

**Bowling Green State University**  
**BG@100 Action Item**  
**ESC Submission: October 19, 2006**

---

**Identification Information:**

<i>Reference Number</i>	FMS-A007
<i>Functional Area</i>	General Ledger/Commitment Control
<i>Title</i>	Generate beginning budgets and roll-over for succeeding fiscal year
<i>ESC Submission</i>	October 19, 2006
<i>ESC Decision Requested By</i>	October 23, 2006

**Issue Description:**

Budgeting for new fiscal years at BGSU has historically been accomplished by copying the prior year's base budget (Original Budget in PeopleSoft), then making any adjustments necessary to arrive at the final Appropriated Budget for the year. To facilitate this practice until the Budgeting module has been implemented, two minor adjustments need to be made to the way PeopleSoft handles allocations and budget journals and transfers.

**Background Information:**

The current business practice consists of copying the current year base budget to the next budget year, then adjusting the base budgets to reflect departmental requests, then rolling forward any positive or negative ending budgets from the current year as adjustments (not base) budget amounts. Finally, base budgets may be changed to reflect Legislative budgets.

PeopleSoft has the ability to roll remaining budgets forward and the ability to just roll the Original budget forward, but not both in the same year. To accomplish this, we need to use the Allocation tool to copy the Original budgets first, and then roll the remaining balances after the POs have been rolled to the new year as well.

In order to do the allocation, the field that determines whether the budget amount is an Original budget or an Adjustment amount needs to be added to the temporary table that the Allocations module uses when copying data. The process for modifying the table is documented in PeopleBooks, since it is recognized that the temporary table will not include every field that is available on every table in PeopleSoft. The time needed to make this change is less than 1 hour.

In addition, to ensure that the Original budgets do not get modified, the default budget entry type for budget journals and budget transfers should be changed from Original to Adjustment. This value can be overridden, but if the default is properly set, the errors will be minimized. Total time for this modification is also less than 1 hour.

**Bowling Green State University**  
**BG@100 Action Item**  
**ESC Submission: October 19, 2006**

---

**Alternatives:**

Alternative #1: The Budget Office can export the Original budget from the current year to a spreadsheet; format the spreadsheet, then import using delivered functionality to the new budget year. Run the delivered budget roll-over process normally.

All budget journals and budget transfers will have to be marked as Adjustments unless the transaction truly should adjust the Original budget amount, which is rare.

All budget journals and budget transfers for the year will need to be reviewed to ensure no Adjustment budget entries were marked as Original.

Alternative #2: Modify the Allocation temporary table and the budget type default. Run an allocation to copy the Original budgets from the current year to the next year. Run the delivered budget roll-over process normally.

All budget journals and budget transfers for the year will still need to be reviewed to ensure no Adjustment budget entries were marked as Original.

Neither alternative will be necessary when a Budgeting tool has been implemented.

*The following table shows the pros and cons for the alternatives identified above.*

#	Alternative	Pros	Cons	Notes
1	Budget Office manually exports, reformats and imports Original budgets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No customization or upgrade costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This requires data to be taken off-line to a spreadsheet and reformatted, then uploaded via a delivered process.</li> </ul>	

**Bowling Green State University**  
**BG@100 Action Item**  
**ESC Submission: October 19, 2006**

*The following table shows the pros and cons for the alternatives identified above.*

#	Alternative	Pros	Cons	Notes
2	Allocation copies the Original budget from current to succeeding year. Change default to budget entry type to Adjustment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data is always on-line – less chance of typos.</li> <li>• It takes less time to run an allocation than to off-load and upload a spreadsheet.</li> <li>• Less chance of Original budget entry mistakes.</li> <li>• Less time and effort entering budget journals and transfers as the default will already be the desired budget type.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Customization and upgrade incur costs</li> </ul>	

**Costs - Alternative #1:** None

**Costs - Alternative #2:**

Estimated Hours for Original Implementation	3 Hours (including time needed to design and test allocation)	
Estimated Cost for Original Implementation	\$450	Use \$150 times hours
Estimated Hours per Each Upgrade	1 Hour	
Estimated Cost per Each Upgrade	\$50	Use \$50 times hours

**Schedule Considerations:**

Alternative #1 – no impact on project go-live date  
 Alternative #2 – no impact on project go-live date. Customization is minor.

**Bowling Green State University**  
**BG@100 Action Item**  
**ESC Submission: October 19, 2006**

---

**Recommendation:**

**Alternative # 2** The allocation, once designed, will be a simple process that only takes a few mouse clicks to run. In addition, the likelihood of budget type entry errors is greatly reduced as the default will not have to be changed every time a budget journal or budget transfer is entered.

Both alternatives will require minor maintenance each year to change the dates.

**Recommendation Supported By:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Project Role</b>
Andrew Palm	FMS Functional Consultant
Trish Jenkins	FMS Functional Lead
Linda Hamilton	Finance and Administration

**ESC Decision:**

Vote:

Linda Dobb - For alternative #2  
Chris Dalton – For alternative #2  
John Folkins - Absent  
Ron Lancaster - For alternative #2  
Bruce Petryshak - For alternative #2  
Gaylyn Finn - For alternative #2  
Chris Cox - For alternative #2  
Melissa Hudson-Nowak – For alternative #2

**ESC Decision Date:** October 23, 2006