

## Oversight Visit Report

November 19, 2015

To the Massachusetts Society of CPAs  
Peer Review Committee

We have reviewed the Massachusetts Society of CPAs' administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program as part of our oversight program. Our procedures were conducted in conformity with the guidance established by the AICPA Peer Review Board (board) as contained in the *AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Handbook*. The administering entity is responsible for administering the AICPA Peer Review Program in compliance with the *AICPA Standards for Performing and Reporting on Peer Reviews*, interpretations, and other guidance established by the board. Our responsibility is to determine whether (1) administering entities are complying with the administrative procedures established by the board as set forth in the *AICPA Peer Review Program Administrative Manual*, (2) the reviews are being conducted and reported upon in accordance with the standards, (3) the results of the reviews are being evaluated on a consistent basis by all administering entity peer review committees, and (4) information disseminated by administering entities is accurate and timely.

Based on the results of the procedures performed, we have concluded that the Massachusetts Society of CPAs has complied with the administrative procedures and standards in all material respects as established by the board.

As is customary, we have issued a letter of oversight visit procedures and observations that details the oversight procedures performed and sets forth recommendations that were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the conclusions expressed in this report.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael L. LeBlanc".

Michael L. LeBlanc, Member, Oversight Task Force  
AICPA Peer Review Program

January 25, 2016

To the Massachusetts Society of CPAs  
Peer Review Committee

We have reviewed the Massachusetts Society of CPAs' administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program as part of our oversight program and have issued our report thereon dated November 19, 2015. That report should be read in conjunction with the observations in this letter, which were considered in determining our conclusions. The observations described below were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the conclusions expressed in that report.

The oversight visit was conducted according to the procedures in the *AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Handbook*. An oversight program is designed to improve the administering entity's administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program through feedback on its policies and procedures and to provide resource assistance from an AICPA Peer Review Board Oversight Task Force member on both technical and administrative matters.

In conjunction with the oversight visit of the Massachusetts Society of CPAs, the administering entity for the program, conducted on November 18 and 19, 2015, the following observations are being communicated.

### **Administrative Procedures**

On the morning of November 18, 2015, Beth Thoresen, Director – Peer Review Operations and I met with the director of peer review to review the program's administration. We believe the administrative processes were being handled in a manner consistent with peer review standards.

We reviewed the files which were still open due to follow-up actions, which had not yet been completed. We found that the follow-up actions were being effectively monitored for completion by the administrative staff and the peer review committee.

We also reviewed the policies and procedures for the granting of extensions. I found that the peer review manager handles short-term requests with discussion with the committee when circumstances warrant.

Additionally, we reviewed the timeliness of the scheduling process, technical reviews and the preparation of acceptance letters and follow-up letters. We found no problems in these areas.

Also, we reviewed the timeliness of the preparation of poor performance and tardiness letters and found these were being issued in a timely and appropriate manner.

The Society has developed a back-up plan to support all peer review staff members should one of them become unable to serve in their capacity.

## **Web Site and Other Media Information**

We met with the director of peer review to review the administering entity's procedures to determine if the information disseminated regarding the AICPA Peer Review Program by the administering entity on their Web site and other media information is accurate and timely.

After AICPA staff's review of the Web site material and other media information, we noted that the administering entity maintains current information as it relates to the peer review program. In addition, the administrative entity has an individual who is responsible for maintaining the peer review section of the Web site and monitors the Web site on a periodic basis to ensure peer review information is accurate and timely.

## **Working Paper Retention**

We reviewed the completed working papers and found compliance with the working paper retention policy.

## **Technical Review Procedures**

I met with the technical reviewer to discuss procedures. He performs a majority of the technical reviews and is an experienced reviewer.

I reviewed the reports, letters of response, if applicable, and the work papers for 15 reviews in preparation for the November 19, 2015 RAB meeting. I believe that all review issues were addressed properly by the technical reviewer before reviews were presented to the committee. This helped the acceptance process to be effective and efficient.

## **Review Presentation**

Reviews are brought to the committee without open technical issues. Accordingly, it was not necessary for the committee to spend a great deal of time reviewing specific technical issues.

## **Committee Procedures**

I met with the committee chair and discussed their procedures for disseminating the comments resulting from the AICPA working paper oversights to the appropriate individuals. It was determined the committee issued reviewer feedback when appropriate.

On November 19, 2015, we sat in on portions of an on-site RAB meeting, as well as the society's committee meeting. We observed the RABs' acceptance process and offered our comments at the close of discussions. It was apparent that the RAB members had thoroughly reviewed the reports and working papers prior to the meeting, and had a good understanding of the program in order to reach an appropriate decision for each review.

Appropriate decisions were made in the acceptance process, appropriate follow-up actions were assigned and reviewers were being appropriately monitored. Reviews were being presented to the RABs on a timely basis.

## **Oversight Program**

The Massachusetts Society of CPAs' peer review committee has adopted a formal oversight program which is well documented. I reviewed the document and procedures performed and found it to be comprehensive.

## Summary

There are no further observations to be communicated to the Massachusetts Society of CPAs.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael L. LeBlanc". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent initial "M".

Michael L. LeBlanc, Member, Oversight Task Force  
AICPA Peer Review Program