

**SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS**

**APRIL 1, 2006 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2006**

**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS**

October 30, 2006

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Dana Gioia  
Chairman

FROM: Daniel L. Shaw  
Inspector General

SUBJECT: **Semiannual Report to the Congress: April 1, 2006 – September 30, 2006**

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-452), as amended, calls for the preparation of semiannual reports to the Congress summarizing the activities of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the six-month periods ending each March 31 and September 30. I am pleased to enclose the report for the period from April 1, 2006 to September 30, 2006.

The Inspector General's report covers audits, evaluations, investigations and other reviews conducted by the OIG as well as our review of the OMB Circular A-133 audits conducted by independent auditors. The report also indicates the status of management decisions whether to implement or not to implement recommendations made by the OIG. The President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency developed the reporting formats for Tables I and II to ensure consistent presentation by the Federal agencies. The tables provide only summary totals and do not include a breakdown by auditee.

The Act requires that you transmit this report to the appropriate committees of the Congress within 30 days of receipt, together with any comments you may wish to make. Comments that you might offer should be included in your "Report on Final Action," a management report that is required to be submitted along with the Inspector General's report. We will work closely with your staff to assist in the preparation of the management report. The due date for submission of both reports is November 30, 2006.

I appreciate the continuing support we have received from the Chairman's Office and your managers throughout the Agency. Working together, I believe we have taken positive steps to improve Agency programs and operations. We look forward to continuing these efforts.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS</b>	1
<b>OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL</b>	1
<b>SUMMARY OF WORK COMPLETED BY THE OIG</b>	2
Audits/Reviews	2
Audit Resolution	2
Investigations	2
Indirect Cost Rate Negotiations	2
Review of Legislation, Rules, Regulations and Other Issuances	3
Technical Assistance	3
Web Site	3
Other Activities	3
Strategic Plan & Five-Year Audit Plan	3
<b>SECTIONS OF REPORT</b>	4
<u><b>SECTION 1</b></u> - Significant Problems, Abuses and Deficiencies	4
<u><b>SECTION 2</b></u> - Recommendations for Corrective Action	4
<u><b>SECTION 3</b></u> - Recommendations in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Implemented	4
<u><b>SECTION 4</b></u> - Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities	4
<u><b>SECTION 5</b></u> - Denials of Access to Records	4
<u><b>SECTION 6</b></u> - Listing of Reports Issued	5
<u><b>SECTION 7</b></u> - Listing of Particularly Significant Reports	6
<u><b>SECTION 8</b></u> - Statistical Tables Showing Total Number of Audit Reports and the Dollar Value of Questioned Costs	6
<u><b>SECTION 9</b></u> - Statistical Tables Showing Total Number of Audit Reports and the Dollar Value of Recommendations that Funds be Put to Better Use by Management	6
<u><b>SECTION 10</b></u> - Audit Reports Issued Before the Commencement of the Reporting Period for Which No Management Decision Has Been Made by the End of the Reporting Period	6

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b><u>SECTION 11</u></b> - Significant Revised Management Decisions Made During the Period	6
<b><u>SECTION 12</u></b> - Significant Management Decisions With Which the Inspector General Disagrees	6
<b>TABLE I</b> - Inspector General Issued Reports With Questioned Costs	7
<b>TABLE II</b> - Inspector General Issued Reports With Recommendations That Funds Be Put To Better Use	8
<b>Definitions of Terms Used</b>	Appendix A

## **NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS**

Since its founding by the U.S. Congress in 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) has offered assistance to a wide range of non-profit organizations and individuals that carry out arts programming. The NEA supports exemplary projects in all the artistic disciplines. Grants are awarded for specific projects rather than for general operating or seasonal support. Most NEA grants must be matched dollar for dollar with non-federal funds. During FY 2006, NEA received a net appropriation of \$124.406 million, which includes both the rescission required by the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act and the government-wide across-the-board rescission required by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The Agency has requested \$124.412 million for FY 2007, which would support an annualized FTE level estimated at 158. In May 2006, the U.S. House of Representatives approved \$129.412 million for FY 2007, an increase of \$5 million above the President's request. In June 2006, the Senate Appropriation's Committee provided \$124.4 million, the same level as enacted in FY 2006. No further action was taken on the Agency's appropriation prior to the Congressional recess. Therefore, as provided in the FY 2007 Defense Appropriations Bill, the Agency is operating under a continuing resolution for the period October 1 through November 17, 2006.

