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Executive Summary

The University of Wisconsin (UW) recently purchased the PeopleSoft Grants Suite to improve business practices, and to provide a strong technical foundation to meet current and future institutional needs. The University undertook a ten-week planning phase focusing on the preparation of an implementation plan and business case for the Grants suite of applications. During this project, Huron worked collaboratively with UW representatives from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Business Services, Division of IT, and other campus representatives to create a detailed project plan. The Huron team provided an overview of the Grants suite’s functionality, lessons learned, modifications made by other Research I universities, work plans, communication plans, and other related implementation tools and templates to the University during this planning effort. The team also made key decisions about the scope of the implementation project.

After careful review of the current environment and demonstration of the PeopleSoft Grants suite by a large group of Research Administration constituents, the team decided to move forward with the following recommendations:

1. Begin an estimated two-year implementation of the PeopleSoft Grants suite (Grants, Projects, Contracts, Billing and Accounts Receivable modules) for the growing research activity at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. In addition to core PeopleSoft functionality, a customized Electronic Transmittal Form and PI Reporting Tool will be implemented as part of this system implementation.

2. Finalize the selection of an Effort Certification System and implement the system for PI use during 2006.

The successful implementation of the above recommendations will allow the University to address the following compliance concerns:

- Effort Reporting
- Accuracy and Timeliness of Reporting
- Cash Management
- Letter of Credit Management
- Cost Transfers and Overruns
- Control and Monitoring of Project Budgets and Expenditures
- Cost Sharing

Although an investment in Research Administration systems will address many areas of research administration concern, these recommendations for future initiatives do not address a Grants.gov solution, Export Controls, nor the ongoing need for UW professionals trained in the business and risks of research administration throughout the large, decentralized Madison campus.

In addition to addressing compliance risk, the implementation of the PeopleSoft Grants suite and an Effort Certification system will address the following strategic and operational business needs:

1. Build upon electronic research systems to address areas of compliance concern.

2. Manage System Risk – Protect research-related data and associated revenue stream by transitioning from legacy system technology.

3. Share Data – Provide information to key university systems and constituencies, at the Madison campus and throughout the UW System.
4. Enhance Reporting – Initiate operational reporting capability and provide for reporting of performance metrics.

5. Implement Grants Management System – Implement a system the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs can use to capture critical data elements for tracking and reporting on research activity.

6. Reduce redundant data entry and manual processes and enable more efficient communication, collaboration, and integration of processes between RSP, compliance committees and the research community.

7. Streamline Support Structure – Support one database and one toolset of PeopleSoft. Reduce the need for maintenance of independent legacy systems.

8. Manage Billing and Accounts Receivable – Gain ability to actively manage revenue, unbilled and billed cash balances real-time.

9. Reduce Need for Supplemental and Legacy Systems – Reduce the need for supplemental systems by colleges, departments, and other UW offices.

10. Replace aging data systems – Reduce reliance on systems that are based on outmoded hardware and software platforms.

To address the University’s most critical business needs and compliance risks while managing the inherent risks of a large system project, a phased implementation plan was developed by a cross disciplined team, comprised of RSP, DoIT, and Huron personnel. The detailed project plan outlines the implementation phases, tasks, durations, and required resources to implement the Grants suite, along with estimates for anticipated reports, modifications, and conversion efforts.
Planning Phase Approach

The University of Wisconsin – Madison (UW), with assistance from UW-Milwaukee, UW-Extension, and UW-System participated in a ten week planning phase that focused on the following key tasks:

- Confirm the scope/resources for the planning phase
- Review the current business processes
- Develop a communications plan
- Provide Grants system overview
- Outline a conversion strategy
- Create an implementation workplan
- Build a business case

UW representatives from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Business Services, Division of IT, and other campus representatives worked collaboratively during each phase of this planning project, resulting in a comprehensive project plan that includes key scope decisions that can be used for future implementation projects.

