



## Meeting Minutes

<b>Meeting Title:</b>	BG@100 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) Meeting
<b>Date:</b>	July 24, 2006
<b>Time:</b>	11:00 AM ET
<b>Location:</b>	McFall Chart Room

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

Names			
*	Bruce Petryshak	#	Toby Singer
#	Linda Dobb	#	Cindy Fuller
*	Chris Dalton	*	Phyllis Short
*	Ron Lancaster	*	John Gleason
*	Gaylyn Finn	*	Mel Hudson-Nowak
*	Bill Gerwin	*	Ginny Pinkelman

### Opening Statements

**Bruce** called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM. Bruce introduced the new Director of Internal Auditing; Melissa Hudson-Nowak.

**Bruce** announced George Knauss is moving to Purchasing. Maureen Ireland is moving from Purchasing to the Project Team.

During the last meeting John had asked for support from the committee on the importance of change. Bruce noted the minutes will reflect an example and endorsement from the committee regarding John's request. Bruce attended the Tuesday Project Implantation meeting and also shared the committee's support regarding change.

**Bruce** noted the new release of HCM is getting close to implementation. The idea is for cutover August 4 and the conversion will begin at 5:00 p.m. that day. The expectation is to finish on Sunday; however, it is possible it could go into Monday. The implications are that View Paycheck and eHire will not be available for the first 4 hours on Monday morning. There were no objections from the committee regarding this plan for the HCM implementation.

**Chris** asked if this would be the Monday after or before graduation and **Phyllis** stated the Monday after graduation and would involve no implications for grades etc.

**Ron** asked about an article in the Connect newsletter regarding new Applications Unlimited for Oracle. **Bill** stated on the web is a document from the HUEG commission referring to applications unlimited. Oracle will continue to support and enhance the PeopleSoft product; there is no end date to that listed at this moment and moving forward with Fusion. The concept is that resources will continue. This announcement gives BGSU the opportunity to better plan for movement toward Fusion. **Bruce** believes the toolset is not complete to build the environment; it is out there, this will allow Oracle to support PeopleSoft longer. **Bill** stated the resources will be kept to enhance the PeopleSoft product, but not at the level customers should expect as in the past.

### Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the July 10 meeting were approved and can be posted to the website pending changes.

### **PeopleSoft Project Status Update**

**John** stated 53% complete and about 2 weeks behind overall; however, some actions in the last few weeks will manifest shortly. Andy Palm, Ciber Consultant, was brought in to assist with General Ledger Commitment Control and will assist Trish.

John and Bill met with Linda Hamilton in regards to fringe benefits pool. Some benefits for certain departments are pooled in relation to commitment control and John believes they were successful in coming up with a solution. The individual department will be charged for the fringe cost and use PeopleSoft's allocation module to budget portion from the pool back to the department. The remaining value in the pool will display what is available and should achieve the objective Linda Hamilton preferred.

Weekly meetings were initiated when Kathleen was on the team, and now that Andy is here weekly meetings will continue and discuss specific tasks to accomplish for the week.

The first weekly budget administrator meeting was held. Representatives from the Purchasing and AP groups have been meeting and last week initiated two more meetings with budget administrators. Tom Kornacki had first meeting this week with the Grants Office to review grants processes.

**John** stated Linda Gray is doing a great job; Linda has completed training in PeopleSoft General Ledger and Commitment Control.

In terms of Customizations, all of the Accounts Payable Purchasing customizations have been written up and presenting two this week. The project team has made great stride in this area.

In terms of Asset Management, still in the process of tuning the control table set up. John is working with Andy and may have to meet with Kathleen. John would like Linda Gray to do some of the leg work; identifying asset categories and asset transactions etc. John's number one priority is preparing for conversion and moving ahead with general ledger.

In terms of Vendor Data Cleanup, 52% complete and looking at Phase II; Sue Tomor indicated about a 1/3 of the responses returned did not provide supplemental address information. **John** will meet with Faye to follow up regarding this issue.

