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# Important Information

**In addition to completing the control and suggested audit procedures, yellow-highlighted text indicates items that must be addressed or updated by auditors and should be deleted after the required information is added.**

*Blue italicized text indicates guidance from CFAE.*

This FACCR has been tailored for local governments and Not-For-Profits with monies passed through the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce. It does not include all required references and testing for Institutes of Higher Learning or State organizations.

If the program had COVID funding expenditures, please refer to the terms and conditions of the grant to determine if any additional requirements were imposed. Also see guidance in [Appendix VII](OMB_Appendix_VII.pdf) of the Compliance Supplement.

If additional material requirements are identified, auditors will need to create procedures to test those requirements. If you have questions, AOS Auditors please open a Spiceworks ticket for assistance (IPAs email [AOSFederal@ohioauditor.gov](mailto:AOSFederal@ohioauditor.gov)).

**Navigation Pane**

Click on the “View” tab on the top ribbon and check the box that says “Navigation Pane” to bring up the headings on the left side of the screen. Click on the various sections within the navigation pane to go directly to that section.

**Table of Contents**

On the table of contents page, users can also click on listed sections to go directly to that section. As information is added into the FACCR, page numbering will change and the Table of Contents may need to be updated to reflect revised numbering. To update the Table of Contents, click on the word “Contents” directly above the line starting with Important Information, which brings up the icon “Update Table.” Clicking OK in the box that appears will update the page numbers on the Table of Contents to reflect any changes in the document.

**Guidance Links**

Links to guidance referenced throughout this document are included below:

* [Part 6](OMB_Part_6.pdf) (Internal Control) of the OMB Compliance Supplement
* [2013 COSO](https://www.coso.org/_files/ugd/3059fc_61ea5985b03c4293960642fdce408eaa.pdf)
* [GAO’s 2014 Green Book](https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-14-704g.pdf)
* [2 CFR Part 200](2_CFR_Part_200.pdf) – Once opened, click on the appropriate section(s)

# Agency Adoption of the UG and Example Citations

[*Appendix II*](OMB_Appendix_II.pdf) *to the OMB Compliance Supplement provides the codified section reference of the agency adoption of the Uniform Guidance (UG) (2 CFR Part 200) and nonprocurement suspension and debarment requirements in 2 CFR Part 180, including the 2020 revisions.*

*While some Federal agencies gave regulatory effect to the Uniform Guidance as a whole, others made changes to the UG language within the agency codified sections by either adding specific requirements/exceptions or editing/modifying existing language. OMB does not maintain a complete listing of agency exceptions to the UG, but the most recent compilation of agency additions and exceptions (updated through December 2014) is provided on the* [*CFO website*](https://www.cfo.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Agency-Exceptions.pdf)*. AOS auditors should review the UG Exception Evaluation by Federal Agency spreadsheet* [*on the Intranet*](https://ohauditor.sharepoint.com/:f:/r/sites/Intranet/Shared%20Documents/Audit_Resources/Federal/Other%20Federal%20Resources?csf=1&web=1&e=RtVw5R) *(Documents > Audit Resources > Federal > Other Federal Resources).*

*Auditors must review the Federal agency adoption of the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR Part 200) and nonprocurement suspension and debarment requirements (2 CFR Part 180) prior to issuing noncompliance citations to verify the Federal agency requirements.*

*Auditors should also review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*
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# Compliance Requirement Matrix

*Footnotes 1-7 below the matrix provide further explanation; review note 6 which discusses tailoring the matrix assessments.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(6)** | **(6)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** | **(5)** | **(7)** |
| **Compliance Requirement** | | | **Applicable per Compliance Supplement**  *(Yes/No)* | **Direct & Material to Program / Entity**  *(Yes/No)* | **Monetary**  **or Nonmonetary**  *(Set by CFAE)*  *(M/N)* | **Population Subject to Requirement (if Monetary)**  *(in $)* | **Inherent Risk**  **(from IRAF)**  *(High/Low)* | **Final Control Risk**  *(High/Low)* | **Detection**  **Risk of Noncompl.**  *(High/Low)* | **Overall Audit Risk of Noncompl.**  *(High/Low)* | **Federal Materiality by Compliance Requirement**  *(usually 5%)* |
| **A** |  | **Activities Allowed or Unallowed** | Yes |  | M |  |  |  |  |  | 5% |
| **B** |  | **Allowable Costs/Cost Principles** | Yes |  | M |  |  |  |  |  | 5% |
| **C** |  | **Cash Management** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** |  | ***Reserved – Not Used*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** |  | **Eligibility** | Yes | **¥** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** |  | **Equipment & Real Property Mgmt** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** |  | **Matching, Level of Effort, Earmark** | Yes |  | M |  |  |  |  |  | 5% |
| **H** |  | **Period of Performance** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **I** |  | **Procurement & Sus. & Debarment** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **J** |  | **Program Income** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **K** |  | ***Reserved – Not Used*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **L** |  | **Reporting** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **M** |  | **Subrecipient Monitoring** | Yes |  | N |  |  |  |  |  | 5% |
| **N** |  | **Special Tests & Provisions –**  **Participation of Private School Children** | Yes |  | M/N |  |  |  |  |  | 5% |
| **N** |  | **Special Tests & Provisions –**  **Access to Federal Funds for New or Significantly Expanded Charter Schools** | Yes | **£** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**¥** *All requirements apply to the SEA (Ohio Department of Education and Workforce), no LEA requirements noted per review of the 2024 Compliance Supplement.*

**£** *This requirement applies to the SEA (Ohio Department of Education and Workforce) as they are responsible for funding charter schools in the State of Ohio. Not applicable at the local level.*

**(1)** *From Part 2, Matrix of Compliance Requirements, for the applicable program in the* [*OMB Compliance Supplement*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/office-federal-financial-management/)*. For programs not included in Part 2, all compliance requirements should be marked as applicable.*

**(2)** *If the Compliance Supplement notes a compliance requirement as being applicable to the program in the first column, it still may not apply at a particular entity either because that entity does not have activity subject to that type of compliance requirement, or the activity could not have a material effect on a major program. If the Compliance Supplement indicates that a type of compliance requirement is applicable and the auditor determines it also is direct and material to the program at the specific entity being audited, the auditor should answer this question “Yes,” and then complete the remainder of the line. Alternatively, if the auditor determines that a particular type of compliance requirement that normally would be applicable to a program (as per part 2 of the Compliance Supplement) is not direct and material to the program at the specific entity being audited, the auditor should answer this question “No.” Along with that response, the auditor should document the basis for the determination in the working papers or this FACCR. When making that determination all parts of that compliance requirement must be considered. For example, Equipment and Real Property Management contains procedures regarding Acquisitions, Dispositions (Disposals), and Inventory Management. The documentation on why the compliance requirement is not applicable to the program/entity must address all parts of that compliance requirement.*

***(3)*** *Refer to the AICPA Single Audit Guide, chapter 10, Compliance Auditing Applicable to Major Programs, for considerations relating to assessing inherent risk of noncompliance for each direct and material type of compliance requirement. For AOS auditors, the auditor documents the inherent risk assessment for each direct and material compliance requirement on the Inherent Risk Assessment Form (IRAF). The assessments in this column should directly tie to the final inherent risk assessment on the IRAF.*

**(4)** *See guidance on the following page for considerations relating to assessing control risk of noncompliance for each direct and material type of compliance requirement.* ***Planned control risk must be assessed at low per 2 CFR § 200.514; therefore, only final control risk is shown in the matrix.*** *Additionally, auditors must document final control risk in each compliance requirement section’s Audit Implications Summary in this FACCR. See AICPA Single Audit Guide, Chapter 9, Consideration of Internal Control over Compliance for Major Programs.*

**(5)** *Audit risk of noncompliance is defined in AU-C 935 as the risk that the auditor expresses an inappropriate opinion on the entity’s compliance when material noncompliance exists. Audit risk of noncompliance is a function of the risks of material noncompliance and detection risk of noncompliance. A “Low” assessment of detection risk in this matrix means that the risk has been reduced to an acceptable level.*

***(6)*** *The AICPA Single Audit Guide 10.55 states the auditor’s tests of compliance with compliance requirements may disclose instances of noncompliance. The Uniform Guidance refers to these instances of noncompliance, among other matters, as “audit findings.” Such findings may be of a monetary nature and involve questioned costs or may be nonmonetary and not result in questioned costs. CFAE included the monetary vs. nonmonetary determinations for each compliance requirement in this program. If AOS auditors believe the determination of monetary vs. nonmonetary should be updated for a particular section, other than sections E and N, they must consult with CFAE via the FACCR specialty in Spiceworks. The Eligibility and Special Tests & Provisions determinations reflect M/N as the determination of whether the compliance requirement is monetary or non-monetary is contingent upon the specific requirements of the program being tested as well as requirements contained within the grant agreement. For sections E and N, auditors should tailor the assessment as appropriate based on the facts and circumstances of their entity’s operations, update the Compliance Requirement Matrix for the appropriate designation (N or M), and document the research and reasoning behind the determination.*

***(7)*** *AU-C 935.13 & .A7 require auditors to establish and document two materiality levels: (1) a materiality level for the program as a whole, and (2) a second materiality level for the each of the applicable 12 compliance requirement listed in Appendix XI to Part 200. This column documents quantitative materiality at the compliance requirement level for each major program.*

*Note: If the compliance requirement is (1) of a monetary nature, and (2) the requirement applies to the* ***total*** *population of program expenditures, then the compliance materiality amount for the program also equals materiality for the requirement as shown in the last column of the matrix. For example, the population for allowable costs and cost principles will usually equal the total Federal expenditures for the major program as a whole. Conversely, the population for some monetary compliance requirements may be less than the total Federal expenditures. Auditors must carefully determine the population subject to the compliance requirement to properly assess Federal materiality. Auditors should also consider the qualitative aspects of materiality. For example, in some cases, noncompliance and internal control deficiencies that might otherwise be immaterial could be significant to the major program because they involve fraud, abuse, or illegal acts. The program level materiality, typically 5%, is documented in the Record of Single Audit Risk (RSAR).*

**Performing Tests to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Controls**

*Control Risk Assessment:*

*Auditors must:*

* *Document the five internal control components (control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring) for each direct and material compliance requirement and*
* *Perform procedures to obtain an understanding of internal control over compliance for federal programs that is sufficient to plan the audit to support a low assessed level of control risk.*

*If internal control over compliance for a compliance requirement is likely to be ineffective in preventing or detecting noncompliance, the auditor is not required to plan and perform tests of internal control over compliance. Rather, the auditor must assess control risk at maximum, determine whether additional compliance tests are required, and report a significant deficiency (or material weakness) as part of the audit findings.*

*AICPA Single Audit Guide’s paragraph 9.08 states that Uniform Guidance provides that the auditors must perform tests of internal controls over compliance as planned. (Paragraphs 9.40-9.42 of the* *AICPA Single Audit Guide discuss an exception related to ineffective internal control over compliance.) In addition, AU-C 330.08 states the auditor should design and perform tests of controls to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of controls. Further, AU-C 330.09 states in designing and performing tests of controls, the auditor should obtain more persuasive audit evidence the greater the reliance the auditor places on the effectiveness of a control.*

*AU-C 330.10 and 330.A28 address testing of the operating effectiveness of controls ordinarily includes procedures such as*

1. *inquiries of appropriate entity personnel, including grant and contract managers;*
2. *the inspection of documents, reports, or electronic files indicating performance of the control;*
3. *the observation of the application of the specific controls; and*
4. *reperformance of the application of the control by the auditor.*

*The auditor should perform such procedures regardless of whether he or she would otherwise choose to obtain evidence to support an assessment of control risk below the maximum level.*

*Paragraph .A24 of AU-C section 330 provides guidance related to the testing of controls. When responding to the risk assessment, the auditor may design a test of controls to be performed concurrently with a test of details on the same transactions. Although the purpose of a test of controls is different from the purpose of a test of details, both may be accomplished concurrently by performing a test of controls and a test of details on the same transaction (a dual-purpose test). For example, the auditor may examine an invoice to determine whether it has been approved and whether it provides substantive evidence of a transaction. A dual-purpose test is designed and evaluated by considering each purpose of the test separately.*

*Also, when performing the tests, the auditor should consider how the outcome of the test of controls may affect the auditor’s determination about the extent of substantive procedures to be performed. See chapter 11 of the AICPA Single Audit Guide for a discussion of the use of dual-purpose samples in a compliance audit.*

*Before a dual-purpose test is performed, AOS auditors must read AOSAM 30500 and 35900 for guidance.*

[Part 6](OMB_Part_6.pdf) of the 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement provides detailed guidance on assessing internal controls over the compliance requirements.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement)*

**Improper Payments**

Under OMB guidance, Public Law (Pub. L.) No. 116-117, Payments Integrity Information Act of 2019, and Executive Order 13520 on reducing improper payments, federal agencies are required to take actions to prevent improper payments, review federal awards for such payments, and, as applicable, recover improper payments. Improper payments include the following:

1. Any payment that should not have been made or that was made in an incorrect amount, including an overpayment or underpayment, under a statutory, contractual, administrative, or other legally applicable requirement; and includes -- (i) any payment to an ineligible recipient;(ii) any payment for an ineligible good or service; (iii) any duplicate payment; (iv) any payment for a good or service not received, except for those payments where authorized by law; and (v) any payment that does not account for credit for applicable discounts.
2. For purposes of producing an estimate, when the agency cannot determine, due to lacking or insufficient documentation, whether a payment is proper or not, the payment must be treated as an improper payment.

Auditors must be alert to improper payments, particularly when testing the following parts of section III. – A, “Activities Allowed or Unallowed;” B, “Allowable Costs/Cost Principles;” E, “Eligibility;” and, in some cases, N, “Special Tests and Provisions.”

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

# Part I – OMB Compliance Supplement Information

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

**References to the ESEA are to the ESEA, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).**

The ESEA was amended December 10, 2015, by the ESSA (Pub. L. No. 114-95).

**Waivers and Expanded Flexibility**

Local educational agencies (LEAs) through their SEA, and schools through their LEA and SEA, may request waivers from ED of many of the statutory and regulatory requirements of programs authorized in the ESEA. In addition, some States have been granted authority to grant waivers of Federal requirements under the Education Flexibility Partnership Act of 1999. See approved States at: <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-state-grantee-relations-evidence-based-practices/ed-flex/awards/>.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, ED invited SEAs to apply for certain fiscal waivers. A list of the invited waivers is available at:

* Adult Ed and Perkins: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/tydings-covid-waiver-letter-aefla.pdf>
* IDEA: <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/monitor/cssos-mfs-2018-waiver-authority-06-05-2020.pdf>

For certain programs, lists of waivers granted under the CARES Act waiver authority are listed in the *Federal* *Register*:

* Adult-Ed and Perkins: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/11/05/2020-24537/notice-of-waiver-granted-under-the-coronavirus-aid-relief-and-economic-security-cares-act>

**Cross-Cutting Requirements**

The requirements in this cross-cutting section can be classified as either general or program specific. General cross-cutting requirements are those that are the same for all applicable programs but are implemented on an entity level. These requirements need only be tested once to cover all applicable major programs. The general cross-cutting requirements that the auditor only need test once to cover all applicable major programs are: III.G.2.1, “Level of Effort Maintenance of Effort” (except for certain ESF programs see the program-specific level of effort- maintenance of effort requirement); and III.N, “Special Tests and Provisions.” Program specific cross-cutting requirements are the same for all applicable programs but are implemented at the individual program level. These types of requirements need to be tested separately for each applicable major program. The compliance requirement in III.N.1, “Participation of Private School Children,” may be tested on a general or program-specific basis.

In recent years, the Office of Inspector General in ED has investigated a number of significant criminal cases related to the risk of misuse of Federal funds and the lack of accountability of Federal funds in public charter schools. Auditors should be aware that, unless an applicable program statute provides otherwise, public charter schools and charter school LEAs are subject to the requirements in this cross-cutting section to the same extent as other public schools and LEAs. Auditors also should note that, depending upon State law, a public charter school may be its own LEA or a school that is part of a traditional LEA.

