor all grant terms including reimbursement time requirements.
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 South Carolina Commission for the Blind for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2000, and dated May 14, 2001. We determined that the Commission has taken adequate corrective action on the finding.
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE
January 27, 2003

Mr. Thomas L. Wagner, Jr.
SC State Auditor
1401 Main Street, Suite 2100
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Wagner:

We have completed our review of the draft report resulting from the review of the South Carolina Commission for the Blind by your staff. We have no objections to the release of the report, and you are herewith authorized to release it.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Nell C. Carney
Commissioner
5 copies of this document were published at an estimated printing cost of $1.40 each, and a total printing cost of $7.00. The FY 2001-02 Appropriation Act requires that this information on printing costs be added to the document.