A meeting was held with HR on standardizing department and location codes. It is much work to go back and convert our existing environment in HR; will make a decision shortly.

**Ron** asked if registration is involved in the meetings with HR and **John** stated yes. **Bill** indicated the team is pulling department and location codes; working within PeopleSoft groups first then registration.

**Ron** asked if there is some other process or disaster if go-live is pushed back two weeks. **John** intends to catch up and the next go-live is not as critical as the beginning of fiscal year. **Bill** stated Fitgap for Student will begin in January; Scope Documents and Project Plan in February. Finance beyond February 5<sup>th</sup> will hold up Student. **Bruce** stated it is expected cutover to occur

---

February 1. **Chris** stated meeting the date is important, but to avoid delays and not push back go-live.

**Bill** stated during the last meeting a discussion occurred regarding workflow and talked about two paths for workflow; Onbase document imaging workflow and PeopleSoft workflow. A decision was made to go with PeopleSoft workflow primarily as it is the most assured with getting this completed. There were too many issues with Onbase to determine if it would be completed on time. **Bill** stated at this point, proceeding with PeopleSoft workflow for Finance. In Phase II, may come back and look at Onbase again, but in a subsequent phase. **Ron** asked about the expectation for Student workflow and **Bill** stated Onbase; eventually everything will be on Onbase. **Mel** asked if there is an exposure from a learning curve or dollar perspective because of stop gap verses going with Onbase right from the start. **Bill** stated workflow in PeopleSoft will eventually be thrown away; however, project team members can do this. With Onbase workflow; would be dependant on their consultants. **Bill** prefers to make sure the two projects line up appropriately and show how workflow will function. **Bruce** stated the objective is to require more in-house knowledge of the workflow product. **Ron** stated both have been running parallel and developing both solutions.

**Bill** stated there is a web-based survey in the plans to begin drawing data from departments to set up security. **Bill** has a group of 150 budget administrators on campus that will be invited to a presentation to explain the survey. The survey will allow the budget administrators to indicate who in their department will be the primary budget administrator, approvers for requisitions in order to determine training and setup of roles within Finance application. The presentation will be in the next week or two. **Gaylyn** cautioned to be cognizant of budget administrators that may delegate duties. **Bill** stated the reason for the survey is to have departments begin thinking about who will take on this role. It will result in a dramatic change bring departments up to speed. **Chris** stated the positive is to enhance the institutions functionality and capabilities. **Mel** noted it is good to inform departments; as the result will involve more responsibility and there might be an unintended financial consequence.

#### **Action & Information Items**

**Bill** introduced Action Item FMS A003 – Electronic Transmission of Remittance Advice for EFT Payments. The plan to date is to send electronic payments to vendors when possible; Accounts Payable expressed concerns that electronic payments via the bank to vendor account, without remittance advice in their hands, would cause vendors to question the transfer. Accounts Payable suggested electronically sending remittance advice to vendors. **Bill** stated this is a complicated process.

There are two alternatives; Alternative #1 is to leave as is; the remittance advice would be printed and sent via US mail to vendor. Alternative #2 is to customize the system to allow for the email of remittance advice to the vendor. Alternative #2 will take 116 hours to develop; fairly expensive customization and concern the electronic remittance would generate questions back to Accounts Payable group.

**Bill** stated the recommendation is Alternative #1. **Bill** added the number of vendors at go-live that would use electronic payment process would be limited in order to evaluate. **Chris** asked if a notes field could be added. **Bruce** stated wire transfers have special instructions pieces. **Gaylyn** stated the notes field relates to the sending of a wire transfer. **Bill** stated in this case the file is sent to our bank and the bank is completing the transfer. **Chris** asked if there is a space or some area that can tie it to a specific invoice. **Bill** is concerned the bank may not forward the

---

comments to the recipients. **Bill** will send a few electronic transfers to vendors and assess if mailing of the remittance creates a lot of phone traffic. **Chris** asked if there is another solution on a trial basis; tie an identifier to the wire transfer or convert to pda file and email. **Bruce** stated there are issues with sending emails, as wire transfers are not always instant. **Chris** suggested tie an identifier to the wire transfer and email. **John** reviewed how PeopleSoft handles the remittance advices and would have to develop logic to break apart each of the remittance advices electronically. Three separate remittances advices print and the hard copies are separate. **Mel** suggested scanning the hard copy and sending 3 emails.