Program procedures for non-ESEA programs covered by this cross-cutting section and additional information on program procedures for the ESEA programs are set forth in the individual program sections of this Supplement.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### I. Program Objectives

The objective of the Supporting Effective Instruction state grant program (formerly Improving Teacher Quality state grants program) in Title II, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (Pub. L. No. 114-95), is to provide funds to state educational agencies (SEAs), and local educational agencies (LEAs) to: (1) increase student achievement consistent with the challenging state academic standards, (2) improve the quality and effectiveness of teachers, principals, and other school leaders, (3) increase the number of teachers, principals, and other school leaders who are effective in improving student academic achievement in schools, and (4) provide low-income and minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

Program objectives for programs covered by this cross-cutting section are set forth in the individual program sections of this Supplement.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### II. Program Procedures

**A. Overview**

Funds are obtained by a state on the basis of the Department of Education’s (ED) approval of either (1) an individual state plan as provided in Section 2101 of the ESEA (20 USC 6611) or (2) a consolidated application that includes the program, in accordance with Section 8302 of the ESEA (20 USC 7842).

**B. Equitable Service**

After timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate private school officials, SEAs and LEAs must provide services to teachers and other educational personnel in private schools on an equitable basis that address their needs under the program and are equitable to the level of services provided to teachers and other educational personnel in the SEA and LEA (see generally ESEA section 8501).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

1. **Overview**
2. *ESEA Programs*

The ESEA requires an SEA to either develop and submit separate, program-specific individual State plans to ED for approval as provided in individual program requirements outlined in the ESEA or submit, in accordance with Section 8302 of the ESEA, a consolidated plan to ED for approval. Each SEA submitted a consolidated State plan. SEAs with approved consolidated State plans may require LEAs to submit consolidated plans or allow an LEA to submit a consolidated plan or individual program plans.

1. **Subprograms/Program Elements**

Unique Features of ESEA Programs That May Affect the Conduct of the Audit Subprograms/Program Elements

The following unique features may affect the conduct of an audit:

1. *Consolidation of Administrative Funds*

SEAs and LEAs (with SEA approval) may consolidate Federal funds received for administration under many ESEA programs, and non-ESEA programs listed in the last sentence, thus eliminating the need to account for these funds on a program-by-program basis. The amount from each applicable program set aside for State consolidation may not be more than the percentage, if any, authorized for State administration under that program. This also includes these non-ESEA programs, ESSER, GEER (if administered by an SEA), and EANS

1. *Schoolwide Programs*

Eligible schools are able to use their Title I, Part A funds, in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds, in order to upgrade the entire educational program of the school and to raise academic achievement for all students. Except for some of the specific requirements of the Title I, Part A program, Federal funds that a school consolidates in a schoolwide program are not subject to most of the statutory or regulatory requirements of the programs providing the funds as long as the schoolwide program meets the intent and purposes of those programs. The Title I, Part A requirements that apply to schoolwide programs are identified in the Title I, Part A program-specific section. If a school does not consolidate Federal funds with State and local funds in its schoolwide program, the school has flexibility with respect to its use of Title I, Part A funds, consistent with Section 1114 of ESEA (20 USC 6314), but it must comply with all statutory and regulatory requirements of the other Federal funds it uses in its schoolwide program.

1. *Transferability*

SEAs and LEAs (with some limitations) may transfer up to 100 percent of their allotment from one or more applicable programs (Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A for SEAs and LEAs; 21st CCLC for SEAs) to one or more of those programs or to other applicable programs: Title I, Part A; Title I, Part C; Title I, Part D; Title III, Part A; and Title V, Part B. Transferred funds are subject to all of the requirements, set-asides, and limitations of the programs into which they are transferred.

1. *Small Rural Schools Achievement Alternative Use of Funds*

Eligible LEAs may, after notifying the SEA, spend all or part of the formula funds they receive under two applicable programs (Title II, Part A and Title IV, Part A) for local activities authorized under one or more of five applicable programs (Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III; Title IV, Part A; and 21st CCLC).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### III. Source of Governing Requirements

This program is authorized by Title II, Part A, of the ESEA, as amended by the ESEA sections 2101-2104 (which is 20 USC 6611-6614). The program purpose and definitions in ESEA Title II, sections 2101 and 2102 (20 USC 6601 and 6602) also apply to this program.

While there are no program regulations, general ESEA requirements in 34 CFR parts 76, 77, and 299 apply.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

**Availability of Other Program Information**

The ESEA, as reauthorized by the ESSA, is available with a hypertext index at <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ95/PLAW-114publ95.pdf> .

An ED Federal Register notice, dated July 2, 2004 (69 FR 40360-40365), indicating which Federal programs may be consolidated in a schoolwide program, is available at <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2004-07-02/pdf/04-15121.pdf> .

A number of documents contain guidance applicable to the cross-cutting requirements in this section. Documents numbered 10-11 below, which were issued before enactment of the ESSA, are applicable in general. They include:

1. ESSA Fiscal Changes & Equitable Services (which includes guidance on Transferability Authority) (November 21, 2016) [ESSA Non Regulatory Guidance Fiscal and Equitable Service 11-21-2016 (PDF) (ed.gov)](https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/essaguidance160477.pdf)

Note: The information on Title I, Part A equitable services in this document is superseded by the nonregulatory guidance ED issued in October 2019. See below.

1. ESSA Schoolwide Guidance (September 29, 2016) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/essaswpguidance9192016.pdf>
2. Title I, Part A of the ESEA: Providing Equitable Services to Eligible Private School Children, Teachers, and Families (October 7, 2019/Updated May 17, 2023) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2023/05/Title-I-ES-guidance-revised-5-2023.pdf>
3. Informational Document on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (January 19, 2021) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/01/19-0043-REAP-Informational-Document-final-OS-Approved-1.pdf>
4. Non-Regulatory Guidance: Early Learning in the Every Student Succeeds Act (November 2016) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/essaelguidance10202016.pdf>
5. Within-District Allocations Under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Draft) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2022/02/Within-district-allocations-FINAL.pdf>
6. Providing Equitable Services to Students and Teachers in Non-Public Schools under the CARES Act Programs (Oct. 9, 2020) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/10/Providing-Equitable-Services-under-the-CARES-Act-Programs-Update-10-9-2020.pdf>
7. Title VIII, Part F of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act: Equitable Services for Eligible Private School Children, Teachers, and Other Educational Personnel (July 17, 2023) <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/non-public-education/files/esea-titleviii-guidance-2023.pdf>
8. How Does a State or Local Educational Agency Allocate Funds to Charter Schools that are Opening for the First Time or Significantly Expanding Their Enrollment? (December 2000) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/cguidedec2000.pdf>
9. Title I Fiscal Issues: Maintenance of Effort; Comparability; Supplement, not Supplant; Carryover; Consolidating Funds in Schoolwide Programs; and Grantback Requirements (February 2008) <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/fiscalguid.pdf>
10. Letter to Chief State School Officers on Granting Administrative Flexibility for Better Measures of Success (September 7, 2012) <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/fund/guid/gposbul/time-and-effort-reporting.html?exp=3>
11. A BABAA FAQ document, U.S. Department of Education Frequently Asked Questions about the Build America Buy America Act, addressing questions related to ED’s implementation of BABAA is available at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/fund/guid/buy-america/faqs.pdf> and additional information can be found at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/fund/guid/buy-america/index.html> .

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### IV. Other Information

Funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program (Assistance Listing 84.358A) may be used for activities allowed under other programs, including this program Title II, Part A.

Expenditures for allowable activities under Title II, Part A from funds awarded for the SRSA Funds Program should be included in the audit universe and total expenditures of Assistance Listing 84.358A (i.e., from the program from which they originated) for purposes of (1) determining Type A programs and (2) completing the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA).

**Availability of Other Program Information**

1. Building Systems of Support for Excellent Teaching and Leading – Non-Regulatory Guidance (September 27, 2016) <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essatitleiipartaguidance.pdf>

2. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants – Non-Regulatory Guidance (October 5, 2006) <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.pdf>

3. Non-Regulatory Guidance: Fiscal Changes and Equitable Services Requirements Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as Amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (November 21, 2016) <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/essaguidance160477.pdf>

4. Non-Regulatory Guidance: Title VIII, Part F of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: Equitable Services for Eligible Private School Children, Teachers, and Other Educational Personnel (July 17, 2023). <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/non-public-education/files/esea-titleviii-guidance-2023.pdf>

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

1. *Consolidation of Administrative Funds (SEAs and LEAs)*

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); CSP (84.282); 21st CCLC (84.287); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

*This section also applies to ESSER, GEER, and EANS (84.425C, D, R, U, and V).*

State and local administrative funds that are consolidated (as described in III.A.1, “Activities Allowed or Unallowed – Consolidation of Administrative Funds (SEAs and LEAs”)) should be included in the audit universe and the total expenditures of the programs from which they originated for purposes of (1) determining Type A programs and (2) completing the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA). A footnote showing, by program, amounts of administrative funds consolidated is encouraged.

1. *Schoolwide Programs (LEAs)*

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

*This section also applies to IDEA (84.027 and 84.173) and CTE (84.048).*

Since schoolwide programs are not separate Federal programs, as defined in 2 CFR section 200.42, expenditures of Federal funds consolidated in schoolwide programs should be included in the audit universe and the total expenditures of the programs from which they originated for purposes of (1) determining Type A programs and (2) completing the SEFA. A footnote showing, by program, amounts consolidated in schoolwide programs is encouraged.

1. *Transferability (SEAs and LEAs)*

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title II, Part A (84.367) and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

Expenditures of funds transferred from one program to another (as described in III.A.3, “Activities Allowed or Unallowed – Transferability (SEAs and LEAs)”) should be included in the audit universe and total expenditures of the receiving program for purposes of (1) determining Type A programs, and (2) completing the SEFA. A footnote showing amounts transferred between programs is encouraged.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

# Part II – Pass through Agency and Grant Specific Information

### Program Overview

**Application Access**

The Ohio Department of Education and Workforce (DEW) uses an online Funding Application (FA), known as the [Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP)](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/default.aspx?ccipSessionKey=638236407880099702) to administer a number of federal programs (not all) under which subawards are made to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs). The consolidated application (CA) is completed by the LEA and constitutes the LEA’s application for various federal programs.

Also, see [Additional Grants Management Guidance and Forms](http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants/Grants-Management-Online-Forms) and [DEW Grants Manual](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/Managing-Your-Grant.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US).

*(Source: Ohio Department of Education and Workforce Office of Federal and State Grants Management)*

### Testing Considerations

**Consolidation of Administrative Funds and Coordination Services Projects**

The Ohio Department of Education and Workforce has not implemented and the CCIP is not setup for the consolidation of administrative funds or the coordination services projects for its ESEA programs. However, consolidation is permitted by DEW.

*(Source: Ohio Department of Education and Workforce Office of Federal Programs)*

### Reporting

*Example SEFA and Footnote shells, the “2024 SEFA Completeness Guide” and additional resources are available for AOS Staff on the Intranet and for IPAs on the* [*IPA Resource Internet Page*](http://www.ohioauditor.gov/references/practiceaids.html)*.*

# Part III – Applicable Compliance Requirements

## A. ACTIVITIES ALLOWED OR UNALLOWED

### OMB Compliance Requirements

*For a cost to be allowable, it must (1) be for a purpose the specific award permits (tested in FACCR Section A)**and (2) fall within 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E Cost Principles (tested in FACCR Section B). These two criteria are roughly analogous to classifying a cost by both program/function and object. That is, the grant award generally prescribes the allowable program/function while 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E prescribes allowable object cost categories and restrictions that may apply to certain object codes of expenditures.*

*For example, could a government use an imaginary Homeland Security grant to pay OP&F pension costs for its police force? To determine this, the client (and auditors) would look to the grant agreement to see if police activities (security of persons and property function cost classification) met the program objectives. Then, the auditor would look to Subpart E (provisions for selected items of cost § 200.420-200.476) to determine if pension costs (an object cost classification) are permissible. (200.431(g) states they are allowable, with certain provisions, so we would need to determine if the auditee met the provisions.) Both the client and the auditor should look at 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E even if the grant agreement includes a budget by object code approved by the grantor agency. Also, keep in mind that granting agencies have codified 2 CFR Part 200 and some agencies have been granted exceptions to provisions within 2 CFR Part 200.*

The specific requirements for activities allowed or unallowed are unique to each Federal program and are found in the federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award pertaining to the program.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for activities allowed or unallowed are contained in program legislation, federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

**1. Activities Allowed**

a. State Use of Funds – *Not Applicable to LEAs*

b. SEAs – *Not Applicable to LEAs*

c. LEA Use of Funds- After conducting meaningful consultation, as required by ESEA Section 2102(b)(3), LEAs may use funds for a broad range of activities designed to improve educator effectiveness that are identified in ESEA Section 2103(b). While not an exhaustive list, examples of allowable activities include:

(1) Providing “professional development” (as the term is defined in ESEA Section 8101(42) (20 USC 7801(42))) to teachers, instructional leadership teams, principals, or other school leaders that is focused on improving teaching and student learning and achievement;

(2) Developing and implementing initiatives to recruit, hire, and retain teachers, principals, and other school leaders;

(3) Providing training, technical assistance, and capacity-building in local educational agencies to assist teachers, principals, or other school leaders with selecting and implementing formative assessments, designing classroom-based assessments, and using data from such assessments to improve instruction and student academic achievement carrying out initiatives that provide teacher, paraprofessional, principal, or other school leader advancement and professional growth, and an emphasis on leadership opportunities, multiple career paths, and pay differentiation. LEAs also may use funds to hire teachers to reduce class size (ESEA sections 2103(b) (20 USC 6613(b))).

**2. Activities Unallowed –** *Not Applicable to LEAs*

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

If there has been a transfer of funds to a consolidated administrative cost objective from a major program, in developing audit procedures to test compliance with “Activities Allowed or Unallowed” and “Allowable Costs/Cost Principles,” the auditor should include the consolidated administrative cost objective in the universe to be tested.

*a. Consolidation of Administrative Funds (SEAs/LEAs)- ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); CSP (84.282); 21st CCLC (84.287); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); Title IV, Part A (84.424). This section also applies to ESSER, GEER, EANS, and the ESF Outlying Areas program (84.425A, C, D, H, R, U, V, and X).*

An SEA may consolidate the amounts specifically made available to it for State administration under one or more ESEA programs (and such other programs as the ED secretary may designate) if the SEA can demonstrate that the majority of its resources are derived from non-Federal sources. An SEA must use consolidated administrative funds for authorized administrative activities of one or more of the consolidated programs. It may also use such funds for administrative activities designed to enhance the effective and coordinated use of funds under one or more of the programs included in the consolidation, such as coordination of ESEA programs with other Federal and non-Federal programs; the establishment and operation of peer review mechanisms; the dissemination of information regarding model programs and practices; and technical assistance (Section 8201 of ESEA (20 USC 7821)).

An LEA may, with the approval of its SEA, consolidate and use for the administration of one or more ESEA programs not more than the percentage, established in each program, of the total available under those programs. An LEA may use consolidated funds for the administration of the consolidated programs and for uses at the school district and school levels comparable to those authorized for the SEA. An LEA that consolidates administrative funds may not use any other funds under the programs included in the consolidation for administration (Section 8203 of ESEA (20 USC 7823)).

An SEA or LEA that consolidates administrative funds is not required to keep separate records of administrative costs for each individual program.

Expenditures of consolidated administrative funds are allowable if they are for administrative costs that are allowable under any of the contributing programs (sections 8201(c) and 8203(e) of ESEA (20 USC 7821(c) and 7823(e))).

See Part I, “Other Information,” for guidance on the treatment of consolidated administrative funds for purposes of Type A program determination and presentation in the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA).

*b. Schoolwide Programs (LEAs)- ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); 21st CCLC (84.287); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424). This section also applies to ESSER & GEER (84.425C, D, and U), IDEA (84.027 and 84.173), and CTE (84.048).*

An eligible school participating under Title I, Part A may, in consultation with its LEA, use its Title I, Part A funds, along with funds provided from the above-identified programs, to upgrade the school’s entire educational program in a schoolwide program.

Part I, “Other Information,” for guidance on the treatment of consolidated schoolwide funds for purposes of Type A program determination and presentation in the SEFA.

