

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Title:	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
Date:	March 27, 2006
Time:	11:00 AM ET
Location:	McFall Chart Room

Invitees/Attendees (* in attendance, # absent, + substitute, = by conference call)

Names	
* Bruce Petryshak	* Cindy Fuller
# Linda Dobb	* Phyllis Short
* Chris Dalton	* John Gleason
* Ron Lancaster	* Michelle Simmons
* Gaylyn Finn	* Larry Smith
* Bill Gerwin	* Ginny Pinkelman
* Toby Singer	# John Gleason

Opening Statements

Bruce called the meeting to order at 11:02 A.M.

Bruce stated there was a good turnout at the Chart of Accounts presentation. Tom Kornacki will join the BG@100 Project Team April 17th.

Bruce stated in a previous meeting it was commented the encumbrances may not be correct or working properly; however, the encumbrances are working properly but may have limitations, and asked Larry Smith to comment on this.

Larry Smith reported on July 1, classified staff was encumbered for the entire year. The first payroll in July is paying for 9 days in June and 1 day of July. When Larry ran encumbrances at the end of July, and each succeeding month, Larry looked at what pay date/cycle had not been paid yet. This resulted in an extra pay cycle into the encumbrances for classified staff. To bring the budgets back in line Larry will change the date and move it forward one pay cycle.

Bill stated from a payroll standpoint it looked correct because the money was out there in July, but the money was being spent on staff time in June. **Chris** stated it appears the system was encumbering 9 days more than 26 pay periods and **Larry** stated yes.

Larry stated classified staff can be corrected; however, faculty is different. The 9 pay faculty has a short work break over summer and the encumbrance process is cutting off May 13, and not encumbering _ month for 9 pay faculty. This can not be corrected for this year, but have it figured out for next year. The 12 pay faculty is also different and will not encumber July and August payments in the system. Normally in June the old system would unencumber July and August for 12 pay faculty. **Chris** clarified this involves academic year contract faculty who choose to be paid over 12 months as apposed to fiscal year faculty and **Larry** states yes. In AFIN an entry was made to expense for July and August so all the expense showed for the correct fiscal year. This was then reversed out for the next fiscal year so it was at zero net effect. The only way around the encumbrance now is to make an entry in AFIN (in September) for 12 pay faculty, make it as an encumbrance on the financial side and let it sit until June and reverse

out the encumbrance and place in an expense. The encumbrance process is not picking up July and August, since it is a different fiscal year.

Gaylyn asked if this is a manual process in September, will it be encumbered by individual and **Larry** stated no it is by budget. **Chris** asked if this involves encumbering the department budget for those 9 month faculty on 12 month pay and **Larry** stated yes and working on a query to pull these individuals and tie in with the department budget. **Chris** advised this should be explained to colleges and departments so they understand. **Gaylyn** stated the March reports will have encumbered throughout the month of April and **Larry** stated that is correct and half of May. **Chris** asked if the solution for next year is to change the date to the end of May and **Larry** advised it would be changed to a short work break as of June 1.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the March 13 meeting were approved and can be published to the website. **Ron** asked if internal charges will be discussed and **Bill** stated yes. **Bruce** stated there was an official response to the questions **Ron** raised at the previous meeting; **Bill** will document and distribute at the next meeting.

PeopleSoft Project Status Update

Bill stated the first item for Tom Kornacki will be training. PeopleSoft Oracle is not ready for 8.9 grants management training and waiting on a date this will be available. **Bill** indicated the training consultant advised there is a fair number of enhancements and recommends 8.9 training. **Bill** stated this training will not be offered until June or July. Once Tom is through grants management training will proceed with grants management consulting. **Bill** hopes to have a consultant on board for grants management shortly and the consultant will begin with a grants management demo. The committee is invited to attend the demo as well as the Business Office, Spar and Grants Management area.

Gaylyn asked if Jen Mulligan should attend training and **Bill** stated maybe. The training may be offered in Ohio. The training staff at Oracle indicated grants management training has not been scheduled, as there is not a high demand for this training. **Bill** stated once 8.8 or 8.9 training is determined a location will need to be established. The closest Oracle training site is Cincinnati. **Bill** is unsure if Jen will need a prerequisite of general ledger and indicated general ledger is a 5 day class. **Bruce** stated if the training is offered in Cincinnati it would be beneficial to have as many people as possible attend due to the cost involved. Also, Ohio State, Cleveland and Akron should be contacted as this will help defray the cost. **Chris** asked if individuals from departments should be invited for the grants management demo and **Bill** stated yes and suggested individuals from various departments as well.