**John** stated PeopleSoft has an eSupplier module; those with questions on open invoices could log into the website and have access to the activity for their payments. **Bruce** suggested the availability of online information verses sending electronically. **John** stated PeopleSoft has an auto application of funds. An electronic transfer from BGSU to a lock box would go through a series of algorithms in the accounts receivable system and match the dollar amount to a vendor account. **John** will research other options and bring back to the next meeting.

**Bruce** suggested tentatively approving Alternative #1 (no modification) with additional review. The committee agreed to tentatively approve Alternative #1 with the understanding further review will take place. **Bruce** asked if this would cause implications with the timeline and **Bill** stated no; however, coming back at a later date and voting on Alternative #2 could be an issue. **Bill** believes the timeline is okay as long as the result does not cost additional hours.

**Bill** introduced Action Item FMS A004 - Report Summarizing Purchase Order Value Change. This deals with tracking of construction purchase orders and change orders. The current system today involves a manual process to keep track of purchase orders. George Knauss indicated the Purchasing Department spends approximately 5 to 7 hours a month making copies of change orders for reports that go to the State of Ohio. Purchasing needs to report back to the state true dollars spent between the original purchase order amount and final payment. The report also needs to show if the vendor is a MBE or EDGE supplier.

Alternative #1 is to leave as is and manually track change orders. Alternative #2 is to create a custom reporting PeopleSoft to capture the change order information.

**Mel** asked if the issue involves the system not collecting data verses the system not having an eloquent way to report the data. Is the data all in the system and if it is; are we approving a more eloquent report. **Bill** stated it is an approval for a more eloquent way to report the data and should be able to tie the change order to the original purchase order. There is a way in the system to create an additional requisition and tie to it the original purchase order. **Mel** asked if this involves training and **Bill** stated yes. **Mel** asked if this customization is nice to have, or a must do. **Bill** stated if this is not completed, at minimal each contract or purchase order will have to be viewed by someone to process the reporting back to the state. The information is there getting into eloquent fashion is difficult. **Bill** supports this as multiple query reports would be difficult and will reduce labor back in Purchasing Department.

**Bruce** stated generating the query has a higher risk of error; the report could eliminate that risk. A roll call vote was taken for Action Item FMS-A004 Alternative #2:

---

Bruce Petryshak	Alternative #2
Ron Lancaster	Alternative #2
Linda Dobb	Absent

---

Chris Dalton	Alternative #2
Gaylyn Finn	Alternative #2
Mel Hudson-Nowak	Alternative #2

**HCM 8.9 Project Status Update**

**Phyllis** stated the HCM upgrade is in the midst of a second parallel test and going well. During the first parallel test; ran monthly, biweekly and special summer payroll. The results were very good. In the second parallel test also including input from Kronos in the entire process. Karen Woods and Cheri Kitchens are working with Donna Wittwer and Kerry Campbell from HR to develop training and documentation. **Phyllis** anticipates no problems during conversion weekend.

**Bruce** stated will begin assembling the team and training for Student in October. **Bruce** invited John Folkins and Chris Cox to join the steering committee for the Student phase.

**Gaylyn** stated Faye & Jim have significant concern regarding the 1099 issue; a modification is not proposed, but each invoice will need to be marked as taxable or nontaxable.

**Bruce** suggested adding this as a small agenda item for the next meeting to allow for more information and research.

Meeting adjourned at 12:08 pm.

<b>Next Meeting Date:</b>	August 14, 2006
<b>Next Meeting Location:</b>	McFall Chart Room
<b>Minutes Prepared by:</b>	Ginny Pinkelman