

**CENTRAL VIRGINIA
COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD**

**COMMENTS ON INTERNAL CONTROL AND
OTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR YOUR
CONSIDERATION**

June 30, 2011

CONTENTS

	Page
INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS.....	3
COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS	
Credit Cards	5
Allowance for Uncollectible Accounts	5
PRIOR YEAR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS	
Segregation of Duties (Material Weakness in 2008, Significant Deficiency in 2009 and 2010).....	6
Accounts Receivable.....	8
Core Accounting System	9

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

To the Board of Directors
Central Virginia Community Services Board
Lynchburg, Virginia

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements of the Central Virginia Community Services Board (the "Board") as of and for the year ended June 30, 2011, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, we considered the Board's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) as a basis for designing our auditing procedures for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements and to comply with *Government Auditing Standards*, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Board's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Board's internal control.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purposes described in the preceding paragraph and would not necessarily identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. We did not identify any deficiencies in internal control in the current year that we consider to be material weaknesses.

A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Additionally, during our audit we became aware of certain other matters that provide opportunities for improving your financial reporting system and/or operating efficiency. Our comments and suggestions regarding these matters are also included in the attached report. Since our audit is not designed to include a detailed review of all systems and procedures, these comments should not be considered as being all-inclusive of areas where improvements might be achieved. It is our hope that these suggestions will be taken in the constructive light in which they are offered.

We have already discussed these comments and suggestions with management, and we will be pleased to discuss them in further detail at your convenience, to perform any additional study of these matters, or to assist you in implementing the recommendations.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Board of Directors, management, and state and federal regulatory agencies and is not intended to be, and should not be, used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Brown, Edwards & Company, L.L.P.

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Roanoke, Virginia
September 23, 2011

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

June 30, 2011

CREDIT CARDS

As the agency's use of credit cards continues to grow, management will need to evaluate the policies and procedures in place to determine that they fit the needs of the organization. Due to timing considerations, the current agency practice is that the fiscal department pays the invoice for the credit card prior to the receipt and reconciliation of all logs and receipts that support the amounts on the credit card statement. Additionally, current agency policy is that receipts for purchases that do not exceed \$15 are not required to be submitted. Finally, the credit limits in place for users could allow them to circumvent the purchasing policies in place for the agency.

We recommend that management look at options to improve the collection of receipts and documentation for credit card purchases so that receipts are received more promptly from individuals so that fiscal staff can reconcile receipts to the credit card statement more timely. One option would be to require users to keep logs that are submitted monthly, rather than sending out statements once they are received from the vendor. A second option would be to discuss with the vendor the ability to download credit card activity during the month so that information can be distributed to users more timely and allow receipts to be turned in at more frequent intervals.

We also recommend that management revisit the current requirement for not submitting receipts for purchases under \$15. While most transactions of this nature would not be significant, this could easily allow individuals to slip personal disbursements through the agency's credit card.

Management's Response:

Management will evaluate options to improve the timeliness of getting the supporting documentation for credit card purchases to enable reconciliations to be completed prior to payment of the credit card invoice.

Additionally, management will assess the value of requiring that all credit card receipts be submitted each month versus the additional costs to process that additional work.

ALLOWANCE FOR UNCOLLECTIBLE ACCOUNTS

As we have discussed further in our communication to the board that accompanies the audited financial statements, the allowance is an estimate that involves a great deal of judgment and is not precise. The current system in place for client billings and collections does not provide a strong method for reviewing the prior year allowance and related activity, creating difficulty in obtaining a complete picture when working on the allowance for the current year. We recommend that management continue to look for ways to improve retrospective reviews on collections to aid in the creation of a more precise methodology going forward. Management has noted to us that with a newer billing system that is on the horizon in a year or two, better information is likely to be available. The most practical way to address this issue may be in contemplating these reporting needs in designing the implantation of the new system.

Management's Response:

Management will continue to look for methods to improve the analytics related to assessing the collectability of client billings that would be used to add more precision to the allowance for uncollectible accounts calculation. As we begin to implement the Electronic Health Record software we plan to build accounts receivable analytics and reporting into that implementation.

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD

PRIOR YEAR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

June 30, 2011

SEGREGATION OF DUTIES (Material Weakness in 2008, Significant Deficiency in 2009 and 2010)

One of the more important aspects of any system of internal control is the segregation of duties. In an *ideal* system of internal controls, no individual would perform more than one duty in connection with any transaction or series of transactions. In particular, no one individual would have access to both physical assets and the related accounting records, since such access may allow errors or fraud to occur and remain undetected or concealed.

Following are some areas where duties are not ideally segregated:

- Checks are returned to the accounts payable staff after printing and signing to be readied for mailing. Ideally, mailing should be handled by an individual with no invoice processing capabilities.

Status: *Accounts payable personnel are still responsible for handling and mailing checks after they are printed and signed.*

- At the outlying offices, administrative personnel job responsibilities for billing and accounts receivable also overlap substantially. Currently, the administrative assistant at each outlying office can create new clients in the system, collects client financial information to determine client ability to pay, enters all billing information for client visits, and collect and deposit payments for clients. One possible remedy would have payments always mailed to the client accounts office. Another option could be to have other personnel, without such access, be responsible for accepting payments at these locations.