## **OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

On October 18, 1988, the President signed Public Law 100-504, the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988. This law amended the Inspector General Act of 1978, Public Law 95-452, and required the establishment of independent Offices of Inspector General (OIG) at several designated Federal entities and establishments, including the National Endowment for the Arts. The Inspector General is appointed by and serves under the general supervision of the NEA's Chairman. The mission of the OIG is to:

- Conduct and supervise independent and objective audits and investigations relating to NEA programs and operations;
- Promote economy, effectiveness and efficiency within the NEA;
- Prevent and detect fraud, waste and abuse in NEA programs and operations;
- Review and make recommendations regarding existing and proposed legislation and regulations relating to NEA programs and operations; and
- Keep the NEA Chairman and the Congress fully and currently informed of problems in Agency programs and operations.

This semiannual report summarizes the OIG's major activities, initiatives and results for the six-month period ending September 30, 2006. During this period, the OIG consisted of two auditors and one program analyst. There is no investigator on the staff. In order to provide a reactive investigative capability, we have signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Inspector General of the General Services Administration (GSA) whereby the GSA's OIG agrees to provide investigative coverage for us on a reimbursable basis as needed. (No investigative coverage from GSA was needed during the recent six-month period.) We have also signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the NEA's Office of General Counsel (OGC) that details procedures to be used for providing the OIG with legal services. An OGC staff member has been assigned to provide such services on an as-needed basis.

## **SUMMARY OF WORK COMPLETED BY THE OIG**

During the six-month period ending September 30, 2006, the OIG conducted the following audits, reviews, investigations and other activities.

### **Audits/Reviews**

During the recent semiannual period, the OIG issued 19 reports. Of those, 15 reports were based on audits/reviews performed by OIG personnel and four reports were the result of OIG desk reviews of audit reports relating to grantee organizations that were required to have audits performed by independent auditors. Overall, our reports contained 34 recommendations, 26 of which were related to systems deficiencies at grantee organizations, while the remaining eight recommendations related to systems deficiencies at the NEA.

### **Audit Resolution**

At the beginning of the six-month period, there were seven reports awaiting a management decision to allow or disallow questioned costs. During the period, none of the newly issued reports identified any questioned costs or any potential refunds.

Management decisions were made on five of the seven open reports to allow questioned costs of \$755,581 and to disallow costs of \$20,142. As a result of the five decisions, a refund of \$45,817 was received. Therefore, at the end of the period, two reports remained outstanding with questioned costs of \$425,449 and potential refunds of \$84,318. (See both Section 10 on page 6 and Table I.)

### **Investigations**

The OIG opened one new allegation case and closed the same case during the recent six-month period. There were no prior open cases to start the period. No criminal investigations were performed during the period.

### **Indirect Cost Rate Negotiations**

Indirect costs are incurred for common or joint objectives, which cannot be readily and specifically identified with a particular project or activity. The costs of operating and maintaining facilities, depreciation or use allowances, and administrative salaries and supplies are typical examples of costs that nonprofit organizations usually consider to be indirect.

Indirect cost rates are negotiated by agreement between a non-Federal organization and a Federal agency (usually the agency that furnishes the preponderance of Federal funding) that acts on behalf of all Federal agencies in approving rates with the organization. During this period, the OIG negotiated six indirect cost rate agreements with NEA grantee organizations.

The OIG also makes use of an Indirect Cost Guide. The Guide answers such questions as: What are direct or indirect costs, what is an indirect cost rate, and does an entity need an indirect cost rate? A copy of the Guide can be found on NEA's web site at [www.arts.gov/about/OIG/IndirectCost.html](http://www.arts.gov/about/OIG/IndirectCost.html).

## **Review of Legislation, Rules, Regulations and Other Issuances**

The OIG is required to review and comment on proposed legislation and regulations for their potential impact on the Agency and its operations. During this reporting period, the OIG provided analyses and written commentaries on Agency Administrative Directives, and other government publications/reports.