*c. Transferability (SEAs and LEAs)- ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are: 21st CCLC (84.287) (for SEAs only), Title II, Part A (84.367), and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

SEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the non-administrative funds allocated for State-level activities from applicable programs to one or more of the other listed applicable programs, or to Title I, Part A (Assistance Listing 84.010); Title I, Part C (Assistance Listing 84.011); Title I, Part D (Assistance Listing 84.013); Title III, Part A (Assistance Listing 84.365A); and Title V, Part B (84.358). LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of their allotments from an applicable program to the other listed applicable program, or to Title I, Part A (Assistance Listing 84.010); Title I, Part C (Assistance Listing 84.011); Title I, Part D (Assistance Listing 84.013); Title III, Part A (Assistance Listing 84.365A); and Title V, Part B (84.358).

See “Matching, Level of Effort, Earmarking – Earmarking,” for additional testing related to transferability.

See Part I, “Other Information,” for guidance on the treatment of funds transferred under this provision for purposes of Type A program determination and presentation in the SEFA.

*d. Small Rural Schools Achievement (SRSA) (LEAs) Alternative Uses of Funds Program- ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title II, Part A (84.367) and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

LEAs that (a) have a total average daily attendance of fewer than 600 students, or serve only schools that are located in counties with a population density of fewer than ten persons per square mile; and (b) serve only schools that are designated rural (locale code of 41, 42, or 43) by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), or (with the concurrence of the SEA) are located in an area defined as rural by a governmental agency of the State may, after notifying the SEA, spend all or part of the funds received under the above programs for local activities authorized under one or more of the following five programs:

* + - 1. Assistance Listing 84.010 Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)
      2. Assistance Listing 84.287 Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)
      3. Assistance Listing 84.365 Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students (Title III)
      4. Assistance Listing 84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction (Title II, Part A)
      5. Assistance Listing 84.424 Student Support and Academic Enrichment (Title IV, Part A) (Section 5211(a)-(c) of ESEA (20 USC 7345(a)-(c))).

See Part I, “Other Information,” for guidance on the treatment of funds transferred under this provision for purposes of Type A program determination and presentation in the SEFA.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**Add program specific requirements from:**

* **The individual grant application, agreement, and policies, and**
* **Federal agency guidance not included in the compliance supplement (such as federal agency grant manuals, references to CFR, etc.)**

**Be sure to indicate the source of your information. If no additional requirements are noted, indicate as such.**

Program funds may be used for Consolidation of Administrative Funds, Coordinated Services Projects, and/or Schoolwide Programs under Title I. Unneeded Program Funds may be transferred to certain other federal programs as detailed in Sections G and N of this FACCR.

For additional DEW guidance related to implementation of the UG and written policy requirements, see [Grants Management Guidance](http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants/Grants-Management-Online-Forms) and DEW [Grants Manual.](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/Managing-Your-Grant.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US)

*(Source: Ohio Department of Education and Workforce Office of Federal and State Grants Management)*

**Unallowable Activities:**

In general, federal education funds should not be used for the acquisition of real property unless specifically permitted by the authorizing statute or implementing regulations for the program (2 CFR 200.311).

*(Source: Ohio Department of Education and Workforce and* [*Grants Management Assurances*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=93022) *#18)*

Ohio Revised Code 3313.24 states, in part: The board of education of each local, exempted village or city school district shall fix the compensation of its treasurer which shall be paid from the general fund of the district. DEW considers all chief financial officers of educational entities, including but not limited to, non-profit corporations, community schools, colleges and universities to be similarly situated to treasurers of school districts.

Regardless of any additional duties in managing Federal or State funds, Federal and state law prohibits treasurers from receiving a supplemental contract for managing Federal or State funds.

*(Source:* [*Treasurer Supplemental Contracts*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1039)*)*

***Transferability***

*Transfers between federal program funds that are covered by ESEA flexibility for federal purposes are allowable. Federal law takes precedence over State Laws and no Ohio Revised Code citations should be issued.*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

**Audit Objectives**

1. Obtain an understanding of internal control, assess risk, and test internal control as required by 2 CFR section 200.514(c).
2. Determine whether Federal awards were expended only for allowable activities.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Control Documentation and Testing**

|  |
| --- |
| *Auditors should clearly document what control procedures address the compliance requirement. Reference or link to documentation or where testing was performed.*  **Basis for the control** *(Ex. reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):*  **Control Procedure** *(Description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct errors):*  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** *(Title):*  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** *(i.e. sampling unit):* |

### Suggested Substantive Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| Consider the results of control testing above in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.  *(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*  ***AOS Auditors:*** *Steps marked with an asterisk (\*) are addressed via the attributes in the payroll and non-payroll Federal Testing Templates available on the Intranet.*  1. Identify the types of activities which are either specifically allowed or prohibited by federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the federal award pertaining to the program.  *Auditors should be able to identify these activities using Part 4 requirements as well as tailoring the “Additional Program Specific Information” section above.*  2. When allowability is determined based upon summary level data, perform procedures to verify that:  a. Activities were allowable.  b. Individual transactions were properly classified and accumulated into the activity total.  \*3. When allowability is determined based upon individual transactions, select a sample of transactions and perform procedures to verify that the transaction was for an allowable activity.  4. The auditor should be alert for large transfers of funds from program accounts which may have been used to fund unallowable activities. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| *Consider the adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies/material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments.*  *Auditors should review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*   1. **Results of Test of Controls:** *(including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and management letter items)* 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive) Test including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## B. ALLOWABLE COSTS/COST PRINCIPLES

**Introduction**

The 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E and appendices III-VII establish principles and standards for determining allowable direct and indirect costs for Federal awards. This section is organized into the following areas of allowable costs: states and local government and Indian Tribe costs (direct and indirect); state/local government central service costs; and state public assistance agency costs.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

*FACCR Section B includes five distinct testing sections, the first of which is always applicable.*

1. *Cost Principles for States, Local Governments, and Indian Tribes – testing guidance and steps included in FACCR, not separate testing document.*

*Auditors* ***must*** *evaluate if additional section(s) are applicable to their Entity, including sources reviewed to verify applicability. For applicable sections, auditors must pull the testing section(s) into their working papers and test accordingly.*

*Additional testing sections are located* [***here***](https://ohauditor.sharepoint.com/sites/Intranet/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?FolderCTID=0x0120002FFBFB1F4A3C3F47AE37C7A44E1C1EDE&id=%2Fsites%2FIntranet%2FShared%20Documents%2FAudit%5FResources%2FFederal%2FFACCRs%20and%20IRAFs&viewid=68cb3ab2%2D567e%2D456a%2D975c%2Da88f3e9c3727)*for AOS auditors and* [***here***](https://ohioauditor.gov/references/practiceaids/faccrs.html) *for IPA auditors.*

1. *De Minimis Indirect Cost Rate*
   1. *This section must be tested if the Entity utilizes the de minimis indirect cost rate to charge indirect costs to the grant, whether as a recipient or subrecipient.*
   2. *Applicability Determination:* **Auditors must specify here if this section is applicable to the Entity and identify which sources were reviewed to make the determination.**
   3. *If applicable, testing documents:* **Link to testing documents**
2. *Allowable Costs – State/Local Government-wide Central Service Costs*
   1. *This section must be tested if the Entity allocated costs to the grant using central service cost allocation plans (CAPs).*
   2. *Applicability Determination:* **Auditors must specify here if this section is applicable to the Entity and identify which sources were reviewed to make the determination.**
   3. *If applicable, testing documents:* **Link to testing documents**
3. *Allowable Costs – State Public Assistance Agency Costs*
   1. *This section must be tested if the Entity charged state public assistance agency costs to the grant.* 
      1. *State public assistance agency costs are defined as (1) all costs allocated or incurred by the State agency except expenditures for financial assistance, medical vendor payments, and payments for service and goods provided directly to program recipients and (2) normally charged to Federal awards by implementing the public assistance cost allocation plan (CAP).*
      2. *This may be applicable at the local level if local entities perform procedures to support the State compliance (for example, this may occur with JFS programs)*
   2. *Applicability Determination:* **Auditors must specify here if this section is applicable to the Entity and identify which sources were reviewed to make the determination.**
   3. *If applicable, testing documents:* **Link to testing documents**
4. *Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations* 
   1. *This section must be tested if the Entity is a nonprofit organization.*
   2. *Applicability Determination:* **Auditors must specify here if this section is applicable to the Entity and identify which sources were reviewed to make the determination.**
   3. *If applicable, testing documents:* **Link to testing documents**

### Applicability of Cost Principles

*For a cost to be allowable, it must (1) be for a purpose the specific award permits (tested in FACCR Section A) and (2) fall within 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E Cost Principles (tested in FACCR Section B). These two criteria are roughly analogous to classifying a cost by both program/function and object. That is, the grant award generally prescribes the allowable program/function while 2 CFR 200, Subpart E prescribes allowable object cost categories and restrictions that may apply to certain object codes of expenditures.*

*For example, could a government use an imaginary Homeland Security grant to pay OP&F pension costs for its police force? To determine this, the client (and we) would look to the grant agreement to see if police activities (security of persons and property function cost classification) met the program objectives. Then, the auditor would look to Subpart E (provisions for selected items of cost § 200.420-200.476) to determine if pension costs (an object cost classification) are permissible. (200.431(g) states they are allowable, with certain provisions, so we would need to determine if the auditee met the provisions.) Both the client and the auditor should look at 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E even if the grant agreement includes a budget by object code approved by the grantor agency. Also, keep in mind that granting agencies have codified 2 CFR Part 200 and some agencies have been granted exceptions to provisions within 2 CFR Part 200.*

*The specific requirements for activities allowed or unallowed are unique to each Federal program and are found in the laws, regulations, and the provisions of the Federal award contracts or grant agreements pertaining to the program.*

The cost principles in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E (Cost Principles), prescribe the cost accounting requirements associated with the administration of Federal awards by:

1. States, local governments and Indian tribes
2. Institutions of higher education (IHEs)
3. Nonprofit organizations

As provided in 2 CFR 200.101, the cost principles requirements apply to grant agreements and cooperative agreements with the exception of those providing food commodities. The cost principles do not apply to grant agreements and cooperative agreements providing food commodities; agreements for loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, and insurance; and programs listed in 2 CFR 200.101(e) (see Appendix I of the 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement). Federal awards administered by publicly owned hospitals and other providers of medical care are exempt from 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E, but are subject to the requirements [45 CFR Part 75, Appendix IX](45_CFR_Part_75.pdf), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) implementation of 2 CFR Part 200.

The cost principles applicable to a non-Federal entity apply to all Federal awards received by the entity, regardless of whether the awards are received directly from the Federal awarding agency or indirectly through a pass-through entity. For this purpose, Federal awards include cost-reimbursement contacts under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). The cost principles do not apply to Federal awards under which a non-Federal entity is not required to account to the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity for actual costs incurred.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for allowable costs and cost principles are contained in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E, program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.

The requirements for the development and submission of indirect (facilities and administration (F&A)) cost rate proposals and cost allocation plans (CAPs) are contained in 2 CFR Part 200, Appendices III-VII as follows:

* Appendix III to Part 200—Indirect (F&A) Const Identification and Assignment and Rate Determination for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)
* Appendix IV to Part 200—Indirect (F&A) Costs Identification and Assignment, and Rate Determination for Nonprofit Organizations
* Appendix V to Part 200—State/Local Government-Wide Central Service Cost Allocation Plans
* Appendix VI to Part 200—Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plans
* Appendix VII to Part 200—States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals

Except for the requirements identified below under “Basic Guidelines,” which are applicable to all types of non-Federal entities, this compliance requirement is divided into sections based on the type of non-Federal entity. The differences that exist are necessary because of the nature of the non-Federal entity organizational structures, programs administered, and breadth of services offered by some non-Federal entities and not others.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Basic Guidelines**

Except where otherwise authorized by statute, costs must meet the following general criteria in order to be allowable under Federal awards;

1. Be necessary and reasonable for the performance of the Federal award and be allocable thereto under the principles in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E.

2. Conform to any limitations or exclusions set forth in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E or in the Federal award as to types or amount of cost items.

3. Be consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally financed and other activities of the non-Federal entity.

4. Be accorded consistent treatment. A cost may not be assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances has been allocated to the Federal award as an indirect cost.

5. Be determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), except, for State and local governments and Indian tribes only, as otherwise provided for in 2 CFR Part 200.

6. Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost-sharing or matching requirements of any other federally financed program in either the current or a prior period.

7. Be adequately documented.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Selected Items of Cost**

2 CFR 200.420 - 200.476 provide the principles to be applied in establishing the allowability of certain items of cost, in addition to the basic considerations identified above. These principles apply whether or not a particular item of cost is treated as a direct cost or indirect (F&A) cost. Failure to mention a particular item of cost is not intended to imply that it is either allowable or unallowable; rather, determination of allowability in each case should be based on the treatment provided for similar or related items of cost and the principles described in 2 CFR 200.402 - 200.411.

[List of Selected Items of Cost Contained in 2 CFR Part 200](Selected_Items_of_Cost_Part_3_ComplianceSupplement.pdf)

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

No Part 4 OMB Program Specific Compliance Requirements

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

If there has been a transfer of funds to a consolidated administrative cost objective from a major program, in developing audit procedures to test compliance with “Activities Allowed or Unallowed” and “Allowable Costs/Cost Principles,” the auditor should include the consolidated administrative cost objective in the universe to be tested.

1. *Documentation of Employee Time and Effort (Consolidated Administrative Funds and Schoolwide Programs)*

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); CSP (84.282); 21st CCLC (84.287); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424). This section also applies to IDEA (84.027 and 84.173) (schoolwide programs only), CTE (84.048) (schoolwide programs only), and ESSER, GEER, and EANS (84.425C, D, R, U, and V) (consolidated administrative funds and schoolwide programs).*

1. *Consolidated Administrative Funds*: An SEA or LEA that consolidates Federal administrative funds is not required to keep separate records by individual program (Sections 8201(c) or 8203(e) of ESEA (20 USC 7821(c) or 7823(e))). The SEA or LEA may treat the consolidated administrative funds as a consolidated administrative cost objective.

Time-and-effort requirements with respect to consolidated administrative funds vary under different circumstances.

1. For an employee who works solely on the consolidated administrative cost objective, an SEA or LEA is not required to maintain records reflecting the distribution of the employee’s salary and wages among the programs included in the consolidation.
2. For an employee who works in part on the consolidated administrative cost objective and in part on a Federal program whose administrative funds have not been consolidated or on activities funded from other revenue sources, an SEA or LEA must maintain time and effort distribution records in accordance with 2 CFR section 200.430(i)(1)(vii) that support the portion of time and effort dedicated to:
   1. The consolidated cost objective, and
   2. Each program or other cost objective supported by non-consolidated federal funds or other revenue sources.
3. *Schoolwide Programs* – A schoolwide program school is permitted to consolidate Federal funds with State and local funds to upgrade the entire educational program of the school. A school that consolidates Federal funds with State and local funds in a consolidated schoolwide pool is not required to maintain separate records by program (Section 1114(a)(3)(C) of ESEA (20 USC 6314(a)(3)(C), 34 CFR section 200.29(d). If a schoolwide program school does not consolidate Federal funds in a consolidated schoolwide pool, the school must keep separate records by program. (Guidance is contained in the publication entitled *Title I Fiscal Issues: Maintenance of Effort; Comparability; Supplement, not Supplant; Carryover; Consolidating Funds in Schoolwide Programs; and Grantback Requirements* (February 2008). This guidance is available at <https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/fiscalguid.pdf>.

Time-and-effort requirements in schoolwide program schools vary under different circumstances.

1. If a school operating a schoolwide program consolidates Federal, State, and local funds in a consolidated schoolwide pool, there is no distinction between staff paid with Federal funds and staff paid with State or local funds. Under these circumstances, payment from the single consolidated schoolwide pool is sufficient to demonstrate that an employee works only on activities of the schoolwide program, and no other documentation is required.
2. If a school operating a schoolwide program does not consolidate Federal funds with State and local funds in a consolidated schoolwide pool, an employee who works, in whole or in part, on a Federal program or cost objective must document time and effort as follows:
   1. For an employee who works solely on a single cost objective (e.g., a single Federal program whose funds have not been consolidated or Federal programs whose funds have been consolidated but not with State and local funds), an LEA is not required to maintain records reflecting the distribution of the employee’s salary and wages, including among the Federal programs included in the consolidation, if applicable.
   2. For an employee who works on multiple activities or cost objectives (e.g., in part on a Federal program whose funds have not been consolidated in a consolidated schoolwide pool and in part on Federal programs supported with funds consolidated in a schoolwide pool or on activities that are not part of the same cost objective), an LEA must maintain time and effort distribution records in accordance with 2 CFR section 200.430(i)(1)(vii) that support the portion of time and effort dedicated to:
      1. The federal program or cost objective; and
      2. Each other program or cost objective supported by consolidated federal funds or other revenue sources.
   3. *Substitute System for time-and-effort reporting (LEA)* In a September 7, 2012, letter to Chief State School Officers, ED authorized SEAs to approve LEAs’ use of a substitute system for time- and-effort reporting for employees whose salaries are supported by multiple cost objectives, but who work on a predetermined schedule. ED also provided guidance to clarify the meaning of a “single cost objective.” For more detail, see *Letter to Chief State School Officers on Granting Administrative Flexibility for Better Measures of Success* (Sept. 7, 2012) (<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/fund/guid/gposbul/time-and-effort-reporting.html> ).

