



March 25, 2026

Bonnie Stewart, Executive Director
Bryan Decker, CPA, Peer Review Committee Chair
Julie McNeal, CPA, CPA on Staff Peer Review Program
Connecticut Society of CPAs
716 Brook St, Suite 100
Rocky Hill, CT 06067

Dear Ms. Stewart, Mr. Decker, and Ms. McNeal:

On March 25, 2026, the AICPA Peer Review Board's Oversight Task Force accepted the report, letter of procedures and observations, and your response thereto on the most recent oversight of the Connecticut Society of CPAs. These documents are now available on the AICPA Peer Review Program website.

We appreciate your cooperation and efforts in making the peer review program a success.

Sincerely,

Jodey Lynn Altier

Jodey Lynn Altier, CPA
Chair – Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Board

Oversight Report

November 20, 2025

To the Peer Review Committee of the Connecticut Society of CPAs:

We have reviewed the Connecticut Society of CPA's administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program (program) as part of our oversight program. The Connecticut Society of CPAs is responsible for administering the program in Connecticut. 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*.

Administering Entity's Responsibility

The administering entity is responsible for administering the program in compliance with the *AICPA Standards for Performing and Reporting on Peer Reviews* (standards) and other guidance.

Oversight Task Force's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to determine whether (1) administering entities are complying with the standards and other guidance, (2) reviews are being conducted and reported upon in accordance with the standards and other guidance, (3) results of 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.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the procedures performed, we have concluded that the Connecticut Society of CPAs has complied with the standards and other guidance, in all material respects.

We have also issued a letter of oversight procedures and observations that details the oversight procedures performed and sets forth recommendations that did not affect the conclusions expressed in this report.



Richard E. Wortmann, Member, Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Board



November 20, 2025

To the Peer Review Committee of the Connecticut Society of CPAs:

We have reviewed the Connecticut Society of CPAs' administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program (program) as part of our oversight program and have issued our report thereon dated November 20, 2025. That report should be read in conjunction with the observations in this letter. The observations described below were considered but did not affect the conclusions expressed in that report.

The oversight was conducted according to the procedures in the *AICPA Peer Review Program Oversight Handbook*. The oversight program is designed to improve the administering entity's administration of the 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.

During the oversight conducted on various dates from October 30 – November 20, 2025, I met with the CPA on staff, the administrator, technical reviewers, and the peer review committee chair.

In conjunction with the administering entity oversight, the following observations are being communicated.

Administrative Procedures

I met with the CPA on staff and the administrator to review procedures for administering the program. I believe the administrative processes were handled in a manner consistent with the *AICPA Standards for Performing and Reporting on Peer Reviews* (standards) and other guidance.

I reviewed the status of open reviews, including reviews with corrective actions and implementation plans which had not yet been completed. I noted that open reviews were effectively monitored for completion.

I noted peer review committee (committee) decision letters were prepared and sent timely.

I reviewed the policies and procedures for granting extensions and noted that extension requests are discussed with the committee when warranted.

The administering entity has developed a backup plan to support the administrator, technical reviewers, and the CPA on staff if they become unable to serve in their respective capacities. I reviewed the backup plan and noted it complied with guidance.

According to discussions with administering entity staff, working paper retention policies for completed reviews are consistently followed.

I noted that the administering entity has policies and procedures in place to determine if information disseminated on their website regarding the program is accurate and timely. I noted the administering entity maintains current information on their website relating to the program. In addition, the administering entity has an individual who is responsible for maintaining the website and monitors it periodically to determine if program information is accurate and timely.

Technical Review Procedures

I met with technical reviewers to discuss their procedures.

Based on the information provided, I noted that all technical reviewers met the qualifications, including training and ethical requirements set forth in the guidance.

I reviewed the reports, letters of response, if applicable, and the working papers for several reviews. I noted one review in which a technical matter had not been sufficiently addressed by the technical reviewer, resulting in delayed acceptance of the review.

During the RAB meeting observed, the technical reviewers were available to answer any questions that arose.