## **Technical Assistance**

The OIG provided technical assistance to NEA grantees and their independent auditors. Our efforts included, for example, clarifying and interpreting the audit requirements of OMB Circular A-133, "*Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*," explaining alternative methods of accounting for indirect costs, and advising some of the first-time and smaller organizations on implementing practical accounting systems and internal controls sufficient to assure compliance with their grant agreements.

The OIG also assisted Agency staff with technical issues related to auditing, accounting and audit followup.

## **Web Site**

The OIG maintains an ongoing Internet presence ([www.arts.gov/about/OIG/Contents.html](http://www.arts.gov/about/OIG/Contents.html)) to assist and inform NEA grantees and Agency employees. The site includes the *Inspectors General Vision Statement*, our two *Financial Management Guides*, our *Indirect Cost Guide*, past *Semiannual Reports to the Congress*, the *OIG Strategic Plan*, contact information about OIG staff, how to report wrongful acts, information about alternative methods of funding, and answers to frequently asked questions.

## **Other Activities**

During this period, the OIG took part in the activities of the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE), and allocated resources for responding to information requests from and for the Congress and other agencies. The OIG also provided oversight of the Agency's independent auditors as they work towards completing the Agency's fourth annual financial statement audit for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006.

Based on the successful implementation of the "Financial Management System & Compliance Evaluation Program of NEA grantees," the OIG determined to continue this program as it is taken to other areas around the country. The objective of this evaluation is to determine whether the auditee's financial management system and recordkeeping comply with the requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget and the NEA's *General Terms and Conditions for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to Organizations*.

## **Strategic Plan & Five-Year Audit Plan**

We have issued our Strategic Plan & Five-Year Audit Plan for the Years 2007 – 2011. The planning methodology that we have adopted is built around the concepts of issues and issue areas. The issue areas are broad categories of prime importance: they highlight the priorities of our customers - Agency management, the Congress and the American people. The individual issues, expressed as questions, represent an assessment of the most significant concerns facing the NEA. The methodology also includes the formulation of annual audit work plans.

## SECTIONS OF REPORT

The following sections of this report discuss the 12 areas specifically required to be included according to Section 5(a) of the Act. Table I shows Inspector General issued reports with questioned costs and Table II also shows that there were no Inspector General issued reports with recommendations that funds be put to better use.

### **SECTION 1 – Significant Problems, Abuses and Deficiencies**

Audits and other reviews conducted by OIG personnel during the current and prior periods have disclosed a few instances of deficient financial management practices in some organizations that received NEA grants. Among these were:

- Reported grant project costs did not agree with the accounting records, i.e., financial status reports were not prepared directly from the general ledger or subsidiary ledgers or from worksheets reconciled to the accounts;
- Personnel costs charged to grant projects were not supported by adequate documentation, i.e., personnel activity reports were not maintained to support allocations of personnel costs to NEA projects;
- The amount allocated to grant projects for common (indirect) costs which benefited all projects and activities of the organization was not supported by adequate documentation; and
- Grantees needed to improve internal controls, such as ensuring a proper separation of duties to safeguard resources and including procedures for comparing actual costs with the budget.

### **SECTION 2 – Recommendations for Corrective Action**

To assist grantees in correcting or avoiding the deficiencies identified in Section 1, the OIG has prepared two “*Financial Management Guides*,” one for non-profit organizations and the other for state and local governments. The guides are not offered as complete manuals of procedures; rather, they are intended to provide practical information on what is expected from grantees in terms of fiscal accountability. The guides are available on NEA’s web site at [www.arts.gov/about/OIG/Contents.html](http://www.arts.gov/about/OIG/Contents.html)

The guides discuss accountability standards in the areas of financial management, internal controls, audit and reporting. The guides also contain sections on unallowable costs and shortcomings to avoid. In addition, the guides include short lists of useful references and some sample documentation forms.

### **SECTION 3 – Recommendations in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Implemented**

There were no significant recommendations in previous reports on which corrective action has not been implemented.

### **SECTION 4 – Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities**

No matters were referred to prosecuting authorities during this reporting period.

### **SECTION 5 – Denials of Access to Records**

No denials of access to records occurred during this reporting period.