*2. Indirect Costs* *(SEA/LEA or other subrecipients)*

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which a restricted indirect cost rate applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); 21st CCLC (84.287); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

*This section also applies to Adult Education (84.002); IDEA (84.027 and 84.173); CTE (84.048); and IDEA, Part C (84.181).*

A “restricted” indirect cost rate (RICR) must be used for programs administered by State and local governments and their governmental subgrantees that have a statutory requirement prohibiting the use of Federal funds to supplant nonfederal funds. The programs listed above in this section have a non-supplanting requirement and therefore must have a restricted indirect cost rate.

Nongovernmental grantees or subgrantees administering such programs have the option of using the RICR, or an indirect cost rate of 8 percent, unless ED determines that the RICR would be lower.

The formula for a restricted indirect cost rate is:

RICR = (General management costs + Fixed costs) / (Other expenditures).

General management costs are costs of activities that are for the direction and control of the grantee’s (or subgrantee’s) affairs that are organization wide, such as central accounting services, payroll preparation and personnel management. For State and local governments, the general management indirect costs consist of (1) allocated Statewide Central Service Costs approved by the Department of Health and Human Services in a formal Statewide Cost Allocation Plan (SWCAP) as “Section I” costs and (2) departmental indirect costs. The term “general management” as it applies to departmental indirect costs does not include expenditures limited to one component or operation of the grantee. Specifically excluded from general management costs are the following costs that are reclassified and included in the “other expenditures” denominator:

* 1. Divisional administration that is limited to one component of the grantee;
  2. The governing body of the grantee;
  3. Compensation of the chief executive officer of the grantee;
  4. Compensation of the chief executive officer of any component of the grantee; and
  5. Operation of the immediate offices of these officers.

Also excluded from the SWCAP Section I indirect costs are any occupancy and maintenance type costs as described in 34 CFR section 76.568. However, because these costs are allocated and not incurred at the departmental level, they do not require reclassification to the “other expenditure” denominator.

Fixed costs are contributions to fringe benefits and similar costs associated with salaries and wages that are charged as indirect costs, including retirement, social security, pension, unemployment compensation, and insurance costs.

Other expenditures are the grantee’s total expenditures for its Federally and non-Federally funded activities, including directly charged occupancy and space maintenance costs (as defined in 34 CFR section 76.568), and the costs related to the chief executive officer of the grantee or any component of the grantee and its offices. Excluded are general management costs, fixed costs, subgrants, capital outlays, debt service, fines and penalties, contingencies, and election expenses (except for elections required by Federal statute).

Occupancy and space maintenance costs associated with functions that are not organization-wide must be included with other expenditures in the indirect cost formula. These costs may be charged directly to affected programs only to the extent that statutory supplanting prohibitions are not violated. This reimbursement must be approved in advance by ED. Specific occupancy and space maintenance costs may be charged directly only to programs affected by the restricted rate calculation if charging for such costs is approved in advance by ED (34 CFR section 76.568(c)).

Indirect costs charged to a grant are determined by applying the RICR to total direct costs of the grant minus capital outlays, subgrants, and other distorting or unallowable items as specified in the grantee’s indirect cost rate agreement.

The other ED programs (those not having a statutory non-supplant requirement) that allow indirect costs do not require a restricted rate and should follow the cost principles in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E (34 CFR sections 76.560 and 76.563-76.569).

1. *Unallowable Direct Costs to Programs (SEA/LEA or other subrecipients)*

Officials from ED have noted that some entities have charged costs in the following areas which were determined to be unallowable as specified in the indicated references. Auditors should be alert that if any such costs are charged, charges must be consistent with provisions of 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E or as applicable.

* 1. Separation leave costs (2 CFR section 200.431(b)).
  2. Severance costs (2 CFR section 200.431(i)).
  3. Post-retirement health benefit (PRHB) costs (2 CFR section 200.431(h)).

1. *Unallowable Costs to Programs (Direct or Indirect) (SEA/LEA or other subrecipients)*

Officials from ED have noted that, in cases where grantees rent or lease buildings or equipment from an affiliate organization, the costs associated with the lease or rental agreement can be excessive. The auditor should be alert to the fact that the measure of allowability in such “less-than-arms-length-relationships” is not fair market value, but rather the “costs of ownership” standard as referenced in 2 CFR section 200.465(c).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

***Written Procedure Requirements:***

*2 CFR 200.302(b)(7) requires written procedures for determining the allowability of costs in accordance with Subpart E-Cost Principles of this part and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.*

*2 CFR 200.430 states that costs of compensation are allowable to the extent that they satisfy the specific requirements of this part, and that the total compensation for individual employees: (1) Is reasonable for the services rendered and conforms to the established written policy of the non-Federal entity consistently applied to both Federal and non-Federal activities; (2) Follows an appointment made in accordance with a non-Federal entity's laws and/or rules or written policies and meets the requirements of Federal statute, where applicable; and (3) Is determined and supported as provided in paragraph (i) of this section, Standards for Documentation of Personnel Expenses, when applicable.*

*2 CFR 200.431 requires established written leave policies if the entity intends to pay fringe benefits.*

*2 CFR 200.464(a)(2) requires reimbursement of relocation costs to employees be in accordance with an established written policy must be consistently followed by the employer.*

*2 CFR 200.475 requires reimbursement and/or charges to be consistent with those normally allowed in like circumstances in the non-Federal entity's non-federally funded activities and in accordance with non-Federal entity's written travel reimbursement policies.*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**Add program specific requirements from:**

* **The individual grant application, agreement, and policies, and**
* **Federal agency guidance not included in the compliance supplement (such as federal agency grant manuals, references to CFR, etc.)**

**Be sure to indicate the source of your information. If no additional requirements are noted, indicate as such.**

DEW uses a CCIP functionality designed to verify that there is a correct approved restricted indirect cost rate during the budget process. When an original budget (Rev 0) or a budget revision is done, a budget error message will appear if the district’s budget for indirect costs under object code 800 – function indirect cost, without an approved indirect cost rate, or if the budgeted indirect costs exceed the approved rate. Due to timing, the previous years approved indirect cost rate may be loaded as a placeholder to allow grantees to budget at the beginning of the fiscal year. Once the current years indirect cost rate is approved, an update is made in the system to load the current years approved rate and grantees adjust the budgeted amount when they submit their next budget revision.

*(Source: CCIP Note #331 -* <https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/documentlibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=79206>*)*

**Time and Effort**

Federal regulation requires that all employees who are paid with federal funds, in full or in part, retain specific documentation to demonstrate the amount of time personnel spent on grant activities (Time and Effort records).

*(Source:* [*DEW Grants Manual*](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/Managing-Your-Grant.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US)*, Page 10)*

Under 2 CFR 200.430 Time and Effort is principles based and requires written policies establishing Time and Effort documentation and procedures. DEW approved a substitute system of time-and-effort reporting in their memo dated 3/17/2014: [2014-002 Grants Management Guidance](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/2014-002-Time-and-Effort-Guidance.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US). This policy was revised in June 2016, August 2019, and July 2023.

For the most updated grants guidance, please visit the Grants Administration webpage. [Grants Administration | Ohio Department of Education and Workforce](https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration)

*(Source:* [*DEW Grants Manual*](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/Managing-Your-Grant.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US)*, Page 21-22*)

***Transferability***

*Transfers between federal program funds that are covered by ESEA flexibility for federal purposes are allowable. Federal law takes precedence over State Laws and no Ohio Revised Code citations should be issued.*

### Cost Principles for States, Local Governments and Indian Tribes

### OMB Compliance Requirements

**Direct Costs**

1. Direct costs are those costs that can be identified specifically with a particular final cost objective, such as a federal award or other internally or externally funded activity, or that can be directly assigned to such activities relatively easily with a high degree of accuracy.
2. Costs incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances must be treated consistently as either direct or indirect costs.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Indirect Costs**

* 1. *Allocation of Indirect Costs and Determination of Indirect Cost Rates*

1. The specific methods for allocating indirect costs and computing indirect cost rates are as follows:
   1. *Simplified Method* – This method is applicable where a governmental unit’s department or agency has only one major function, or where all its major functions benefit from the indirect cost to approximately the same degree. The allocation of indirect costs and the computation of an indirect cost rate may be accomplished through simplified allocation procedures described in 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph C.2.
   2. *Multiple Allocation Base Method* – This method is applicable where a governmental unit’s department or agency has several major functions that benefit from its indirect costs in varying degrees. The allocation of indirect costs may require the accumulation of such costs into separate groupings which are then allocated individually to benefiting functions by means of a base which best measures the relative degree of benefit. (For detailed information, refer to 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph C.3.)
   3. *Special Indirect Cost Rates* – In some instances, a single indirect cost rate for all activities of a department or agency may not be appropriate. Different factors may substantially affect the indirect costs applicable to a particular program or group of programs (e.g., the physical location of the work, the nature of the facilities, or level of administrative support required). (For the requirements for a separate indirect cost rate, refer to 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph C.4.)
   4. *Cost Allocation Plans* – In certain cases, the cognizant agency for indirect costs may require a state or local government o unit’s department or agency to prepare a CAP instead of an ICRP. These are infrequently occurring cases in which the nature of the department or agency’s federal awards makes impracticable the use of a rate to recover indirect costs. A CAP required in such cases consists of narrative descriptions of the methods the department or agency uses to allocate indirect costs to programs, awards, or other cost objectives. Like an ICRP, the CAP either must be submitted to the cognizant agency for indirect cost for review, negotiation, and approval, or retained on file for inspection during audits.
   5. *Submission Requirements*
2. Submission requirements are identified in 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph D.1. All departments or agencies of a governmental unit claiming indirect costs under federal awards must prepare an ICRP and related documentation to support those costs.
3. A state/local department or agency or Indian tribe that receives more than $35 million in direct federal funding must submit its ICRP to its cognizant agency for indirect costs. Other state/local government departments or agencies that are not required to submit a proposal to the cognizant agency for indirect costs must develop an ICRP in accordance with the requirements of 2 CFR Part 200 and maintain the proposal and related supporting documentation for audit.
4. Where a government receives funds as a subrecipient only, the pass-through entity will be responsible for the indirect cost rate used (2 CFR section 200.331(a)(4)).
5. Each Indian tribe desiring reimbursement of indirect costs must submit its ICRP to the DOI (its cognizant agency for indirect costs).
6. ICRPs must be developed (and, when required, submitted) within 6 months after the close of the governmental unit’s fiscal year, unless an exception is approved by the cognizant agency for indirect costs.
   1. *Documentation and Certification Requirements*

The documentation and certification requirements for ICRPs are included in 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraphs D.2 and 3, respectively. The proposal and related documentation must be retained for audit in accordance with the record retention requirements contained in 2 CFR section 200.334(f).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Cognizant Agency for Indirect Costs**

2 CFR Part 200, Appendix V, paragraph F, provides the guidelines to use when determining the Federal agency that will serve as the cognizant agency for indirect costs for States, local governments, and Indian tribes. References to the “cognizant agency for indirect costs” are not equivalent to the cognizant agency for audit responsibilities, which is defined in 2 CFR 200.1.

For indirect cost rates and departmental indirect cost allocation plans, the cognizant agency is generally the Federal agency with the largest value of direct Federal awards (excluding pass-through awards) with a governmental unit or component, as appropriate. In general, unless different arrangements are agreed to by the concerned Federal agencies or described in 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix V, paragraph F, the cognizant agency for central service cost allocation plans is the Federal agency with the largest dollar value of total Federal awards (including pass-through awards) with a governmental unit.

Once designated as the cognizant agency for indirect costs, the Federal agency remains so for a period of 5 years. In addition, 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix V, paragraph F, lists the cognizant agencies for certain specific types of plans and the cognizant agencies for indirect costs for certain types of governmental entities. For example, HHS is cognizant for all public assistance and State-wide cost allocation plans for all States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), State and local hospitals, libraries, and health districts and the Department of the Interior (DOI) is cognizant for all Indian tribal governments, territorial governments, and State and local park and recreational districts.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

#### Audit Objectives and Control Tests: Allowable Costs –– Direct and Indirect Costs

The individual State/local government/Indian tribe departments or agencies (also known as “operating agencies”) are responsible for the performance or administration of Federal awards. In order to receive cost reimbursement under Federal awards, the department or agency usually submits claims asserting that allowable and eligible costs (direct and indirect) have been incurred in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E.

The indirect cost rate proposal (ICRP) provides the documentation prepared by a State/local government/Indian tribe department or agency to substantiate its request for the establishment of an indirect cost rate. The indirect costs include (1) costs originating in the department or agency of the governmental unit carrying out Federal awards, and (2) for States and local governments, costs of central governmental services distributed through the State/local government-wide central service CAP that are not otherwise treated as direct costs. The ICRPs are based on the most current financial data and are used to either establish predetermined, fixed, or provisional indirect cost rates or to finalize provisional rates (for rate definitions refer to 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph B).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Audit Objectives**

1. Obtain an understanding of internal control, assess risk, and test internal control as required by 2 CFR section 200.514(c).

**Audit Objectives: Direct Costs**

1. Determine whether the organization complied with the provisions of 2 CFR Part 200 as follows:
2. Direct charges to federal awards were for allowable costs.
3. Unallowable costs determined to be direct costs were included in the allocation base for the purpose of computing an indirect cost rate.

