OneSource

Title: Chart of Accounts Discovery Session #5

Date: August 16, 2016

Participants: Chad Cox, Lauren Holcomb, Michael Oldham, Kim Eberhart, Elisa Collins, Terri Akers, Mica Turner, Jeanell Muckle, Susan McCullough, Chad Cleveland, Lisa Catanese, Nicole Moon, Therese Hodges, Donna Wooddell, Keith Morgan, Sunshine Jordan, Blake Waldrop, Emily Czaplinski, Craig Mathews, John Varghese, Bill Prigge, Sean Rogers, Sadie Brown, Marsha Allen, Tracie Sapp, Holley Schramski, Celise Elder, Sarah Fraker, Julie Thompson, Tamara Morton, Sharon Green, Bill Weyrich, Cliff Merkell

Topics discussed:

Item	Notes
COA Discovery & Design Schedule Changes	• Handouts were provided of the revised COA schedule. • Holley Schramski went through the specific process and date changes to the schedule. • The participants for the first three design sessions will be a smaller subset of the current COA team, project team, and SMEs. • The smaller group will take all the information derived from the discovery sessions along with feedback from campus and come up with a couple of COA recommendations. • These recommendations will then be brought to the larger participant group (COA team, grants team, project team, SMEs) for their review in three different confirmation sessions.
Interfaces and Reports	• Listings of current known interfaces and external reports were distributed. As we continue to receive interface and report information it will be added to these lists. • Since interfaces are unique to each department/unit it will be best to meet with each department/unit individually to discuss their interface. It was determined that these discussions should include a senior financial person, functional person, and IT person from the department/unit.

Reporting in PeopleSoft	• Cliff Merkell discussed various considerations when reporting within PeopleSoft. • For reporting purposes, it will be critical that UGA understand the tables (LEDGER and LEDGER_KK), data residing in the tables, and the how PeopleSoft processes transactions between these ledgers. • Strong closing procedures (monthly and yearly) will also be critical to UGAs specific reporting needs. • Cliff explained the various issues he has encountered when institutions do not understand their data and process flow. He also gave examples of what could happen if there are lax (or no) closing procedures in place. • Cliff presented an example of how the Project Costing module could be used by departments for their individual allocation purposes. Since there are additional chart fields in the Project Costing module (such as activity) this could allow departments to allocate funds down to the level they need for specific faculty (or other needs to track at a more granular level) • Cliff provided a hand out showing an example of a PeopleSoft Tree. He explained the different levels and nodes on the tree. Trees can be used for reporting purposes and perhaps budgetary control purposes.

Action Items:

Item	Due Date	Person(s) Responsible
No Action Items		

Decisions:

Description	Person(s) Responsible
Participants agreed that we should continue to explore the use of Project ID with the Project Costing Module as a method that could be used for department allocation purposes.	COA Team and Project Team

Change Management Items:

Description
No change management items.

Parking Lot Items:

Description
Will budget reference be used as a chart field?
Will a location chart field be needed?
<Item 3>