**SECTION 6 – Listing of Reports Issued**

<b><u>REPORT NUMBER</u></b>	<b><u>TITLE</u></b>	<b><u>DATE OF REPORT</u></b>
---------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------

*Oversight Audit Agency Review Reports*

OAA-06-02	The Metropolitan Museum of Art.....	04/12/2006
OAA-06-03	State of South Dakota.....	05/11/2006
OAA-06-04	Kansas Arts Commission .....	08/31/2006
OAA-06-05	Idaho Commission on the Arts.....	09/01/2006

*Limited Scope Audit Reports*

LS-06-03	Delaware Division of the Arts .....	07/17/2006
----------	-------------------------------------	------------

*Financial Management System & Compliance Evaluation Reports*

SCE-06-08	The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.....	05/15/2006
SCE-06-09	Austin Film Society.....	05/15/2006
SCE-06-10	National Association of Latino Arts and Culture .....	05/15/2006
SCE-06-11	Esperanza Peace and Justice Center.....	05/16/2006
SCE-06-12	Texas Folklife Resources .....	05/23/2006
SCE-06-13	FotoFest, Inc. ....	05/23/2006
SCE-06-14	Houston Grand Opera Association, Inc.....	05/31/2006
SCE-06-15	DiverseWorks, Inc. ....	06/16/2006
SCE-06-16	Dance/USA .....	06/21/2006
SCE-06-17	Project Row Houses.....	07/06/2006
SCE-06-18	Alternate ROOTS, Inc. ....	08/31/2006
SCE-06-19	Independent Media Artists of Georgia, Etc., Inc. ....	09/07/2006
SCE-06-20	Art Papers, Inc.....	09/25/2006

*Special Review Report*

R-06-02	FY 2006 Evaluation of NEA's Compliance with FISMA.....	09/21/2006
---------	--	------------

**TOTAL REPORTS – 19**



**SECTION 7 – Listing of Particularly Significant Reports**

There were no particularly significant reports during the reporting period.

**SECTION 8 – Statistical Tables Showing Total Number of Audit Reports and the Dollar Value of Questioned Costs**

Table I of this report presents the statistical information showing the total number of audit reports and the total dollar value of questioned costs.

**SECTION 9 – Statistical Tables Showing Total Number of Audit Reports and the Dollar Value of Recommendations that Funds be Put to Better Use by Management**

As shown on Table II, there were no audit reports with recommendations that funds be put to better use by management.

**SECTION 10 – Audit Reports Issued Before the Commencement of the Reporting Period for Which No Management Decision Has Been Made by the End of the Reporting Period**

**1. SCE-06-01 – Video Machete – Issued 11/9/05**

**Recommendation**

Grantee should provide specific expense documentation on allocable costs for Grant Numbers 03-3400-1119 and 03-5100-8188, or refund the \$63,000 share of those grants.

**Reason No Management Decision Was Made**

Grantee responded to both of the grants and additional information was requested and received on several different dates. We are in the process of evaluating the latest submission. A management decision should be finalized by 12/31/06.

**2. SCE-06-04 – From the Top, Inc. – Issued 1/31/06**

**Recommendation**

Grantee should provide documentation to support the questioned salary and fringe benefit costs. If matching requirements are not met based on disallowance of grant costs, a refund (of up to \$21,318) will be required.

**Reason No Management Decision Was Made**

Grantee response was received and additional documentation was requested. Grantee is a small organization and the official that we are working with is on extended leave so it may take a couple of more months before we receive a response and then evaluate it. A management decision should be made by 3/31/07.

**SECTION 11 – Significant Revised Management Decisions Made During the Period**

No significant revised management decisions were made during the reporting period.

**SECTION 12 – Significant Management Decisions With Which the Inspector General Disagrees**

There were no significant management decisions that the Inspector General disagreed with during the reporting period.