**Audit Objectives: Indirect Costs**

1. Determine whether the governmental unit complied with the provisions of 2 CFR Part 200 as follows:
2. Charges to cost pools used in calculating indirect cost rates were for allowable costs.
3. The methods for allocating the costs are in accordance with the cost principles, and produce an equitable and consistent distribution of costs (e.g., all activities that benefit from the indirect cost, including unallowable activities, must receive an appropriate allocation of indirect costs).
4. Indirect cost rates were applied in accordance with negotiated indirect cost rate agreements (ICRA).
5. For State/local departments or agencies that do not have to submit an ICRP to the cognizant agency for indirect costs (those that receive less than $35 million in direct Federal awards), indirect cost rates were applied in accordance with the ICRP maintained on file.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

***Additional Control Test Objectives for Written Procedures***

*When documenting and identifying the key control(s) in place to address the compliance requirement, consider if the client has written procedures to document the control process.*

* *UG requires written policies for the requirements outlined in 2 CFR 200.302(b)(7), 2 CFR 200.430, 2 CFR 200.431, 2 CFR 200.464(a)(2), and 2 CFR 200.475.*
* *Document whether the non-federal entity established written procedures consistent with the following requirements:*
  + *2 CFR 200.302(b)(7) for determining the allowability of costs in accordance with Subpart E-Cost Principles.* 
    - *Reference to Written Policy:* **Auditors must include a reference here to the Entity’s written policy which addresses this requirement. If the Entity does not have a written policy, auditors must document a reaction/conclusion.**
  + *2 CFR 200.430 for allowability of compensation costs.* 
    - *Reference to Written Policy:* **Auditors must include a reference here to the Entity’s written policy which addresses this requirement. If the Entity does not have a written policy, auditors must document a reaction/conclusion.**
  + *2 CFR 200.431 for written leave policies.* 
    - *Reference to Written Policy:* **Auditors must include a reference here to the Entity’s written policy which addresses this requirement. If the Entity does not have a written policy, auditors must document a reaction/conclusion.**
  + *2 CFR 200.464(a)(2) for reimbursement of relocation costs.* 
    - *Reference to Written Policy:* **Auditors must include a reference here to the Entity’s written policy which addresses this requirement. If the Entity does not have a written policy, auditors must document a reaction/conclusion.**
  + *2 CFR 200.475 for travel reimbursements.* 
    - *Reference to Written Policy:* **Auditors must include a reference here to the Entity’s written policy which addresses this requirement. If the Entity does not have a written policy, auditors must document a reaction/conclusion.**
* *It is auditor judgment how to report instances where the entity either lacks having a written policy or their written policy is insufficient to meet the requirements of 2 CFR 200.302(b)(7), 2 CFR 200.430, 2 CFR 200.431, 2 CFR 200.464(a)(2), and 2 CFR 200.475.*
  + *While auditors would normally use a written policy as the basis for the compliance control, there could be other key controls in place to ensure program compliance.*
  + *The lack of a policy would be noncompliance, which could rise to the level of material noncompliance and even a control deficiency (SD / MW) if there were underlying internal control deficiencies.* 
    - *If there are key controls in place operating effectively, AOS auditors would report the lack of the required UG policy as a management letter citation. However, in subsequent audits, evaluate if the noncompliance should be elevated if not adopted. Written policies aid in consistency and adherence to requirements strengthening internal control processes.*

**Control Documentation and Testing**

|  |
| --- |
| *Auditors should clearly document what control procedures address the compliance requirement. Reference or link to documentation or where testing was performed.*  **Basis for the control** *(Ex. reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors)*:  **Control Procedure** *(Description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct errors)*:  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** *(Title)*:  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** *(i.e. sampling unit)*: |

#### Suggested Substantive Audit Procedures – Compliance – Direct and Indirect Costs

|  |
| --- |
| Consider the results of control testing above in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.  *(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*  ***AOS Auditors:*** *Steps marked with an asterisk (\*) are addressed via the attributes in the payroll and non-payroll Federal Testing Templates available on the Intranet.*  ***Direct Costs***  \*Test a sample of transactions for conformance with the following criteria contained in 2 CFR Part 200, as applicable:   1. If the auditor identifies unallowable direct costs, the auditor should be aware that “directly associated costs” might have been charged. Directly associated costs are costs incurred solely as a result of incurring another cost, and would not have been incurred if the other cost had not been incurred. For example, fringe benefits are “directly associated” with payroll costs. When an unallowable cost is incurred, directly associated costs are also unallowable. 2. Costs were approved by the Federal awarding agency, if required (see the above table (Selected Items of Cost, Exhibit 1) or 2 CFR 200.407 for selected items of cost that require prior written approval). 3. Costs did not consist of improper payments, including (1) payments that should not have been made or that were made in incorrect amounts (including overpayments and underpayments) under statutory, contractual, administrative, or other legally applicable requirements; (2) payments that do not account for credit for applicable discounts; (3) duplicate payments; (4) payments that were made to an ineligible party or for an ineligible good or service; and (5) payments for goods or services not received (except for such payments where authorized by law).   d. Costs were necessary and reasonable for the performance of the Federal award and allocable under the principles of 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E.  e. Costs conformed to any limitations or exclusions set forth in 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E, or in the Federal award as to types or amount of cost items.  *While several selected items of cost are included in Exhibit 1 , one item to note is* Compensation - Personnel Services*, (formally referred to as Time and Effort/Semi Annual Certification). See 2 CFR 200.430.*  *As a reminder, this is a policy-based requirement. If employees are partially paid from at least one federal grant, auditors should review the auditee’s policy for ensuring employee pay is allocated to federal programs based on actual time spent on each program and test accordingly.*  f. Costs were consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally financed and other activities of the State/local government/Indian tribe department or agency.  g. Costs were accorded consistent treatment. Costs were not assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances was allocated to the Federal award as an indirect cost.  h. Costs were not included as a cost of any other federally financed program in either the current or a prior period.  i. Costs were not used to meet the cost-sharing or matching requirements of another Federal program, except where authorized by Federal statute.  j. Costs were adequately documented.  ***Indirect Costs***  a. If the State/local department or agency is not required to submit an ICRP and related supporting documentation, the auditor should consider the risk of the reduced level of oversight in designing the nature, timing, and extent of compliance testing.  b. *General Audit Procedures* – The following procedures apply to charges to cost pools that are allocated wholly or partially to Federal awards or used in formulating indirect cost rates used for recovering indirect costs under Federal awards.  (1) Test a sample of transactions for conformance with:  (a) The criteria contained in the “Basic Considerations” section of 2 CFR 200.402 - 200.411.  (b) The principles to establish allowability or unallowability of certain items of cost (2 CFR 200.420 - 200.476).  *While several selected items of cost are included in Exhibit 1 , one item to note is* Compensation - Personnel Services*, (formally referred to as Time and Effort/Semi Annual Certification). See 2 CFR 200.430.*  *As a reminder, this is a policy-based requirement. If employees are partially paid from at least one federal grant, auditors should review the auditee’s policy for ensuring employee pay is allocated to federal programs based on actual time spent on each program and test accordingly.*  (2) If the auditor identifies unallowable costs, the auditor should be aware that directly associated costs might have been charged. Directly associated costs are costs incurred solely as a result of incurring another cost, and would have not been incurred if the other cost had not been incurred. When an unallowable cost is incurred, directly associated costs are also unallowable. For example, occupancy costs related to unallowable general costs of government are also unallowable.  c. *Special Audit Procedures for State, Local Government, and Indian Tribe ICRPs (see also the AOS discussion on* [*testing the ICRP*](Testing_the_ICRP_discussion.pdf)*)*  (1) Verify that the ICRP includes the required documentation in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph D.  (2) *Testing of the ICRP* – There may be a timing consideration when the audit is completed before the ICRP is completed. In this instance, the auditor should consider performing interim testing of the costs charged to the cost pools and the allocation bases (e.g., determine from management the cost pools that management expects to include in the ICRP and test the costs for compliance with 2 CFR Part 200). Should there be audit exceptions, corrective action may be taken earlier to minimize questioned costs. In the next year’s audit, the auditor should complete testing and verify management’s representations against the completed ICRP.  The following procedures are some acceptable options the auditor may use to obtain assurance that the costs collected in the cost pools and the allocation methods used are in compliance with 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E:  (a) *Indirect Cost Pool* – Test the indirect cost pool to ascertain if it includes only allowable costs in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200.  (i) Test to ensure that unallowable costs are identified and eliminated from the indirect cost pool (e.g., capital expenditures, general costs of government).  (ii) Identify significant changes in expense categories between the prior ICRP and the current ICRP. Test a sample of transactions to verify the allowability of the costs.  (iii) Trace the central service costs that are included in the indirect cost pool to the approved State/local government or central service CAP or to plans on file when submission is not required.  (b) *Direct Cost Base* – Test the methods of allocating the costs to ascertain if they are in accordance with the applicable provisions of 2 CFR Part 200 and produce an equitable distribution of costs.  (i) Determine that the proposed base(s) includes all activities that benefit from the indirect costs being allocated.  (ii) If the direct cost base is not limited to direct salaries and wages, determine that distorting items are excluded from the base. Examples of distorting items include capital expenditures, flow-through funds (such as benefit payments), and subaward costs in excess of $25,000 per subaward.  (iii) Determine the appropriateness of the allocation base (e.g., salaries and wages, modified total direct costs).  (c) *Other Procedures*  (i) Examine the records for employee compensation to ascertain if they are accurate, and the costs are allowable and properly allocated to the various functional and programmatic activities to which salary and wage costs are charged. (Refer to 2 CFR 200.430 for additional information on support of salaries and wages.)  (ii) For an ICRP using the multiple allocation base method, test statistical data (e.g., square footage, audit hours, salaries and wages) to ascertain if the proposed allocation or rate bases are reasonable, updated as necessary, and do not contain any material omissions.  (3) *Testing of Charges Based Upon the ICRA* – Perform the following procedures to test the application of charges to Federal awards based upon an ICRA:  (a) Obtain and read the current ICRA and determine the terms in effect.  (b) Select a sample of claims for reimbursement and verify that the rates used are in accordance with the rate agreement, that rates were applied to the appropriate bases, and that the amounts claimed were the product of applying the rate to the applicable base. Verify that the costs included in the base(s) are consistent with the costs that were included in the base year (e.g., if the allocation base is total direct costs, verify that current-year direct costs do not include costs items that were treated as indirect costs in the base year).  (4) *Other Procedures* – No Negotiated ICRA  (a) If an indirect cost rate has not been negotiated by a cognizant agency for indirect costs, the auditor should determine whether documentation exists to support the costs. When the auditee has documentation, the suggested general audit procedures under paragraph 3.b above should be performed to determine the appropriateness of the indirect cost charges to awards.  (b) If an indirect cost rate has not been negotiated by a cognizant agency for indirect costs, and documentation to support the indirect costs does not exist, the auditor should question the costs based on a lack of supporting documentation. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| *Consider the adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies/material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments.*  *Auditors should review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*  ***This box should include results of applicable additional testing sections as determined at the beginning of Section B.***   1. **Results of Test of Controls:** *(including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)* 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive) Test including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## G. MATCHING, LEVEL OF EFFORT, EARMARKING

### OMB Compliance Requirements

The specific requirements for matching, level of effort, and earmarking are unique to each Federal program and are found in the statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of awards pertaining to the program. For programs listed in this Supplement, these specific requirements are in Part 4, “Agency Program Requirements,” or Part 5, “Clusters of Programs,” as applicable.

However, for matching, 2 CFR 200.306 provides detailed criteria for acceptable costs and contributions. The following is a list of the basic criteria for acceptable matching:

- Are verifiable from the non-Federal entity’s records;

- Are not included as contributions for any other Federal award;

- Are necessary and reasonable for accomplishment of project or program objectives;

- Are allowed under 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E (Cost Principles);

- Are not paid by the Federal Government under another award, except where the Federal statute authorizing a program specifically provides that Federal funds made available for such program can be applied to matching or cost sharing requirements of other Federal programs;

- Are provided for in the approved budget when required by the Federal awarding agency; and

- Conform to other provisions of this part, as applicable.

“Matching,” “level of effort,” and “earmarking” are defined as follows:

1. *Matching* or cost sharing includes requirements to provide contributions (usually non-Federal) of a specified amount or percentage to match Federal awards. Matching may be in the form of allowable costs incurred or in-kind contributions (including third-party in-kind contributions).

2. *Level of effort* includes requirements for (a) a specified level of service to be provided from period to period, (b) a specified level of expenditures from non-Federal or Federal sources for specified activities to be maintained from period to period, and (c) Federal funds to supplement and not supplant non-Federal funding of services.

3. *Earmarking* includes requirements that specify the minimum and/or maximum amount or percentage of the program’s funding that must/may be used for specified activities, including funds provided to subrecipients. Earmarking may also be specified in relation to the types of participants covered.

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for matching are contained in 2 CFR 200.306, program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award. The requirements for level of effort and earmarking are contained in program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

**1. Matching (LEAs) -** Not Applicable

**2. Level of Effort**

**2.1 Level of Effort – Maintenance of Effort** – See ED Cross-Cutting Section Below

**2.2 Level of Effort – Supplement Not Supplant** – See ED Cross-Cutting Section Below

**3. Earmarking**

a. LEA Subgrant Reservation – *Not Applicable to LEAs*

b. State Administration and Activities – *Not Applicable to LEAs*

c. See ED Cross-Cutting Section Below

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

**1. Matching** – *Not Applicable to AL #84.367*

**2. Level of Effort**

***2.1 Level of Effort*** *– Maintenance of Effort (SEAs/LEAs)*

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); Title III, Part A (84.365); and Title II, Part A (84.367).;* as described in the Introduction, “Cross-Cutting Requirements,” this requirement is a general cross-cutting requirement that need only be tested once to cover all major programs to which it applies.

An LEA may receive funds under an applicable program only if the SEA finds that the combined fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of the LEA from State and local funds for free public education for the preceding year was not less than 90 percent of the combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding year, unless specifically waived by ED.

An LEA’s expenditures from State and local funds for free public education include expenditures for administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services, operation and maintenance of plant, fixed charges, and net expenditures to cover deficits for food services and student body activities. They do not include the following expenditures: (a) any expenditures for community services, capital outlay, debt service and supplementary expenses as a result of a presidentially declared disaster and (b) any expenditures made from funds provided by the Federal government.

If an LEA fails to maintain fiscal effort, an SEA must reduce an LEA’s allocation under a covered program if the LEA also failed to maintain effort in one or more of the five immediately preceding fiscal years in the exact proportion by which the LEA fails to maintain effort by falling below 90 percent of both the combined fiscal effort per student and aggregate expenditures (using the measure most favorable to the LEA) (Section 8521 of ESEA (20 USC 7901); 34 CFR section 299.5).

In some States, the SEA prepares the calculation from information provided by the LEA. In other States, the LEAs prepare their own calculation. The suggested audit procedures for compliance contained in Part 3G for “Level of Effort – Maintenance of Effort” should be adapted to fit the circumstances. For example, if auditing the LEA and the LEA does the calculations, the auditor should perform steps a., b., and c. If auditing the LEA and the SEA does the calculation, the auditor should perform step c for the amounts reported to the SEA. If auditing the SEA and the SEA performs the calculation, the auditor should perform steps a. and b. and amend step c to trace amounts to the LEA reports. If auditing the SEA and the LEA performs the calculation, the auditor should perform step a. and, if the requirement was not met, determine if the funding was reduced appropriately.

***2.2 Level of Effort –*** *Supplement Not Supplant*

*MEP (84.011); CTE (84.048); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

*General* – A grantee and subgrantee may use program funds only to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of the Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for the education of participating students. In no case may an LEA use Federal program funds to supplant funds from non-Federal sources (MEP, Section 1304(c)(2) of ESEA (20 USC 6394(c)(2)); Title III, Part A, Section 3115(g) (20 USC 6825(g)) (see additional information below); Title II, Part A, Section 2301 of ESEA (20 USC 6691)); and Title IV, Part A, Section 4110 (20 USC 7120)).

In the following instances, it is presumed that supplanting has occurred:

* 1. The SEA or LEA used federal funds to provide services that the SEA or LEA was required to make available under other federal, state, or local laws.
  2. The SEA or LEA used federal funds to provide services that the SEA or LEA provided with non-federal funds (or for Title III, Part A, other federal funds, as noted below) in the prior year.
  3. The SEA or LEA used MEP funds to provide services for participating children that the SEA or LEA provided with non-federal funds for nonparticipating children.

These presumptions are rebuttable if the SEA or LEA can demonstrate that it would not have provided the services in question with non-federal funds had the federal funds not been available.

*MEP* – An SEA and LEA may exclude from determinations of compliance with the supplement not supplant requirement supplemental State or local funds spent in any school attendance area or school for programs that meet the intent and purposes of the MEP, as identified in Title I of ESEA (sections 1118(d) and 1304(c)(2) of ESEA (20 USC 6321(d) and 6394(c)(2)); 34 CFR section 200.88).

Title I, Part C funds may only be used to address the needs of migratory children that are not addressed by services available from other **federal or non-federal programs** (Section 1306(b)(2) of ESEA). *Title III, Part A* – An SEA or LEA may only use funds under Title III, Part A to supplement the level of federal, state and local public funds that, in the absence of the Title III funds, would have been provided for programs for English learners and immigrant children and youth (Section 3115(g) of ESEA (20 USC 6825(g))).

**3. Earmarking**

1. Administration *(SEA) – Not Applicable to AL #84.367*
2. Transferability *(SEA/LEA)*

*Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

SEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the non-administrative funds allocated for State-level activities from one or more of the programs listed above (as well as 21st CCLC) to one or more of those programs, or to Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 (84.013); Title III, Part A (84.365A); or Title V, Part B (84.358). LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of their allotments from one or more of the programs listed above to one or more of those programs, or to Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 (84.013); Title III, Part A (84.365A); or Title V, Part B (84.358).

The allocation base for a program for a fiscal year equals that fiscal year’s original funding plus funds transferred into the program for that fiscal year. Funds may be transferred during a fiscal year’s carryover period.