CPA on Staff Procedures

I met with the CPA on staff to discuss procedures for monitoring the program.

Based on the information provided, I noted that the CPA on staff met the qualifications, including training and ethical requirements set forth in the guidance.

I reviewed the annual confidentiality agreements and noted that appropriate agreements were obtained and signed based on each individual's role in the program.

The administering entity has developed policies and procedures to identify familiarity threats and implement safeguards to maintain objectivity and skepticism while considering the results of peer reviews. I reviewed the familiarity threat policies and procedures and noted they are comprehensive.

RAB and Peer Review Committee Procedures

I met with the committee chair to discuss their procedures.

Based on the information provided, I noted that the committee and RAB members met the qualifications, including training and ethical requirements set forth in the guidance.

I noted that comments resulting from RAB observation reports were disseminated to the appropriate individuals.

I reviewed procedures regarding RAB/committee evaluations of firms receiving consecutive non-pass peer review reports and whether the failure to correct deficiencies or significant deficiencies should be deemed as noncompliance with the requirements of the program. After reviewing evaluations and discussing with the committee chair and administering entity staff, I believe these are handled in a manner consistent with guidance.

I attended a RAB meeting on October 30, 2025 and observed the acceptance process and offered my comments at the close of discussions. It was apparent that the RAB members had reviewed the reports and working papers prior to the meeting and had a good understanding of the program. Except as noted below, appropriate decisions were made in the acceptance process.

As noted in the Technical Review Procedures section, I noted a review in which a technical matter had not been sufficiently addressed by the technical reviewer and this was not identified by the RAB. The RAB was ready to accept the review as presented; however, based on my comments and subsequent discussion by the RAB, they agreed to delay acceptance of the review to obtain additional information from the captain and revised peer review documents.

I also attended a peer review committee meeting.

Oversight Program

I reviewed the oversight policies and procedures adopted by the committee and noted the oversight program is comprehensive.

Summary

My recommendations to enhance the Connecticut Society of CPAs' administration of the program are summarized as follows:

Technical reviewers should exercise greater care in performing technical reviews to identify and resolve issues before the report acceptance process and the RAB should exercise care to ensure all critical matters are identified and discussed.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard E. Wortmann', written in a cursive style.

Richard E. Wortmann, Member, Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Board



Peer Review Program



Peer Review
Program

Administered in Connecticut by
the Connecticut Society of CPAs

February 24, 2026

Oversight Task Force
AICPA Peer Review Board
Palladian I Corporate Center
220 Leigh Farm Road
Durham, NC 27707-8110

Re: Oversight of Connecticut Society of CPAs

To the AICPA Peer Review Board's Oversight Task Force:

This letter represents our response to the report and letter of procedures and observations issued in connection with the oversight of the Connecticut Society of CPA's administration of the AICPA Peer Review Program (program) performed on various dates from October 30 – November 20, 2025.

The matters discussed herein were brought to the attention of all peer review committee members, administrative staff, and technical reviewers. In addition, the matters discussed in this letter will be monitored to ensure they are effectively implemented as part of our administration of the program.

Technical Review Procedures

We have discussed how to promote completeness and consistency in preparing reviews to reduce delays within the RAB acceptance process. Additionally, the team has reviewed the specific requirements and collaboratively enhanced procedures to document the review of single audit engagement profiles and checklists for the proper identification and reporting of clusters.

RAB and Peer Review Committee

We have discussed the issue with both the full committee and the report acceptance body. We have also developed and implemented a procedure for the RAB to review the technical reviewer's notation of the appropriate consideration of single audit clusters.



Peer Review Program



Peer Review Program

Administered in Connecticut by the Connecticut Society of CPAs

Sincerely,

Bonnie Stewart

Signature State CPA Society CEO

Bonnie Stewart

Print CEO name

Mar 10, 2026

Date

Julie McNeal

Signature of CPA on staff

Julie McNeal

Print CPA on staff name

Feb 25, 2026

Date

Bryan Decker

Signature of Peer Review Committee Chair

Bryan Decker

Print Peer Review Committee Chair name

2/24/2026

Date