Action Item HCM-A024

Phyllis presented Action Item HCM-A024, Retroactive Pay Increases for Student Employees via Kronos. This is not a customization to Kronos but a feature that is available. The interface between Kronos and PeopleSoft can be modified. This will eliminate the work involved in retro pay for students when the department did not request the change and eliminate the manual work involved between Payroll and Student Employment. The department will be responsible for figuring the retro pay. Much time is spent in Student Employment to figure retro pay and work with the Payroll Office. This will bypass Student Employment and Payroll and the department will be responsible for determining the retro pay and entering it into Kronos.

Michelle stated Kronos has a tracking and auditing process. Instead of the department contacting Student Employment to calculate the retro pay the employer would now calculate the retro pay and send a document to student employment in order for the pay to be permanent. The employer would calculate the retro pay, the sum entered into the student's time card and the employer would sign off on the time card. The student has no impact and is not authorized to adjust their time. **Chris** asked if student employment reviews this, someone outside the department looks at this or is it automatically going into the system. **Michelle** stated the employer would fill out a document and it would be placed in the department file. **Chris** asked if the document would be reviewed by student employment to avoid errors. **Michelle** stated there are features in Kronos that prevent large over payments. There is a corresponding document that would request student employment to begin the raise on a specific date. **Chris** understands the rationale but concerned this will be perceived as shifting work from student employment to the department level and take the departments more time that student employment. **Michelle** stated this has been piloted on a modified basis. Michelle stated reminders are sent notifying departments of the deadline for paperwork to be received at student employment; however, a number of departments routinely forget. Departments will become more compliant in responding to reminders so they will not have to calculate retro pay. **Chris** asked if there are situations where the mistake is made in student employment and not the department and **Michelle** stated yes and in this case student employment would correct. **Gaylyn** asked as an example if the adjustment should be \$10.00 and it was incorrectly entered as \$100.00; would student employment catch this when reviewing paperwork. **Michelle** stated student employment plans to do this until departments are aware of the procedure. **Ron** asked if it is possible someone will enter the adjustment and fail to send a report and **Michelle** stated possibly. **Ron** expressed concern the adjustment would be entered and not questioned. **Michelle** stated in order to make the change permanent in the system the employer must send a document. **Ron** asked if this is for all employees including work study. **Michelle** stated work study and non-work study employees look the same in Kronos, the only difference is how the account is set up in Kronos. **Ron** asked if the alternative option is modifying Kronos. **Phyllis** stated the alternative option would modify the Kronos interface. Phyllis stated the feature will be turned on in Kronos (that is already there), no time engagement with Kronos to make an adjustment in the program. **Bruce** asked if there is a lot of retro activity or anticipate more retro activity and **Michelle** stated 100 retro pay accounts were received in October 2005. **Larry** stated currently there are 2 for this pay cycle. **Bruce** stated it would be good to identify and review retro pay. **Michelle** stated Kronos has a number of reporting features and if it is important to run with each payroll student employment can do this. **Larry** stated a separate occurrence code can be utilized and the retro pay will appear on a separate report for review. **Bruce** asked if they can be tracked as exceptions on a regular basis and **Larry** stated yes they would be identified as retro payments coming through Kronos. **Bruce** suggested modifying Alternative 3 to include the reporting. A roll call vote was taken for Action Item HCM-A024 amended to include the reporting requirement:

Bruce Petryshak	Alternative 3, Pending Modifications
Ron Lancaster	Alternative 3, Pending Modifications
Linda Dobb	Absent
Chris Dalton	Alternative 3, Pending Modifications
Gaylyn Finn	Alternative 3, Pending Modifications

Bruce stated Alternative 3 approved with suggested modification.

Bruce stated the budget is doing well. The HCM Phase 1 is finished, the upgrade is in process and that cost is included in the BG@100 budget; about \$900,000 on the good side of the budget and doing well.

Bruce adjourned the meeting at 11:38 A.M.

Next Meeting Date:	April 10, 2006
Next Meeting Location:	McFall Chart Room
Minutes Prepared by:	Ginny Pinkelman