Planning Phase Stakeholders

Realizing the importance of including representation from the research community in the planning phase, a large number of participants took part in the meetings, demonstrations, and key decision sessions, working side-by-side, ensuring continuous knowledge transfer throughout the project. Participants were organized into the following roles.

Planning Phase Project Team Organization

The project team for the Project Planning phase consisted of Huron and UW personnel, working side-by-side, ensuring continuous knowledge transfer throughout the project. The team organization structure along with individual roles will need to be reconfirmed and updated for the implementation phase.
Project Roles:

- **Executive Committee**

  The primary responsibilities of the Executive Committee are to act as advisors and decision makers for the overall project.

  Responsibilities include:

  - Act as advisors and ultimate decision-makers
  - Assist in the resolution of major issues
  - Communicate and advocate change in the organization
  - Assist with the funding approval process for future phases
  - During the planning stage, the committee met at the beginning, mid point, and end of the project.

Representatives for the Executive Committee include:

- Darrell Bazzell, Vice Chancellor for Administration
- Martin Cadwallader, Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School
- Annie Stunden, CIO and Director of the Division of Information Technology

Advisors to the Executive Committee include:

- Ron Kraemer, Deputy Chief Information Officer of the Division of Information Technology
- Steve Hahn, Director of Information Technology, Graduate School and RSP
- Kim Moreland*, Director of RSP
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- Peter Eschenbach, Huron Consulting Group Managing Director
- Joy Walton, Huron Consulting Group Project Director
- Doug Tilghman, Huron Consulting Group Project Lead

* Kim Moreland will serve as the Executive Committee meeting facilitator.

**Project Sponsors**

The primary role of the Project Sponsors is to successfully achieve the project’s objectives. The Project Sponsors supervises the team’s overall work, resolves issues, participates in key project decisions, and provides regular reports to the Executive Committee, Campus Advisory Committee, and the Administrative Advisory Committee. The Project Sponsors are also responsible for managing the project within its budget.

The responsibilities of Project Sponsors typically include:

- Periodically meet with the Executive, Administrative Advisory, and Campus Advisory Committees to discuss project’s progress
- Assist in the resolution of major issues
- Communicate the project vision from the top down
- Devise overall project planning, resource acquisition and work assignment responsibilities
- Establish project milestones, track project performance, adjust staffing to ensure cost effectiveness and timely delivery
- Report on project cost, schedule, and status information
- Communicate and coordinate issues, conflicts, and status to UW management
- Obtain sign-off on the deliverables
- Project Sponsors will meet frequently to review status.

Representatives for the Project Sponsors include:

- Steve Hahn*, Director of Information Technology, Graduate School and RSP
- Kim Moreland, Director of RSP
- Jack Duwe, Deputy Chief Information Officer of the Division of Information Technology

Advisors to the Project Sponsors include:

- Peter Eschenbach, Huron Consulting Group Managing Director
- Chris Holtzman, Division of Information Technology
- John Peterson, Director Systems Engineering and Operations, Division of Information Technology
- Tom Scott, Director ADI, Division of Information Technology
- Doug Tilghman, Huron Consulting Group Project Lead
- Joy Walton, Huron Consulting Group Project Director

* Steve Hahn will serve as the Project Sponsors meeting facilitator.

**Planning Team**

Designated representative leads/users from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, Business Services and the Division of IT and other campuses will form the Planning team for the duration of the Project.
The Planning Team leads will be responsible for the progress and quality of the team, and report to the Project Sponsors.

Responsibilities include:

- Identify and work to resolve issues
- Serve as point persons for questions related to each respective area
- Work on all tasks as defined in the workplan
- Identify and escalate issues to the Project Sponsors
- Review and ensure quality of work products and deliverables
- The Planning Team will participate in the system overview demonstration and receive a weekly written status report.