Funds must be transferred to the receiving program’s allocation for the same fiscal year that the funds were allocated to the transferring program (Sections 5103(a) and (b) of ESEA (20 USC 7305b(a) and (b))).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**Add program specific requirements from:**

* **The individual grant application, agreement, and policies, and**
* **Federal agency guidance not included in the compliance supplement (such as federal agency grant manuals, references to CFR, etc.)**

**Be sure to indicate the source of your information. If no additional requirements are noted, indicate as such.**

***Framework for Testing Supplement, Not Supplant, for School Treasurers***

*If Federal funds are used to pay a School Treasurer, refer to the Suggested Audit Procedures below for a framework for testing supplement, not supplant, requirements for Treasurer pay.*

Maintenance of Effort is an Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) fiscal requirement under Section 9521 that requires districts to demonstrate that the level of state and local funding remains relatively constant from year to year, so that districts receive their full ESEA grant allocations. A district’s education expenditures from the general fund must be at least 90 percent of the immediately preceding year’s amounts. It is the state’s responsibility to make an annual determination as to whether a district has maintained fiscal effort.

DEW guidance on Maintenance of Effort is available [here](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/MOE/Help/ESEA_MOE_Process_Handbook.pdf).

*(Source:* [*DEW Grants Manual*](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/Managing-Your-Grant.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US)*, Page 9-10)*

Federal funds shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-federal funds that would otherwise be used for authorized activities under certain ESEA programs including, but not limited to, Title I-A, Title I-C, Title II-A, Title III, Title VI-B Rural and IDEA-B. These funds shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any other federal, state or local education funds. In general, federal funds must enhance, add to and supplement services and programs that are offered with state and local funds; federal funds may not be used to replace any services and programs that were offered, or would otherwise be offered, using state and local funds.

USDOE guidance on Supplement, Not Supplant is available [here](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/snsfinalguidance06192019.pdf).

*(Source:* [*DEW Grants Manual*](https://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Finance-and-Funding/Grants-Administration/Managing-Your-Grant/Managing-Your-Grant.pdf.aspx?lang=en-US)*, Page 10)*

1. **Maintenance of Effort – Overview of DEW MOE Procedures:**

In Ohio, the SEA prepares the calculation from information provided by the LEA through EMIS. Auditors do not need to request copies of DEW’s maintenance of effort calculations for local school districts. LEA auditors only need to perform limited tests over LEA maintenance of effort reports submitted to DEW.

A Local Educational Agency (LEA) may receive its full allocation of Title I, Part A, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds for any fiscal year only if the State educational agency (SEA) determines that the LEA has maintained its fiscal effort in accordance with section 8521 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The full list of grants (both active and inactive) for which this narrative applies includes the following:

* Title I, Part A
* Title I, Part D, Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk;
* Title II, Part A, Supporting Effective Instruction
* Title III, Part A; Language Instruction for English Learner and Immigrant Students
* Title IV, Part A, Student Support and Academic Enrichment
* Title IV, Part B, 21st Century Learning Centers;
* Title V, Part B, Subpart 2, Rural and Low-Income School Program; and
* McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B

Section 8521 provides that an LEA may receive funds under Title I, Part A and 21st Century for any fiscal year only if the SEA finds that either the combined fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of the LEA and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by the LEA for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90 percent of the combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year. The new flexibility in ESSA states that for an LEA to fail MOE, they must fall below 90 percent of both the combined fiscal effort per student and aggregate expenditures and have failed MOE in 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years. LEAs that do not meet the 90 percent of both the combined fiscal effort per student and aggregate expenditures but have not failed MOE in the immediately preceding fiscal years, are granted an exemption to the MOE penalty of reduction of allocation.

The Office of Federal Programs (OFP) uses the final EMIS Student Reporting Period S (student FTE data) and EMIS Period H (fiscal) data reported by LEAs for the MOE determination.

The OFP has an application to determine which LEAs did not meet MOE. Included in aggregate expenditures are state and local funds for free public education (administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services, operation and maintenance of plant, fixed charges, and net expenditures to cover deficits for food services and student body activities). Expenditures for community services, capital outlay, debt service, or supplemental expenses made as a result of a presidentially declared disaster are not included in the determination. In addition, any expenditure made from funds provided by the Federal government is excluded from the determination.

Aggregate expenditures consist of expenditures reported by LEAs under funds 001, 016, and 467 into EMIS aggregated into the expenditure per pupil categories.

**Maintenance of Effort – Specific Procedures:**

The OFP monitors whether LEAs meet MOE requirements. For LEAs that do not meet MOE requirements and have failed MOE in 1 or more of the 5 immediately preceding fiscal years and do not receive a waiver from the U.S. Department of Education, their allocations will be reduced in the next state fiscal year.

After the EMIS Reporting Period closes, the year-end reporting is finalized. EMIS data submitted by LEAs is pulled into the Maintenance of Effort (MOE) module (web-based system), which calculates MOE and is available to all LEAs under the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP). The system calculates MOE using two methods – per pupil expenditures and aggregate expenditures. The system also analyzes if the LEA has failed MOE within the immediately preceding five years. Additionally, in determining maintenance of effort for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year in which an LEA failed to maintain effort, DEW considered an LEA's expenditures in the year the failure occurred to be no less than 90 percent of the 90 percent of the expenditures for the third preceding year. The OFP has an MOE team that reviews all LEA’s missing data elements used in determining Maintenance of Effort that were not reported to DEW.

* + - * + LEA closed in the current fiscal year – calculation is performed, but no action is taken if LEA failed MOE or has missing data elements.
        + LEA uses SW pool – LEAs are asked to enter the percentage of state and local funds share in the fund 598.
        + LEA has erroneous, missing or incorrectly reported FTE – The LEA investigates the reasons for the data issues. The LEA is allowed to appeal the data during an appeal window. If the appeal is approved and new data is submitted showing the LEA has met MOE, no further action is required.
        + LEA has erroneous, missing, or incorrectly reported financial data and did not submit an appeal during the appeal window – LEA is contacted and given an opportunity to use Agreed Upon Procedures to submit the financial data that will be used for the MOE calculations. After the report is submitted, it is reviewed by a designee (school finance area coordinator) and opinion is issued if the report complied with the procedures. When this confirmation is received – it is documented by entering the note in the MOE system and the financial data for a year in question is entered into the MOE system. The new calculation is performed.

Entities that do not report their data into EMIS and do not have a consolidated application are not subject to MOE requirements and not monitored by the Office of Federal Programs. This includes closed LEAs, LEAs that are not recipients of the specific grants monitored, and Community Based Organizations (CBOs). (Note: Entities that can receive 21st Century Community Learning Center funds include Local Educational Agencies (LEA) and CBOs. CBOs are considered non-LEA entities and not subject to Maintenance of Effort requirements.)

After the initial MOE determination is made, the LEAs that did not meet the current MOE requirement are notified by the OFP, as evidenced by an e-mail sent from the MOE system. (E-mails are sent to the LEA’s Superintendent, Treasurer, and CCIP contact). Information provided includes directions on how to request a waiver and where to direct the request.

LEAs may request a MOE waiver every year that they do not meet the maintenance of effort requirement. The LEAs can submit information and request a waiver directly in the MOE application, and then DEW requests the waiver from USDoE on the LEA’s behalf.

The USDoE provides DEW with an Excel spreadsheet to complete for the LEAs not meeting MOE requirements. For any LEAs requesting a waiver, the OFP provides each LEA’s expenditures, revenue and the LEA explanations in the spreadsheet. Once completed, the spreadsheet is sent to the USDoE.

The Secretary may waive the MOE requirement if it is determined that such a waiver would be equitable due to—

* + - * + Exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances such as a natural disaster, or a change in the organizational structure of the LEA; or
        + A precipitous decline in the financial resources of the LEA. [Section 8521(c)(1)(2)]

If additional information is needed USDoE requests the DEW, OFP MOE designee to clarify, verify or obtain additional information from LEA.

After the OFP receives USDoE response regarding the waivers, a copy of the letter to all LEAs that have received an approval of their request is enter in the documents tab of the MOE application. For LEAs that did not receive a waiver or did not request one from USDoE, a note is entered in the appropriate state fiscal year CCIP application History Log to notify them that their allocations are to be reduced (by the method most favorable for LEA) percentage by which LEA did not meet MOE. LEAs allocations are reduced by the percentage most favorable to the LEAs in the appropriate year of the CCIP consolidated application for grants covered by this requirement.

Note: Clarification on MOE calculation and tests:

* + - * + FY 2024 allocations are affected by the MOE calculation performed in FY 2023
        + FY 2023 MOE calculations compare FY 2023 to FY 2022
        + Therefore, for FY2024, we will test FY 2023 and FY 2022 information when performing the applicable steps *(if auditors tested FY2022 data in the prior audit, that testing can be leveraged rather than reperforming the same testing)*.

In the event that a reduction is required, OFP will reduce the next succeeding allocation. If necessary, allocations will be adjusted during the reallocation process. Maintenance of Effort (MOE) under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) included additional flexibility provision in effect for the current period MOE determinations.

*(Sources:*

* + - * + *Office of Federal Programs*
        + *DEW Data Quality and Governance (EMIS)*
        + *AOS State Single Audit, DEW, Project No. 31A36FRAN,*
        + *Regulatory: DEW EMIS Manual, Sections 1, 2, and 6 (available at:* [*http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/EMIS/EMIS-Documentation/Current-EMIS-Manual*](http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/EMIS/EMIS-Documentation/Current-EMIS-Manual) *).*
        + *Regulatory: DEW CCIP Maintenance of Effort guidance, Revised as of May 15, 2020 (available at:* [*https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1040*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1040) *) )*
        + *USDOE Non-Regulatory Guidance, Fiscal Changes and Equitable Services Requirements Under ESEA as amended by ESSA November 21, 2016 available at* [*https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=80127*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=80127) *)*

1. **Schoolwide Resource Consolidation**

The CCIP application submitted to DEW is different than a school-wide plan. The CCIP is a district level budgeting, planning and approval process. Therefore, LEA’s are aggregating the uses of the various federal programs in the buildings up to the district level. The DEW approves all activities to be conducted by the LEA via the CCIP. In many cases, the budgeted expenditures reflected on the CCIP are at the district-wide-level; however, most of the expenditures should be at the individual buildings.

The challenge of accounting for school-wide programs lies at the district-level accounting. At the building level, there is only one budget and one revenue code needed. At the district level, accounting can be challenging especially if there is a combination of school-wide programs, targeted assistance buildings and non-title I buildings (which also participate in all the other titles and in IDEA). Consolidating of state, federal and local funds is permitted at the school-wide building level as long as the building/LEA can demonstrate that they have met the intent and purpose of all contributing federal programs.

An LEA can budget for many grants tracked as one fund at the building level. However, the LEA would also need to create a pool of funds at the district level that would combine the participating program funds. Reasonably, there would need to be a pool for each building. The LEA can make decisions about how much of each Title program is to be distributed and available for each of the buildings.

The “business rule” was created by DEW as a means of providing the flexibility described in the law under transfer of funds. The rule also allows the same degree of flexibility in a school-wide program while providing a rational basis for determining and reporting carryover and the expenditure of funds. The business rule essentially states that all expenditures are in the exact proportion as the revenue. If a program contributes 41% to the pool, then that program pays 41% of each expenditure from the pool. This is different from taking money for the first quarter from a title I program and then switching to another program in the 2nd quarter. For personnel, this eliminates the requirement for time and effort logs, as this is a single cost objective under OMB Circular A-87 (codified in 2 CFR Part 225) (2 CFR part 225). It meets the requirement of the law which allows LEA’s to not track individual program expenditures but allows them to make a definite and precise determination of how many of each program's funds have been expended. However, any school-wide program would need to have the appropriate documentation that they have conducted the approved activity.

Since each program is approved separately, but expended as one program, there is no change in the FER. There is a difference, however, in how you request funds via the PCR and how you determine the prorated expenditure. The FER already accounts for two or more funds. Based on the funds transferred, the FER already follows the business rule for transferred funds. It unbundles the reported expenditures and calculates the prorated amounts. Therefore, the ability to file an accurate FER can be done by using the same set of business rules used for transferred funds. Expenditures are equally distributed across all contributing programs in the same proportion as the program contribution. All expenses are paid from the pool and the determination of what fund is used is a simple proration calculation. For the FER and PCR, all expenditures should be prorated and then request or report funds based on that prorated amount. Therefore, if title I constitutes 29% and special ed. constitutes 22% of the building revenue, they are automatically 29% and 22% respectively of the expenditures.

1. **Supplement, Not Supplant (SNS)**

For supplement not supplant, Title I is a methodology test and for other programs the test can be rebutted by the LEA on a cost by cost basis. In other words, the LEA needs to be able to describe how the services would not be rendered in the absence of federal funds.

DEW guidance on Supplement Not Supplant can be found [here](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=83011).

*(Source: Jeremy Marks, Ohio Department of Education and Workforce)*

**Titles Other than Title I, Part A Requiring SNS**: For all other titles that require SNS, the compliance test is the same as before ESSA. In other words, when determining if supplanting has or has not occurred, it will depend on the individual facts and circumstances of each situation. Generally, the compliance test relies on three presumptions of supplanting:

1. Were the federal funds used to provide services required under other federal, state or local laws?
2. Were the federal funds used to provide services provided with nonfederal funds in the prior year?
3. Were the federal funds used to provide services to eligible students while those same services were provided to non-eligible students with nonfederal funds?

*(Sources: Ohio Department of Education and Workforce Office of Federal and State Grants Management,* [*https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=83011*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=83011)*.)*

A presumption of supplanting exists in situations where a treasurer is awarded a supplemental contract to manage Federal and state funds within a school district. Additionally, this same prohibition is present for direct charges to a Federal grant for a portion of the treasurer’s salary.

*(Source:*[*https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/documentlibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1039*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/documentlibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=1039) *)*

**Title I, Part A**: The compliance test for Supplement, Not Supplant for Title I, Part A was amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Under Section 1118 (b), no local educational agency (LEA) shall be required to identify that an individual cost or service supported under Title I, Part A is supplemental. Furthermore, no LEA shall be required to provide services under Title I, Part A through a particular instructional method or in a particular instructional setting in order to demonstrate compliance with SNS. Instead, to satisfy compliance with Title I, Part A SNS, a LEA shall demonstrate that the methodology used to allocate state and local funds to each school receiving assistance under Title I, Part A ensure that such school receives all the state and local funds it would otherwise receive if it were not receiving assistance under Title I, Part A.

In Ohio, for a LEA to satisfy compliance with Title I, Part A SNS, a LEA must select from one of two methodologies for distributing their non-federal funds among its schools. DEW has guidance in the CCIP Doc Library to assist districts with selecting a methodology.

*(Source:* [*https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=83011*](https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=83011) *and Ohio Department of Education and Workforce Office of Federal and State Grants Management)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

**Audit Objectives**

1. Obtain an understanding of internal control, assess risk, and test internal control as required by 2 CFR section 200.514(c).

2. *Level of Effort* – Determine whether specified service or expenditure levels were maintained.