**TABLE I**

**INSPECTOR GENERAL ISSUED REPORTS  
WITH QUESTIONED COSTS**

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>QUESTIONED COSTS</u>	<u>UNSUPPORTED COSTS</u>	<u>POTENTIAL REFUNDS<sup>1</sup></u>
A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	<u>7</u>	<u>1,201,172</u>	<u>(1,201,172)</u>	<u>461,903</u>
B. Which were issued during the reporting period	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(0)</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotals (A + B)	<u>7</u>	<u>1,201,172</u>	<u>(1,201,172)</u>	<u>461,903</u>
C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period <sup>2/</sup>	<u>5</u>	<u>775,723</u>	<u>(775,723)</u>	<u>377,585</u>
(i) Dollar value of disallowed costs	<u>2</u>	<u>20,142</u>	<u>(20,142)</u>	<u>45,817</u>
(ii) Dollar value of costs not disallowed	<u>5</u>	<u>755,581</u>	<u>(755,581)</u>	<u>331,768</u>
D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	<u>2</u>	<u>425,449</u>	<u>(425,449)</u>	<u>84,318</u>
Reports for which no management decision was made within six months of issuance	<u>2</u>	<u>425,449</u>	<u>(425,449)</u>	<u>84,318</u>

<sup>1/</sup> The potential refund amount usually will not equal the questioned costs amount because matching requirements must be considered and the grantee may be either under or over matched. In addition, historically, the potential refund generally is reduced significantly as a result of the audit followup process, which includes examination of documentation submitted by the grantee.

<sup>2/</sup> Includes two grantees that had both costs disallowed (i) and costs not disallowed (ii) by management.

## TABLE II

### **INSPECTOR GENERAL ISSUED REPORTS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS THAT FUNDS BE PUT TO BETTER USE**

	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>DOLLAR VALUE</u>
A. For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	0	0
B. Which were issued during the reporting period	0	0
Subtotals (A + B)	0	0
C. For which a management decision was made during the reporting period	0	0
(i) dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management	0	0
- based on proposed management action	0	0
- based on proposed legislative action	0	0
(ii) dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management	0	0
D. For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	0	0
Reports for which no management decision was made within six months of issuance	0	0

## DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following definitions apply to terms used in reporting audit statistics:

<b>Questioned Cost</b>	A cost that the Office of Inspector General (OIG) questioned because of alleged violation with a provision of a law, regulation, contract, or other agreement or document governing the expenditure of funds; such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.
<b>Unsupported Cost</b>	A cost which the OIG questioned because the cost was not supported by adequate documentation at the time of the audit.
<b>Disallowed Cost</b>	A questioned cost that management has sustained or agreed should not be charged to the NEA grant or cooperative agreement.
<b>Funds Be Put To Better Use</b>	A recommendation made by the OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if management took actions to implement and complete the recommendation.
<b>Management Decision</b>	Management's evaluation of the findings and recommendations contained in the audit report and the issuance of management's final decision, including actions to be taken. Interim decisions and actions are not considered final management decisions for the purpose of the tables in this report.
<b>Final Action</b>	The completion of all actions that management has concluded in its management decision with respect to audit findings and recommendations. If management concluded that no actions were necessary, final action occurs when a management decision was made.


## REPORTING WRONGFUL ACTS

**Anyone, including Agency employees, who learns about or has reason to suspect the occurrence of any unlawful or improper activity related to NEA operations or programs, should contact the OIG immediately. A complaint/referral may be made by visiting the OIG office, calling the OIG at 202-682-5402, emailing at [oig@arts.endow.gov](mailto:oig@arts.endow.gov) or writing to the Office of Inspector General, Room 601, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20506.**

When contacting the OIG, it will help if you have answers to the following questions:

- Who are the parties involved (names, addresses and phone numbers if possible);
- What is the suspected activity (specific facts of the wrongdoing);
- When and where did the wrongdoing occur;
- How did you learn about the activity (from a third party, actual observation, conclusion drawn from observing or performing different activities, etc.); and
- Where can you be contacted or when will you contact us again.

**The OIG will not disclose the identity of a complainant or informant without consent, unless the Inspector General determines that such disclosure is unavoidable during the course of the investigation. You may remain anonymous, if you choose. Federal employees are protected against reprisal for disclosing information to the Inspector General unless such disclosure was knowingly false.**





NATIONAL  
ENDOWMENT  
FOR THE ARTS

---

A great nation  
deserves great art.

