

November 6, 1995

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Robert Zimmerman
From: W. David Wimberly
Copy: Craig Brown, Susan Cromwell, Jo Diercouff, Don McFatrigh, David Merrifield, Bill Moody, Ron Neyman, and Dale Stingley
Subject: October Status

Personnel

We have hired Randy Putt as a an hourly programmer/analyst. Randy has 15 years experience in the field in the areas of COBOL, manufacturing, IBM and VAX, and system administration. He is a College of Business DPQA grad from the late 70s. We are pleased to have Randy and hope to see him move into an appointed position.

Natural Class

Since we had two new employees, Joe Cantlon and Randy, I decided to hold a Natural class primarily for their benefit. We also had various degrees of participation from Pete Campbell, Joe Fournier, David Keith, and Becky Shoemaker, all who had an interest in learning more about our tools and are interested in developing their own report programs. We took a couple of hours every afternoon for three weeks in this endeavor, which I know was very beneficial for my new employees. (The last Natural class I conducted was in January 1992.)

CCC List

Michael has developed a Company Cost Center List facility. This is an application independent function that will permit users to define sets of company cost centers to be used as report selection criteria. The requirement for this came from the need to produce Labor Distribution reports for various organizational entities which work with multiple cost centers, such as Residence Life & Dining Services and Cooperative Extension Service. This function provides a means to define and retain these CCC groupings. Although it will initially be used only in LABOR, it is expected to be applicable to other areas.

University Procurement System (UPS)

Requisition/Bid

Numerous meetings have been held to define the processes and data requirements associated with requisitions. Recently this has led into bid processing issues, since departments are permitted to do telephone quotes under a certain dollar limit. Initial plans had been to store departmental telephone quotes as part of the requisition, but based upon recent discussions we have decided to store these in the same form as other bids.

Paul and Sandra have resurrected the practice of writing meeting summaries, due to the lack of other documentation produced following our discussions. I am still hopeful that we can

work out a way to directly produce our System Manual documentation components as we go, so that we have a reference document throughout the development and don't have to do the job twice. Donna Carter has done a good job of documenting the requisition header and line online functions, which will become part of the User Manual and online help. The only problem is that it has been slow to develop and doesn't address all the issues covered in our meetings, thus the persistent need for the meeting summaries.

Items still requiring significant definition include: how, when, and what constitutes a commitment (due to its affect on any available balance); Advance PO processing; facilities for copying text from one place to another; and the cross-field data edits required to maintain integrity of the data.

OU Visit

I participated in the Financial Affairs sponsored trip to visit OU and see how their imaging system worked. The following are my observations:

- Their imaging system is very straight forward to use, with the primary advantages gained by scanning an entire batch of documents which are later indexed as a separate process.
- Their COLD system was extremely fast because it didn't have to retrieve and uncompress an entire report, it appeared to work with report pages individually.
- Central receiving would be great.
- All invoice payment problems were handled by a separate staff of *expeditors*. who were proactive -- they fixed problems before they showed up in AP by following up with departments on orders that should have been already been received. At OU, this staff of 4 was a part of Purchasing.
- The departmental categorization of expenditures could be a campus wide code with additions made on request. Hopes that this code could feed GL and be used to derive other coding (institution budget categories, state object codes, and Purchasing Commodity codes), however, seems to be too far fetched.
- The OU purchasing and AP system seems to be very simple, and yet seems to meet their needs adequately.

Vendor Subsystem

The functions that permit changes to vendor names and addresses for the purpose of correcting data entry or standards errors have been developed and are in DEMO.

Personal Services Budget (PSB)

This project has finally gotten under way by having lots of meetings. Ava indicated that she was involved in 15 such sessions during October. It is apparent that there was little preparatory work done for this module since concepts such as budgeting all fund groups and budgeting by period have just emerged (at least they are just now being talked about between parties). I feel valuable time has been lost in this situation. I am also not sure who is in charge of this project, and feel that it should not be a part time assignment for a new team leader with no experience in BASIS applications nor application development projects.

Departmental Accounting

Discussion in other project areas continues to indicate that Departmental Accounting will be a BASIS module, and that it will be extensively integrated with UPS, PSB and GL. Its major component will be an available balance file where: commitments, encumbrances, and expenditures resulting from the procurement process will be reflected; salary encumbrances

and salary savings would be reflected; budget balances would be loaded (or originate); feeds to GL might originate (or may not be required given the availability of that data in this system); and numerous reports could be generated rather than from GL. Current discussion is to retain this data across three dimensions: organizational entity (company cost center?), category (whose?), and time period (months?). The concept also includes allowing departments to identify planned activity that would be aggregated with these balances, and that would be automatically reconciled when possible. There are obviously many questions outstanding in this area.

Hourly Time Sheets (HRLY-TS)

Minimal activity has occurred in this area consisting of minor enhancements and fixes. One, use of Emp ID as a starting value for LTBU, has been coded in several forms only to result in the decision to not make the change (but, instead, wait for the super list version that will permit page back).

Leave Accounting (LEAVE)

Our *240 hour rule* emerged once again as a problem. Three months after conversion, it was realized that a fix applied early in the year to the old Leave system was still in place. That fix had exempted holiday hours from the 240 hour rule so that employees would not be able to carry over more than 240 hours of vacation by inappropriately charging vacation rather than comp time (a problem discovered at the end of last year). The new Leave system has a holiday category, so this fix was no longer applicable but had been left in place. This has been corrected and a report of people potentially affected was produced for HR.

Labor Distribution (LABOR)

The essential pieces for the General Extract and Report have finally been put together and are receiving final testing. The Company Cost Center List function previously mentioned was one component. Another was the development of an ISPF macro to generate a sub-program to format a data record for downloading based upon user options for delimiting fields. A driver program and online job submission facility was also developed. For print output, it currently requires a CMS ID or specification of one of the few known NETPRINT names that works from MVS. This will have to be revised once the MVS TCP/IP Network Print Facility is working. I expect that it will be a challenge training users in how to setup their workstations to accept the MVS outbound FTP (when a file is requested).

The Agriculture extract and report has also been redone and online job submission capabilities built. Agriculture is currently testing this with production data.

Several other Labor issues have been raised, but no decisions made. These include: removal of the special fringe benefit rate for the COEX companies, use of Emp ID as a starting value on lists, which cost centers to use to determine routing of a retroactive change in distribution, and whether to make changes so that the system enforces requirements for A21 certification.