Status: *Controls at these offices remain inconsistent. Administrative personnel still collect and receipt payments from clients and make deposits, but cannot post payments to client accounts. Additionally, for most outlying areas, clinicians are now opening new clients and administrative personnel are inputting financial intake information. We recommend further evaluation of the amounts collected at these offices and that the cost versus benefit of additional controls be evaluated.*

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD

PRIOR YEAR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

June 30, 2011

SEGREGATION OF DUTIES (Material Weakness in 2008, Significant Deficiency in 2009 and 2010) (Continued)

- Currently, some employees in the accounts receivable department can post payments, post write-offs, and make adjustments to client accounts. This is because the responsibilities for posting payments, adjustments, write-offs, etc. are divided among personnel by the type of insurance or other coverage, rather than by process (payments, adjustments, cash receipts, etc.). This situation could allow funds to be stolen and the theft concealed by simply adjusting or writing off the receivable. Per the accounts receivable manager, while she can print a report to review write-offs and adjustments she rarely does this due to her workload, and because she also posts payments and entries to client accounts, her review of such activity would serve only to detect fraud by her staff.

The best solution would be to strictly separate the handling of incoming cash and checks from anyone with the access to the accounts receivable. Two staff members could open the mail together, photocopy all checks and currency, prepare the deposits, and then immediately transport the funds to the bank for deposit. The photocopies would then be used to post the payments. Other controls could include the logging of incoming checks or even the use of a bank lock box. The best controls will separate *access* to the assets from the *accounting* for those assets as early as possible.

Compensating controls, such as the review of write-offs and adjustments will be of little use because of the volume of such activity.

Status: *Management has implemented a process requiring two individuals to open and sort incoming mail together, with one of those individuals transporting the funds to the bank. This at least partially mitigates the overlapping responsibilities pervasive in this area. Individuals are still assigned responsibility for entire funding streams (i.e. one person handles billings, payments, and adjustments for Medicaid, for example), rather than for a given function/process, such as being responsible for posting payments for all funding streams. During fiscal year 2011, the supervisor in this area was no longer responsible for posting payments, billings, adjustments, and assisting in sorting mail. Additionally, the department made changes in how billings, payments, and postings responsibilities are assigned so that no one individual has complete responsibility for an entire funding stream.*

Overall 2011 status of this separation of duties comment:

Because of changes that management has implemented in recent years we believe that this area is no longer a significant deficiency, although, as at all organizations, it should warrant continued attention.

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD

PRIOR YEAR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

June 30, 2011

ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

The Board has many accounts that are significantly delinquent, and collections on such accounts appear not to be actively pursued, nor is there a clear process for monitoring the following up on delinquent accounts. The Board has multiple options available to it to pursue these delinquent accounts, including the utilization of an outside collections firm and filing with the debt set-off program administered by the Commonwealth of Virginia to have amounts withheld from individual tax refunds. We recognize that decisions to pursue or not pursue collections, for an organization such as the Board, are made differently than for a for-profit enterprise. However, we believe that the current rates of delinquency and noncollection are partially attributable to inadequate policies and procedures. A step as significant as outsourcing the billing and collection process entirely may be worth consideration.

We also noted that current practice only posts cash receipts to the general ledger subsequent to month end. The result is that the Board's general ledger cash balance never truly reflects the cash position of the Board as postings to the ledger are always behind. We recommend the Board begin posting receipts at least weekly to the general ledger. More frequent posting will allow management to make decisions based on more reliable information.

Additionally, we noted approximately 2,800 individual client accounts that had a negative receivable balance at June 30, 2009, totaling approximately \$190,000. While none of these accounts contain significant balances, the total is significant enough to warrant attention. These negative accounts appear to result from incorrect postings at some point to individual client accounts – whether it be billings, payments or adjustments rather than amounts that are owed back to clients. We recommend the Board's staff determine the reason for these negative balances and make the necessary corrections. We also suggest periodic review of the sub-ledger for negative accounts, with appropriate follow-up and resolution.

Status: *Management continues to post receipts on a monthly basis. The Board has not yet developed a clear policy for writing off old accounts, although this is being discussed by management. Management is currently trying to evaluate client accounts on a case-by-case basis to determine collectability and has worked on reducing the number of severely delinquent accounts. Staff has completed training to use the debt set-off program provided by the Commonwealth of Virginia. During fiscal year 2011, the Board wrote off all accounts that had been dormant for at least eighteen months. Finally, the Board took steps to reduce the number of accounts with negative balances during fiscal years 2010 and 2011. At June 30, 2010, there were approximately 1,750 individual client accounts with negative balances, totaling approximately \$72,600. At June 30, 2011, there were approximately 425 individual client accounts with negative balances, totaling approximately \$14,800.*

CENTRAL VIRGINIA COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD

PRIOR YEAR COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

June 30, 2011

CORE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

We noted that the new core accounting system data is based on a SQL standardized structure. Two system analysts have SQL utilities that allow them to directly change data from outside the accounting system. While it appears that no significant changes have been made through this process, such changes are not reviewed regularly.

We recommend that a person without access to these SQL utilities review a log that records any change that is made by those SQL utilities, to determine that appropriate documentation was retained and that the changes were appropriate. Such documentation should explain the nature and effect of such changes.

Status: *This condition still exists, however, the SQL activities are being reviewed periodically by an individual with no access.*