

**Title:** Chart of Accounts Design Session #1

**Date:** August 18, 2016

**Participants:** Cliff Merkell, Bill Weyrich, Michael Oldham, Tamara Morton, Ken Dover, Celise Elder, Sadie Brown, Emily Czaplinski, Chad Cleveland, Kenneth Little, Lauren Holcomb, Holley Schramski, Blake Waldrop

**Topics discussed:**

Item	Notes
Setting a Goal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants agreed that the goal of this first design session would be to focus on the department chart field (DEPTID).</li> </ul>
Group Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the first COA discovery session (08.02.2016) a starting point definition for department was agreed upon. The group reviewed that definition to begin discussions.</li> <li>Many factors were discussed in relation to the department chart field such as budgeting, reporting and location.</li> <li>Bill and Cliff explained that in PeopleSoft you can have multiple roll up trees. This would mean that UGA could have one tree for reporting purposes and a totally different tree for budgeting purposes.</li> <li>While many methods were discussed for possibly using the department chart field in some manner to capture location, in the end the group agreed the best solution would be to use an additional chart field for location. (The possible need for a location chart field was a ‘parking lot item’ in COA discovery sessions four and five.)</li> <li>The recommendation is to use the PeopleSoft chart field of ‘Operating Unit’ (OPERATING_UNIT) for location. This field can be up to 8 digits. A default value can be set for this field.</li> <li>The recommendation for the Department ID chart field length is 6 digits.</li> <li>A list of pros and cons was drafted for Department ID options: 1) keep the current UGA department number as a component of the 6-digit field (left justify current</li> </ul>

	<p>number and add three zeros) or 2) create a new Department ID strategy with a 6 digit length.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft list of pros and cons of each option, along with examples of each option, will be emailed to the larger group next week (COA team, grants team, project team and SMEs) for their input and feedback.</li> <li>• There was discussion on other uses of Department ID, such as department ‘632’ which is currently used to house federal student financial aid funds. Chad Cleveland asked if we need to have a way to separate Pell (for example) from other federal financial aid funds. Currently we use a separate Project ID to track Pell for a given award year from SEOG for a given award year. The group reviewed Georgia State’s chart of accounts and found they use Department ID similar to UGA’s current practice for federal aid. It was determined the COA design could follow Georgia State’s example and fulfill UGA needs; the result if almost identical to UGA’s current COA for these aid types. Therefore, the Department ID definition may need to be modified to include institutional needs for Department ID that are not the same as most uses of that chart field. Bill W. asked if there is a person or department responsible for these groupings; the answer is yes. For example: Student Accounts/Bursar is responsible for the department number used for all student aid types.</li> </ul>
Goals for Design Session #2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the feedback on the Department ID field.</li> <li>• Discuss and come up with a recommendation for the project ID (PROJECT_ID) chart field.</li> </ul>

**Action Items:**

Item	Due Date	Person(s) Responsible
Create two scenarios (including examples) for the Department ID options: 1) includes the current department number and 2) a new format.	As soon as possible	Kenneth Little and Celise Elder
Email larger group (COA Team and Grants Team and additional SMEs) the scenarios,	Week of August 22	Celise Elder

examples and a draft list of pros and cons related to the Department ID options.		
Examine changes needed to the Department ID definition to include institutional groupings such as Pell Grant, etc.		Celise Elder Holley Schramski Chad Cleveland
Determine what decisions have been made in HCM related to the department chart field. Bill W. has already asked the HCM consultant Greg Bennett to gather some of this information. Chad Cleveland and Blake Waldrop will also review their OneUSG notes.	As soon as possible	Bill Weyrich

**Decisions:**

Description	Person(s) Responsible
The recommended field length for Department ID is six digits.	COA Team
COA design recommendation will include use of the OPERATING_UNIT chart field to accommodate UGA's need to track financial data by location.	COA Team Celise Elder Chad Cleveland Holley Schramski

**Change Management Items:**

Description
There will be impacts to both of the Department ID options. There are currently examples of departments using more than one department ID and business officers would like to collapse those to one department ID. There are examples of the opposite. Whether the Department ID field continues to contain the historical department number or is totally renumbered, will have some change impact.
Use of the location chart field is not applicable in all situations. Education and understanding of its purpose will be important.

**Parking Lot Items:**

<b>Description</b>
<p>Consider eliminating department 999 to ghost-budget/track the portion of salary paid directly by counties to CAES employees with responsibilities to both the county and the University. Some counties are still paying a portion of the employee's salary directly to the employee where in other cases payroll is disbursed by UGA in full and UGA bills the county. Consider transitioning so 100% of these salaries are paid from a UGA account and UGA bills the portion funded by the county to the county.</p>
<p>Will the same combo edits be used in Hyperion that are used in PeopleSoft Financials?</p>
<p>If Operating Unit is used as a chart field for location, the field length and value will need to be determined. Discuss at the 8/24 COA design meeting.</p>