3. *Earmarking* – Determine whether minimum or maximum limits for specified purposes or types of participants were met.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Control Documentation and Testing**

|  |
| --- |
| *Auditors should clearly document what control procedures address the compliance requirement. Reference or link to documentation or where testing was performed.*  **Basis for the control** *(Ex. reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors)*:  **Control Procedure** *(Description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct errors)*:  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** *(Title)*:  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** *(i.e. sampling unit)*: |

### Suggested Substantive Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| Consider the results of control testing above in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.  *(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*  *Steps Added by AOS CFAE*  **1.** **Matching** – *Not Applicable*  **2. Level of Effort**  **2.1** **Level of Effort** – *Maintenance of Effort*  a. Identify the required level of effort and perform tests to verify that the level of effort requirement was met. *Not required to be tested for amounts passed through DEW, see DEW pass-through steps below.*  b. Perform test to verify that only allowable categories of expenditures or other effort indicators (e.g., hours, number of people served) were included in the computation and that the categories were consistent from year to year. For example, in some programs, capital expenditures may not be included in the computation. *Not required to be tested for amounts passed through DEW, see DEW pass-through steps below.*  c. Perform procedures to verify that the amounts used in the computation were derived from the books and records from which the audited financial statements were prepared. *Tested in DEW pass-through steps section, below.*  d. Perform procedures to verify that non-monetary effort indicators were supported by official records. *Not required to be tested for amounts passed through DEW, see DEW pass-through steps below.*  **Additional DEW Pass-Through Steps:**  The Ohio Department of Education and Workforce performs the maintenance of effort calculation for all LEA’s. Auditors do not need to request copies of maintenance of effort computations for local school districts from DEW. LEA auditors need only test step c below to gain assurances over the amounts reported to DEW. Steps a, b, and d from the 2024 requirements in the OMB Compliance Supplement have been omitted from this FACCR.  Note: Clarification on MOE calculation and tests:  • FY 2024 allocations are affected by the MOE calculation performed in FY 2023  • FY 2023 MOE calculations compare FY 2023 to FY 2022  • Therefore, for FY 2024, we will test FY 2023 **and** FY 2022 information when performing the applicable steps (*if auditors tested FY2022 data in the prior audit, that testing can be leveraged rather than reperforming the same testing*).  c. Perform procedures to verify that the amounts used in the computation were derived from the books and records from which the audited financial statements were prepared. The procedures below have been designed to assist LEA auditors testing this step at the LEA level. The information below explains how to test certain EMIS report submissions for accuracy and completeness to satisfy this substantive step.  **Maintenance of Effort – LEA Annual ADM Substantive Testing Procedures:**  The Maintenance of Effort (MOE) module utilizes the final EMIS Student Reporting Period S (student FTE data) and EMIS Financial Period H (EXPD-002) data reported by LEAs to perform the MOE computation. This computation is tested during the State’s annual single audit. Auditors should not request this computation from DEW for LEA MOE testing. Instead, LEA auditors need only verify the amounts LEAs submit through EMIS to DEW for the MOE computation are accurate and complete based on the underlying books and records. LEA auditors should perform the steps that follow for Annual ADM and Financial Expenditure Reports.  The student FTE data used for MOE is the same as the data used by DEW to calculate funding for districts. DEW calculates these FTEs once and uses them for multiple purposes. This calculation is reviewed statewide as part of DEW’s annual audit. Therefore, the critical check at the local level is related to the data reported by each LEA to DEW to ensure that it is accurate. The FTE (ADM) audit procedures in the Ohio Compliance Supplement relating to Ohio Revised Code Sections 3317.01, 3317.02, 3317.03 (E), 3321.04, 3313.48, 3313.981(F) and 3321.04 and OAC 3301-35-06 for traditional schools and ORC Sections 3313.64, 3314.03, and 3314.08 for community schools review this data and can be relied upon for the ADM portion of the MOE review. As explained above, MOE calculations are based upon information spanning several years and we will be relying on 2022 **and** 2023 information/testing for 2024 (*if auditors tested FY2022 data in the prior audit, that testing can be leveraged rather than reperforming the same testing*).  The enrollment ADM portion of testing is the same for ESEA (i.e. #84.010 Title I, #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction, #84.287 Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers, etc.) and the Special Education IDEA Part B Cluster, so auditors may test it for one major program and leverage the testing for the other major program(s). However, **the Aggregate General Expenditures / Expenditures Per Pupil testing is different for ESEA and Special Education Cluster, so auditors must test that portion separately.**  If auditors are testing MOE procedures for one of the ESEA programs to which they apply (i.e. #84.010 Title I, #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction, #84.287 Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers, etc.), **both** the enrollment ADM and Aggregate General Expenditures procedures are the same, so auditors may test it for one major program and leverage the testing for the other program(s).  **Annual ADM Substantive Steps:**  **Ohio Compliance Supplement Testing**  Review the 2023 and 2022 work papers (if accessible) for the Ohio Compliance Supplement testing referenced above along with the Schedule of Findings and Management Letter to determine if any there were any issues reported regarding the code sections noted above regarding FTE.  **Aggregate General Expenditures Substantive Steps**:  EMIS Financial EPP Period H data should include District- and Building- Level financial information for aggregate “general expenditures” using the Expenditure Per Pupil Categories (EPP) described in DEW’s Expenditure Reports at <https://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Data/EMIS/EMIS-Documentation/FY16-EMIS-Validation-and-Report-Explanation-Docume> (EMIS Validation and Report Explanations). “General expenditures” include expenditures from the General Fund (001), 016, Poverty Aid (494), and State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (532). If the LEA operates a Schoolwide Pool, the LEA should also include the percentage of state and local funds included in its Schoolwide Fund (598) as “general expenditures” (i.e., this means the LEA will need to identify the percentage of state and local revenues receipted in Fund 598 in order to prorate the portion of state and local expenditures included in the Schoolwide Fund).  LEA Treasurers extract the required data elements for the appropriate period from the USAS system that automatically is loaded into EMIS or they manually upload a file into the EMIS system to complete the Period H report. All A-site consortiums, including NWOCA, receive a SOC audit. These reports are available in the AOS Internet Audit Search function. LEA auditors can use these reports to obtain assurances over the A-sites internal controls related to data files maintained in EMIS. However, there is still some risk of incomplete or inaccurate reporting at the LEA level (e.g., the LEA did not extract expenditure data for the appropriate time period from the includable EPP funds, functions, and objects, etc.).   * 1. Request the EMIS Coordinator or other District-designated official to run the following EMIS Period H, Financial Expenditure Per Pupil Categories (EPP) report for the fiscal years being tested (2023 and 2022):   EXPD-002 (Access: Data Collector/Archives/Collection Request>FYXX-H-Financial (Choose FY you are working with)/List Archives/Level 2 Reports (from 20XXH0000)/(EXPD-002))   * 1. Select a few key totals, subtotals, and line-items and compare these amounts to the expenditures recorded in the underlying USAS accounting system.   Scan EMIS Period H reports to ensure they include only the following types of expenditures, which are allowable under the Expenditure Per Pupil Categories (EPP) (i.e., expenditures related to the direct education of a student).  (a) Allowable maintenance of effort expenditures include state and local funds for free public education (administration, instruction, attendance and health services, pupil transportation services, operation and maintenance of plant, fixed charges, and net expenditures to cover deficits for food services and student body activities) made in accordance with the Per Pupil Categories (EPP).  (b) LEAs should exclude expenditures for community services, capital outlay, debt service, expenditures made as a fiscal agent, rotary, or supplemental expenses made as a result of a presidentially declared disaster and any expenditure made from funds provided by the Federal government from the EMIS Period H Financial expenditure reports.  Note: DEW confirmed that Debt Expenditures ARE to be EXCLUDED from the EMIS Period H financial expenditure reports.  Note: Auditors may choose to coordinate their scanning procedures with testing of non-Federal non-payroll transactions to ensure transactions were properly coded in accordance with the EPP. Our primary concern is whether unallowable transactions have been included, suggesting the LEA improperly reported expenditures from unallowable sources which could have been improperly included on DEW’s maintenance of effort computation.  **2.2** **Level of Effort** – *Supplement Not Supplant*  a. Ascertain if the non-Federal entity used Federal funds to provide services which they were required to make available under Federal, State, or local law and were also made available by funds subject to a supplement not supplant requirement.  b. Ascertain if the non-Federal entity used Federal funds to provide services which were provided with non-Federal funds in the prior year.  (1) Identify the federally funded services.  (2) Perform procedures to determine whether the Federal program funded services that were previously provided with non-Federal funds.  (3) Perform procedures to ascertain if the total level of services applicable to the requirement increased in proportion to the level of Federal contribution.  **Additional DEW Pass-Through Step: Title I, Part A**  c. *Not Applicable for AL #84.367*  **Additional DEW Pass-Through Step: Non-Title I Expenditures**  d. If there is a presumption of supplanting for a transaction, evaluate the supporting documentation for rebutting the presumption.  *Framework for Testing Supplement, Not Supplant, for School Treasurers*   1. *Determine the source of the funds for the payment & any restrictions on the use of the funds (i.e., grant term states that monies must be used exclusively on school supplies or teaching staff).*    1. *Was the source of the payment federal funds?*       1. *If no, no need to consider SNS compliance, proceed to 1.b. consideration of proper use of funds under state law or any other restrictions on the use of funds*       2. *If yes, proceed to 1.c.*    2. *Is the expenditure permissible based on any state restrictions or any other restrictions on the use of funds (i.e., state monies must be used to provide instruction only and cannot be used for staff compensation)?*       1. *If no, then follow normal AOS procedures for unallowable expenditures. There is no reason to consider federal supplanting or other state laws, stop testing here.*       2. *If yes, then skip to Step 4.*    3. *Is the payment permissible based on any federal restrictions on the use of funds (i.e., grant term states that monies must be used exclusively on school supplies or teaching staff)?*       1. *If no, then follow normal AOS procedures for unallowable expenditures. There is no reason to consider federal supplanting or other state laws, stop testing here.*       2. *If yes, then move to Step 2.* 2. *Is this an Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 program?*    1. *If no, is the supplanting prohibition applicable? Note: Supplanting was not applicable to ESSER funds.*       1. *If yes, then the prohibition is explicitly applicable to the program. Move to Step 3.*       2. *If no, then skip to Step 4.*    2. *If yes, is the source of the payment a Title I, Part A program?*       1. *If no, then move to Step 3.*       2. *If yes, does the district have any one of the following: (1) only one school building (OR) (2) only Title I schools (OR) (3) a grade span that contains only a single school, non-Title I schools, or Title I schools (no methodology required for this grade span) (OR) (4) a program that meets the intent and purpose of Title I, Part A (no methodology required for this program).*          1. *If yes, then no allocation methodology is required. Move to Step 4.*          2. *If no, is the LEA’s methodology for allocating non-federal resources Title I neutral? (i.e., based on estimated costs of staffing and supplies and NOT Title I status)*             1. *If no, there is a failure to comply with SNS Compliance. Report SNS Noncompliance. Stop testing here.*             2. *If yes, then satisfied SNS Compliance. Move to Step 4.* 3. *Does the LEA answer “yes,” to any of the following questions: (1) Was the activity supported with Title I, Part A funds required by State or local law?; (2) Was the activity supported with Title I, Part A funds supported in a prior year with State or local funds?; (3) Was the activity supported with Title I, Part A funds in a Title I school supported with State or local funds in a non-Title I school?*   *Note: The answer for School Treasurer compensation will be yes to Question 1, unless R.C. sections 3313.29 and 3313.31 change in the future.*   * 1. *If yes, can the LEA demonstrate that it would not have been able to provide the services/activity in question with non-Federal funds had the Federal funds not been available?*      1. *If no, then report SNS Noncompliance. Stop testing here.*      2. *If yes, then there has been SNS Compliance. Move to Step 4.*   2. *If no, then move to Step 4.*  1. *Is the payment a part of the original contract(s) that was entered when the school district acted pursuant to R.C. 3313.24(A) (i.e, when the district board set the compensation for the treasurer)?*    1. *If yes, was the payment made directly from the general fund or other fund(s)?*       1. *General Fund, this is permissible. Testing stops here.*       2. *Other Fund(s), consult with CFAE via FACCR Inbox (IPA) or Spiceworks (AOS Auditors) for further information regarding the method for reimbursing the general fund for any allowable portions.*    2. *If no, then the payment is an increase in the compensation under the original contract(s)/resolution setting the compensation amount and is permissible pursuant to 3313.24(B). Was the payment made directly from the general fund or other fund(s)?*       1. *General Fund, this is permissible. Testing stops here.*       2. *Other Fund(s), this is permissible so long as the moneys in the fund could be used for that purpose and it comports with accounting guidance from AOS. Testing stops here.*   **3. Earmarking**  a. Identify the applicable percentage or dollar requirements for earmarking.  b. Perform procedures to verify that the amounts recorded in the financial records met the requirements (e.g., when a minimum amount is required to be spent for a specified type of service, perform procedures to verify that the financial records show that at least the minimum amount for this type of service was charged to the program; or, when the amount spent on a specified type of service may not exceed a maximum amount, perform procedures to verify that the financial records show no more than this maximum amount for the specified type of service was charged to the program).  c. When earmarking requirements specify a minimum percentage or amount, select a sample of transactions supporting the specified amount or percentage and perform tests to verify proper classification to meet the minimum percentage or amount.  d. When the earmarking requirements specify a maximum percentage or amount, review the financial records to identify transactions for the specified activity which were improperly classified in another account (e.g., if only 10 percent may be spent for administrative costs, review accounts for other than administrative costs to identify administrative costs which were improperly classified elsewhere and cause the maximum percentage or amount to be exceeded).  **Additional DEW Pass-Through Steps:**  Transferability  (a) For funds transferred during a fiscal year’s carryover period, ensure the total amount transferred from the fiscal year’s allocation base does not exceed the maximum percentage.  (b) Ensure funds are transferred to the receiving program’s allocation for the same fiscal year that the funds were allocated to the transferring program.  e. When earmarking requirements prescribe the minimum number or percentage of specified types of participants that can be served, select a sample of participants that are counted toward meeting the minimum requirement and perform tests to verify that they were properly classified.  f. When earmarking requirements prescribe the maximum number or percentage of specified types of participants that can be served, select a sample of other participants and perform tests to verify that they were not of the specified type. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| *Consider the adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies/material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments.*  *Auditors should review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*   1. **Results of Test of Controls:** *(including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)* 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive) Test including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## M. SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

OMB Note: Transfers of Federal awards to another component of the same auditee under 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart F, do not constitute a subrecipient or contractor relationship.

### OMB Compliance Requirements

A pass-through entity (PTE) must:

- *Identify the Award* *and Applicable Requirements* – Clearly identify to the subrecipient: (1) the award as a subaward at the time of subaward (or subsequent subaward modification) by providing the information described in 2 CFR 200.332(a)(1); (2) all requirements imposed by the PTE on the subrecipient so that the Federal award is used in accordance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award (2 CFR 200.332(a)(2)); and (3) any additional requirements that the PTE imposes on the subrecipient in order for the PTE to meet its own responsibility for the Federal award (e.g., financial, performance, and special reports) (2 CFR 200.332(a)(3)).

- *Evaluate Risk* – Evaluate each subrecipient’s risk of noncompliance for purposes of determining the appropriate subrecipient monitoring related to the subaward (2 CFR 200.331(b)). This evaluation of risk may include consideration of such factors as the following:

1. The subrecipient’s prior experience with the same or similar subawards;
2. The results of previous audits including whether or not the subrecipient receives single audit in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart F, and the extent to which the same or similar subaward has been audited as a major program;
3. Whether the subrecipient has new personnel or new or substantially changed systems; and
4. The extent and results of Federal awarding agency monitoring (e.g., if the subrecipient also receives Federal awards directly from a Federal awarding agency).

- *Monitor* – Monitor the activities of the subrecipient as necessary to ensure that the subaward is used for authorized purposes, complies with the terms and conditions of the subaward, and achieves performance goals (2 CFR 200.332(d) through (f)). In addition to procedures identified as necessary based upon the evaluation of subrecipient risk or specifically required by the terms and conditions of the award, subaward monitoring must include the following:

1. Reviewing financial and programmatic (performance and special reports) required by the PTE.
2. Following-up and ensuring that the subrecipient takes timely and appropriate action on all deficiencies pertaining to the Federal award provided to the subrecipient from the PTE detected through audits, on-site reviews, and other means.
3. Issuing a management decision for audit findings pertaining to the Federal award provided to the subrecipient from the PTE as required by 2 CFR 200.521.

* *Ensure Accountability of For-Profit Subrecipients* – Some Federal awards may be passed through to for-profit entities. For-profit subrecipients are accountable to the PTE for the use of the Federal funds provided. Because 2 CFR Part 200 does not make Subpart F applicable to for-profit subrecipients, the PTE is responsible for establishing requirements, as necessary, to ensure compliance by for-profit subrecipients for the subaward. The agreement with the for-profit subrecipient must describe applicable compliance requirements and the for-profit subrecipient's compliance responsibility. Methods to ensure compliance for Federal awards made to for-profit subrecipients may include pre-award audits, monitoring during the agreement, and post-award audits (2 CFR 200.501(h)).

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for subrecipient monitoring for the subaward are contained in 31 USC 7502(f)(2) (Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 (Pub. L. No. 104-156)), 2 CFR 200.332 and 2 CFR 200.501(h); Federal awarding agency regulations; and the terms and conditions of the award.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

No Part 4 OMB Program Specific Compliance Requirements

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**Add program specific requirements from:**

* **The individual grant application, agreement, and policies, and**
* **Federal agency guidance not included in the compliance supplement (such as federal agency grant manuals, references to CFR, etc.)**

**Be sure to indicate the source of your information. If no additional requirements are noted, indicate as such.**

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

**Audit Objectives**

1. Obtain an understanding of internal control, assess risk, and test internal control as required by 2 CFR section 200.514(c).