CHAIRMAN'S SEMIANNUAL REPORT  
ON FINAL ACTION  
RESULTING FROM AUDIT REPORTS

April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006

Submitted  
November 2006



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION		1
REPORT ON FINAL ACTION RESULTING FROM AUDIT REPORTS		
Section 1	Comments Relating to the Inspector General's Report	2
Section 2	Management Report on Final Action on Audits with Disallowed Costs for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2006	3
Section 3	Management Report on Final Action on Audits with Recommendations to Put Funds to Better Use for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2006	3
Section 4	Audit Reports for Which a Management Decision Was Made Prior to October 1, 2005, but on Which Final Action Has Not Occurred	3
Table A	Management Report on Final Action on Audits with Disallowed Costs for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2006	5
Table B	Management Report on Final Action on Audits with Recommendations to Put Funds to Better Use for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2006	6

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended by the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988 (Public Law 100-504), established independent, objective units within Federal agencies for the following purposes:

- To supervise and conduct audits and investigations of agency programs and operations;
- To lead, coordinate, and recommend policies for promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of programs and operations, and to prevent and detect fraud and abuse therein; and
- To keep the agency head and the Congress informed about related problems and deficiencies and associated corrective action.

Section 106(a) of P.L. 100-504 requires the Inspector General to report semiannually on the office's activities for the preceding six-month periods ending March 31<sup>st</sup> and September 30<sup>th</sup>. The report must (1) address significant problems, abuses, and deficiencies in the management of agency programs and operations identified during the reporting period, and (2) identify recommendations for corrective action. Section 106(b) directs the Inspector General to furnish this report within 30 days to the agency head, who is required to prepare a separate report on management decisions resulting from audit reports, the status of disallowed costs, and final actions taken during the corresponding period, including any comments deemed appropriate. The agency head must transmit both reports to the Congress within the ensuing 30 days.

Accordingly, the Chairman presents the Arts Endowment's management report for the period April 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006.

## REPORT ON FINAL ACTION RESULTING FROM AUDIT REPORTS

### Section 1. Comments Relating to the Inspector General's Report

#### A. Comments on OIG's Summary Section

Audits/Reviews. As reported in the Inspector General's *Semiannual Report to the Congress*, at the beginning of the reporting period there were seven reports awaiting a management decision to allow or disallow questioned costs. During the period, none of the newly issued reports identified any questioned costs or potential refunds. Management decisions were made on five of the seven open reports outstanding at the beginning of the period; the remaining two are discussed in Section 10 of the OIG's report. Management continues to work with the remaining two auditees to resolve the outstanding audit issues.

When the Audit Followup Official disallows questioned costs, it is typically because the grantee or cooperator has responded inadequately to the Arts Endowment's request for supporting documentation, such as canceled checks, invoices, contracts, personnel activity reports, or testimonial evidence. Agency funds may represent only a small portion of an awardee's total project costs. Deficiencies normally are resolved through the Agency's audit resolution process, and refunds are infrequent.

While the Inspector General's report is not required to include information about audit reports for which management decisions have been made but final actions are pending, we think it useful to provide that information here. Currently, there are two such organizations in this situation, where a total of \$462,964 in disallowed costs has been identified, with potential refunds of \$498,611. Both organizations have agreed and are making repayments on an installment basis. As final actions occur, including receipt of required refunds, they will be reported in a subsequent *Chairman's Semiannual Report*.

Technical Assistance: Improved Oversight. The Arts Endowment places a high priority on ensuring its employees are well informed about policies, procedures, and requirements related to grants administration and audits. The Grants & Contracts Office routinely conducts training on various topics for Agency staff, including targeted one-on-one training as necessary. During the period the Grants & Contracts Office and the OIG continued to provide technical assistance and compliance evaluations for grantees.

Web Site. The Arts Endowment has continued to enhance its "My Grant at a Glance" feature on the Agency Web site. In addition to previously reported capabilities, including tracking the status of payment requests online, grantees can now obtain historical reports of all their grants dating back to at least 1988 – which includes, among other information, the amount of the grant, the period of

support, and a brief project description. The Arts Endowment also continues to enhance the user-friendliness of its online grant application information and the electronic application submission process (through grants.gov, the government-wide grant application portal).