2. Determine whether the PTE identified the subaward and applicable requirements at the time of the subaward (or subsequent subaward modification) in the terms and conditions of the subaward and other award documents sufficient for the PTE to comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.

3. Determine whether the PTE monitored subrecipient activities to provide reasonable assurance that the subrecipient administered the subaward in compliance with the terms and conditions of the subaward.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Control Documentation and Testing**

|  |
| --- |
| *Auditors should clearly document what control procedures address the compliance requirement. Reference or link to documentation or where testing was performed.*  **Basis for the control** *(Ex. reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors)*:  **Control Procedure** *(Description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct errors)*:  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** *(Title)*:  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** *(i.e. sampling unit)*: |

### Suggested Substantive Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| Consider the results of control testing above in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.  The auditor may consider coordinating the tests related to subrecipients performed as part of C., “Cash Management” (tests of cash reporting submitted by subrecipients); E., “Eligibility” (tests that subawards were made only to eligible subrecipients); I., “Procurement and Suspension and Debarment” (tests of ensuring that a subrecipient is not suspended or debarred), and L, “Reporting (tests of performance data reported to funding sources) with the testing of M, “Subrecipient Monitoring.”  *(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*  ***AOS Auditors:*** *Steps marked with an asterisk (\*) are addressed via the attributes in subrecipient monitoring Federal Testing Template available on the Intranet.*   1. Review the pass-through entity’s (PTE’s) subrecipient monitoring policies and procedures to gain an understanding of the PTE’s process to identify subawards, evaluate risk of noncompliance, and perform monitoring procedures based upon identified risks.   **\***2. Review subaward documents including the terms and conditions of the subaward to ascertain if, at the time of subaward (or subsequent subaward modification), the PTE made the subrecipient aware of the award information required by 2 CFR 200.332(a) sufficient for the PTE to comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.  **\***3. Review the PTE’s documentation of monitoring the subaward and consider if the PTE’s monitoring provided reasonable assurance that the subrecipient used the subaward for authorized purposes in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the subaward.  **\***4. Ascertain if the PTE verified that subrecipients expected to be audited as required by 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart F, met this requirement (2 CFR 200.332(f)). This verification may be performed as part of the required monitoring under 2 CFR 200.332(d)(2) to ensure that the subrecipient takes timely and appropriate action on deficiencies detected though audits. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| *Consider the adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies/material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments.*  *Auditors should review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*   1. **Results of Test of Controls:** *(including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies, and management letter items)* 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive) Test including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## N. SPECIAL TESTS AND PROVISIONS – Participation of Private School Children

### OMB Compliance Requirements

The specific requirements for Special Tests and Provisions are unique to each Federal program and are found in the statutes, regulations, and the provisions of contract or grant agreements pertaining to the program. For programs listed in this Supplement, the compliance requirements, audit objectives, and suggested audit procedures for Special Tests and Provisions are in Part 4, “Agency Program Requirements.” or Part 5. “Clusters of Programs.” For programs not included in this Supplement, the auditor must review the program’s contract and grant agreements and referenced statutes and regulations to identify the compliance requirements and develop the audit objectives and audit procedures for Special Tests and Provisions which could have a direct and material effect on a major program. The auditor should also inquire of the non-Federal entity to help identify and understand any Special Tests and Provisions.

Additionally, both for programs included and not included in this Supplement, the auditor must identify any additional compliance requirements which are not based in statute or regulation (e.g., were agreed to as part of audit resolution of prior audit findings) which could be material to a major program. Reasonable procedures to identify such compliance requirements would be inquiry of non-Federal entity management and review of the contract and grant agreements pertaining to the program. Any such requirements which may have a direct and material effect on compliance with the requirements of that major program shall be included in the audit.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

No Part 4 OMB Program Specific Compliance Requirements

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Education, AL #84.367 Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants)*

***US Department of Education Crosscutting Information***

*ESEA programs in this Supplement to which this section applies are Title I, Part A (84.010); MEP (84.011); 21st CCLC (84.287); Title III, Part A (84.365); Title II, Part A (84.367); and Title IV, Part A (84.424).*

*This section also applies to ESSER I and GEER I (84.425C and D), as well as ESF-SEA, ESF II-SEA, ESF-Governor, ESF II-Governor, and ARP-OA SEA (84.425A, H, and X, respectively).*

Depending on how the SEA/LEA implements requirements for the provision of equitable participation of private school children, this requirement may be tested on a general or program-specific basis (as described in the Introduction, “Cross-Cutting Requirements”).

*Compliance Requirements*

For programs funded under Title I, Part A (Assistance Listing 84.010), an LEA, after timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials, must provide equitable services to eligible private school children, their teachers, and their families. Eligible private school children are those who reside in a participating public school attendance area and have educational needs under Section 1115(c) of the ESEA (20 USC 6315(c)). The amount of funds an LEA makes available for equitable services under Title I, Part A must be equal to the proportion of funds generated by private school children from low-income families who reside in participating public school attendance areas. An LEA must determine the proportional share available for services for eligible private school children based on the total amount of Title I funds received prior to any expenditures or transfers of funds within the program, such as reservations for administration, parental involvement, and district-wide activities (20 USC 6320(a)(4)(A)). LEAs determine the proportional share by multiplying the proportion of children from low-income families who attend private schools and live in participating Title I attendance areas by the LEA’s total Title I allocation (including any funds transferred into Title I). For more information, see Title I, Part A of the ESEA: Providing Equitable Services to Eligible Private School Children, Teachers, and Families (October 7, 2019) (<https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/07/equitable-services-guidance-100419.pdf>).

For programs under Title VIII of the ESEA (Assistance Listing 84.011, 84.365, 84.367, and 84.424), ESF-SEA I (Assistance Listing 84.425A), and ESF-Governor I (Assistance Listing 84.425H), an agency, consortium, or entity receiving financial assistance under an applicable program must provide eligible private school children and their teachers or other educational personnel with equitable services or other benefits under the program. Before an agency, consortium, or entity makes any decision that affects the opportunity of eligible private school children, teachers, and other educational personnel to participate, the agency, consortium, or entity must engage in timely and meaningful consultation with private school officials. Expenditures for services and benefits to eligible private school children and their teachers and other educational personnel must be equal on a per-pupil basis to the expenditures for participating public school children and their teachers and other educational personnel, taking into account the number and educational needs of the children, teachers and other educational personnel to be served (Section 8501 of ESEA (20 USC 7881); 34 CFR sections 299.6 through 299.9).

For programs under ESSER I and GEER I (Assistance Listing 84.425C and D), an LEA that receives funds under one or both of those programs must provide equitable services in the same manner as provided under section 1117 of Title I, Part A of the ESEA (20 USC 6320) (Assistance Listing 84.010) to students and teachers in private schools as determined in consultation with private school officials (section 18005(a) of the CARES Act). To meet this requirement, an LEA must determine the proportional share of ESSER I or GEER I funds available for equitable services in accordance with section 1117(a)(4)(A) of the ESEA (20 USC 6320(a)(4)(A)). Consistent with the guidance referenced below, under ESSER I and GEER I, the LEA in which a private school is located is responsible for providing equitable services to students and teachers in the school. With respect to the provision of services, in general all students and teachers in a private school are eligible to receive equitable services under ESSER I and GEER I. However, an LEA may limit eligibility to students who are low-achieving and reside in a Title I public school attendance area in the LEA consistent with the Title I, Part A equitable services requirements in section 1117 of the ESEA. In addition, if a Governor (under GEER I) or an SEA (through the SEA reserve fund under ESSER I) targets funds for a specific purpose or population of public school students, an LEA may similarly target services for private school students. For more information, see questions 4 and 7–11 in Providing Equitable Services to Students and Teachers in Non-Public Schools under the CARES Act Programs (Oct. 9, 2020) (<https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/10/Providing-Equitable-Services-under-the-CARES-Act-Programs-Update-10-9-2020.pdf>).

An LEA that receives funds under ESSER II, ARP ESSER, or GEER II is not required to provide equitable services to students and teachers in private schools.

For programs under ESF-SEA, ESF II-SEA, ESF-Governor, ESF II-Governor, and ARPOA SEA, SEAs and governors will ensure that equitable services, as determined through timely and meaningful consultation with non-public school officials, will be provided to students and teachers in non-public elementary and secondary schools in the same manner as provided under section 8501 of the ESEA.

The control of funds used to provide equitable services to eligible private school students, teachers and other educational personnel, and families, and title to materials, equipment, and property purchased with those funds must be in a public agency and the public agency must administer the funds, materials, equipment, and property. The provision of equitable services must be by employees of a public agency or through a contract by the public agency with an individual, association, agency, or organization that is independent of the private school. The contract must be under the control of the public agency (Sections 1117(d), and 8501(d) of ESEA (20 USC 6320(d), and 7881(d); section 18005(b) of the CARES Act; 34 CFR sections 76.661, 200.64(b)(3), 200.67, and 299.9).

These compliance requirements also apply to transfers from *Title II, Part A (84.367)* and *Title IV, Part A (84.424)* (Section 5103(e)(2) of ESEA (20 USC 7305b(e)(2)), as provided in III.A.3, “Activities Allowed or Unallowed – Transferability”).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**Add program specific requirements from:**

* **The individual grant application, agreement, and policies, and**
* **Federal agency guidance not included in the compliance supplement (such as federal agency grant manuals, references to CFR, etc.)**

**Be sure to indicate the source of your information. If no additional requirements are noted, indicate as such.**

See DEW’s “Nonpublic School Service Questions and Answers” for further info - <https://ccip.ode.state.oh.us/DocumentLibrary/ViewDocument.aspx?DocumentKey=80988>

*(Source: Ohio Department of Education and Workforce Office of Federal Programs)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

**Audit Objectives**

1. Obtain an understanding of internal control, assess risk, and test internal control as required by 2 CFR section 200.514(c).

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

1. Determine whether (1) an LEA, SEA, or other agency receiving ESEA funds, an LEA receiving ESSER I or GEER I funds (84.425C and D), and an OA SEA or Governor receiving ESF-SEA, ESF II-SEA, ESF-Governor, ESF II-Governor, and ARP-OA SEA (84.425A, H, and X, respectively) has conducted timely consultation with private school officials to determine the kind of educational services to provide to eligible private school children, (2) the planned services were provided, and (3) the required amount was used for private school children.

*(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Department of Education Crosscutting Procedures)*

**Control Documentation and Testing**

|  |
| --- |
| *Auditors should clearly document what control procedures address the compliance requirement. Reference or link to documentation or where testing was performed.*  **Basis for the control** *(Ex. reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors)*:  **Control Procedure** *(Description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct errors)*:  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** *(Title)*:  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** *(i.e. sampling unit)*: |

### Suggested Substantive Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| Consider the results of control testing above in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.  *(Source: 2024 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*   * 1. Verify, by reviewing minutes of meetings and other appropriate documents, that the agency, consortium, or entity conducted timely consultation with private school officials in making its determinations and set aside the required amount for private school children.   2. Review program expenditure and other records to verify that educational services that were planned were provided.   3. For Title I, Part A, verify that the amount of funds available for equitable services in an LEA was determined by multiplying the proportion of private school children from low-income families residing in participating public school attendance areas by the LEA’s total Title I, Part A allocation.   4. If an agency, consortium, or entity provides services to eligible private school students under an arrangement with a third-party provider, verify that the agency, consortium, or entity retains proper administration and control by having a written contract that:      1. Describes the services to be provided; and      2. Provides that the agency, consortium, or entity retains ownership of materials, equipment, and property purchased with Federal I funds.   5. For programs other than Title I, Part A, ESSER I, and GEER I, verify that expenditures are equal on a per-pupil basis for public and private school students, teachers, and other educational personnel, taking into consideration their numbers and needs as required by 34 CFR section 299.7. Please note that all students and teachers in a non-public school are eligible to receive equitable services under the CARES Act programs, unless a Governor (under the GEER Fund) or an SEA (through the SEA reserve under the ESSER Fund) targets funds for a specific purpose or population of public and non-public school students. If a Governor or SEA does this, then equitable services would also be limited. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| *Consider the adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies/material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments.*  *Auditors should review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*   1. **Results of Test of Controls:** *(including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)* 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive) Test including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## Program Testing Conclusion

We have performed procedures sufficient to provide reasonable assurance for federal award program compliance requirements (to support our opinions). The procedures performed, relevant evidence obtained, and our conclusions are adequately documented. (If you are unable to conclude, prepare a memo documenting your reason and the implications for the engagement, including the audit reports.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conclusion** | | |
| **The opinion on this major program should be:** | |  |
| **Unmodified:** |  | |
| **Qualified (describe):** |  | |
| **Adverse (describe):** |  | |
| **Disclaimer (describe):** |  | |

Per paragraph 13.39 of the AICPA *Single Audit* Guide**[Permalink to here](https://checkpoint.riag.com/app/view/docPermaLink?DocID=iAICPAIGS:767.2440&docTid=T0AICPAIGS:767.2440-1&feature=ttoc&lastCpReqId=97899&tlltype=AICPAIGS:767.2668)**, the following are required to be reportedas audit findings in the federal awards section of the schedule of findings and questioned costs(2 CFR 200.516)**:**

1. Significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in internal control over major programs.
2. Material noncompliance with the federal statues, regulations, or the terms and conditions of federal awards related to a major program.
3. Known questioned costs that are greater than $25,000 for a type of compliance requirement for a major program. The auditor also must report (in the schedule of findings and questioned costs) known questioned costs when likely questioned costs are greater than $25,000 for a type of compliance requirement for a major program.
4. Known questioned costs that are greater than $25,000 for programs that are not audited as major.
5. Known or likely fraud affecting a federal award, unless such fraud is otherwise reported as an audit finding in the schedule of findings and questioned costs.
6. Significant instances of abuse relating to major programs.
7. The circumstances concerning why the opinion in the auditor's report on compliance for major programs is other than an unmodified opinion, unless such circumstances are otherwise reported as audit findings in the schedule of findings and questioned costs (for example, a scope limitation that is not otherwise reported as a finding).
8. Instances in which the results of audit follow-up procedures disclosed that the summary schedule of prior audit findings prepared by the auditee in accordance with 2 CFR 200.511(b) of the Uniform Guidance, materially misrepresents the status of any prior audit finding.

[Appendix I](2_CFR_Part_200.pdf) lists block grants and other programs excluded from the requirements of specified portions of 2 CFR Part 200.

*Auditors must review the Federal agency adoption of the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR Part 200) and nonprocurement suspension and debarment requirements (2 CFR Part 180) prior to issuing noncompliance citations to verify the Federal agency requirements. Auditors should also review this* [*link*](Agency_Adoption_of_the_UG_and_Example_Citations.pdf) *for a discussion on how to cite non-compliance exceptions based on agency adoption of the UG.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-reference to internal control matters (significant deficiencies or material weaknesses), if any, documented in the FACCR:** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-reference to questioned costs and matter of noncompliance, if any, documented in this FACCR:** |
|  |

Per paragraph 13.50 of the AICPA *Single Audit* Guide, the schedule of findings and questioned costs must include all audit findings required to be reported under the Uniform Guidance. A separate written communication (such as a communication sometimes referred to as a management letter) may not be used to communicate such matters to the auditee in lieu of reporting them as audit findings in accordance with the Uniform Guidance. See the discussion beginning at paragraph 13.34 for information on Uniform Guidance requirements for the schedule of findings and questioned costs. If there are other matters that do not meet the Uniform Guidance requirements for reporting but, in the auditor's judgment, warrant the attention those charged with governance, they should be communicated in writing or verbally. If such a communication is provided in writing to the auditee, there is no requirement for that communication to be referenced in the Uniform Guidance compliance report. Per table 13-2 a matter must meet the following in order to be communicated in the management letter:

* Other deficiencies in internal control over compliance that are not significant deficiencies or material weaknesses required to be reported but, in the auditor's judgment, are of sufficient importance to be communicated to management.
* Noncompliance with federal statutes, regulations or terms and conditions of federal awards related to a major program that does not meet the criteria for reporting under the Uniform Guidance but, in the auditor's judgment, is of sufficient importance to communicate to management or those charged with governance.
* Other findings or issues arising from the compliance audit that are not otherwise required to be reported but are, in the auditor's professional judgment, significant and relevant to those charged with governance.

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-reference to any Management Letter items and explain why not included in the Single Audit Compliance Report:** |
|  |