Other Activities. Arts Endowment staff continued to work closely with the OIG on issues of mutual interest, most notably the independent audit of the Agency's financial statements for fiscal year 2006; this was the Agency's fourth such audit, and resulted in a fourth "clean" opinion.

## **B. Comments on OIG's Sections 1 and 2**

OIG audit and evaluation reports on Arts Endowment awardees are based upon reviews conducted by the OIG itself or upon OIG analysis of audits completed by outside auditors. The outside audits may be performed by State audit agencies, by other Federal agencies (generally the agency providing the greatest amount of Federal funding to an organization also supported by the Arts Endowment), or by independent public accountants engaged by awardees.

### **Section 2. Management Report on Final Action on Audits with Disallowed Costs for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2006 (Section 8 of the OIG Report)**

Management decisions were made in resolving five of seven audits issued prior to this period (see Section 1.A.), which resulted in final actions on all five audits and the recovery of \$45,817 during the period (see Table A).

### **Section 3. Management Report on Final Action on Audits with Recommendations to Put Funds to Better Use for the Six-Month Period Ending September 30, 2006 (Section 9 of the OIG report)**

There were no audits with recommendations to put funds to better use awaiting final action as of September 30, 2006 (see Table B).

### **Section 4. Audit Reports for Which a Management Decision Was Made Prior to October 1, 2005, but on Which Final Action Has Not Occurred**

Two management decisions were made prior to October 1, 2005 on which final actions have not yet occurred. The first, LS-03-01: National Black Touring Circuit, Inc., was issued on June 12, 2003. On February 4, 2004, management requested a refund of \$30,000 from the auditee. On March 12, 2004, the auditee agreed to an installment payment plan, with final payment due by March 31, 2007. The auditee is current with payments, having returned \$23,500 through September 30, 2006.

The second decision concerned LS-04-05: Educational Broadcasting Corporation, issued on August 27, 2004. Management requested a refund of \$363,014 (representing the remaining portion of the unused \$500,000 that had been disbursed to the auditee since the grant was awarded). Management also requested payment of \$105,596.89 in accrued interest on the unused funds, plus a final payment by August 31, 2007 for interest accrued during the repayment period. On September 27, 2004, the auditee refunded the remaining portion of the unused grant funds and agreed to an installment payment plan for the interest. The auditee is current with payments, having returned both the unused grant funds and \$70,397.20 in interest through September 30, 2006.

TABLE A  
MANAGEMENT REPORT ON FINAL ACTION  
ON AUDITS WITH DISALLOWED COSTS  
FOR THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2006

ITEM	# OF AUDIT REPORTS	DISALLOWED COSTS	POTENTIAL REFUNDS
A. Audit reports with management decisions on which final action had not been completed at the beginning of the reporting period.	2	\$462,964	\$498,611
B. Audit reports on which management decisions were made during the period.	5	20,142	45,817
C. Total audit reports pending final action during the period (A + B).	7	483,106	544,428
D. Audit reports on which final action was taken during the period:			
1. Recoveries			
a. Collection & offsets	2	20,142	45,817
b. Property	0	0	0
c. Other	3	0	0
2. Write-offs	0	0	0
3. Total (D1 + D2)	5	20,142	45,817
E. Audit reports needing final action at the end of the period (C – D3).	2	\$462,964	\$498,611

TABLE B

MANAGEMENT REPORT ON FINAL ACTION ON AUDITS  
WITH RECOMMENDATIONS TO PUT FUNDS TO BETTER USE  
FOR THE SIX-MONTH PERIOD ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2006

ITEM	# OF AUDIT REPORTS	FUNDS TO BE PUT TO BETTER USE
A. Audit reports with management decisions on which final action had not been taken at the beginning of the reporting period.	0	\$0
B. Audit reports on which management decisions were made during the period.	0	0
C. Total audit reports pending final action during the period (A + B).	0	0
D. Audit reports on which final action was taken during the period:		
1. Dollar value of recommendations implemented:		
a. Based on management action	0	0
b. Based on proposed legislative action	0	0
2. Dollar value of recommendations not implemented	0	0
3. Total (D1 + D2)	0	0
E. Audit reports needing final action at end of the period (C – D).	0	\$0