Representatives for the Planning Team include:

- Bob Andresen, Assistant Director and Post-Award Services
- Elise Barho, SFS Project Manager, Financial Application – DoIT
- Al Benzschawel, Controller, UW Madison
- Carol Block, IS Supervisor, ADI Financial Applications
- Dwan Schuck, System Financial Operations, UW System
- Mark Sweet*, ERA Coordinator

Advisors to the Planning Team include:

- Doug Tilghman*, Huron Consulting Group Project Lead
- Joy Walton, Huron Consulting Group

* Mark Sweet and Doug Tilghman will serve as the Planning Team meeting facilitator/lead.

- Grants Team

The Huron team, along with designated representative leads/users from RSP will form the working Grants Team. This team will be focused on the PeopleSoft Grants suite and be involved in the detailed configuration, training, and analysis of the modules.

Responsibilities include:

- Review business processes and current state systems
- Lead requirement gathering efforts
- Provide configuration guidance based on their experience
- Prepare and execute PeopleSoft Grants system overview
- Review modifications, enhancements, and process changes from other research institutions
- Work on all the tasks as defined in the Project Approach section of this document
- Identify and work to resolve issues
- Serve as point person for questions related to each respective area

Representatives for the Grants Team include:

- Bob Andresen, Assistant Director, RSP
- Diane Barrett, Assistant Director, RSP
- Cyril Chen, Huron Consulting Group
- Dave Diericks, Financial Management Supervisor, Accounting Services
- Jim Erickson, Accountant, UW Extension**
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- Todd Friske, Project Manager, Financial Application – Madison
- Ruth Fruehling, Indirect Cost Analyst
- Stephanie Gray, RSP Pre Award Supervisor
- Mark Inman, RSP Post Award Supervisor
- Mary Ann Stefonek, Accountant, UW System
- Mark Sweet*, ERA Coordinator
- Doug Tilghman*, Huron Consulting Group Project Lead
- Peggy Vanco, Director, Sponsored Projects, Milwaukee
- Joy Walton, Huron Consulting Group

* Mark Sweet and Doug Tilghman will serve as the Grants Team meeting facilitator/lead.
** The Grants Team will hold monthly-expanded meetings to include Peggy Vanco, Jim Erickson, and Mary Ann Stefonek

- Key Contacts

The primary responsibilities of the Key Contacts is to act as an expert in their respective area and be able to provide guidance on topics and issues related to their areas. Depending on the scope of use, a representative may be necessary from each of the potential campuses to use this system.

Responsibilities include:

- Act as subject matter experts in each of their respective areas
- Provide guidance on specific areas and resolve issues related to their respective areas

Representatives for the Key Contacts include:

- Deanna Dietrich, Associate Dean, Engineering
- Warren Emery, Director of Computer Services, Medical School
- Mike Hardiman, Director, Purchasing
- Linda Haskins, Waisman Center
- Carol Hillmer, Assistant Dean, CALS
- Linda Johnson, Admin Program Specialist, L&S
- Jeff Kuhn, Accountant, UW System
- K Lucia, Waisman Center
- Gene Masters, Sr Info Processing Consultant, Engineering
- Sandi Robins, Assistant Dean, Medical School
- Petra Schroeder, Assistant Dean, Graduate School
- Beth Walsh, Assistant Dean, Education

* Mark Sweet will serve as the liaison to the key contacts.

- Campus Advisory Committee

The Campus Advisory Committee will receive monthly updates from the Project Sponsors on the progress of the planning and implementation efforts.

Responsibilities include:
• Participate in monthly update meeting
• Assist with the communication of the project vision across campus
• Communicate issues and proposed solutions to the Project Sponsors

Representatives for the Campus Advisory Committee include:

- Paul Deluca, Associate Dean, Medical School
- Irwin Goldman, Associate Dean, CALS
- Steve Hahn*, Director of Information Technology, Graduate School and RSP
- Kathy Irwin, Senior University Legal Counsel
- Benzi Karsch, Faculty, Engineering
- Jerry Lange, Director of Internal Audit
- Bruce Maas, Director of Info Tech, UW Milwaukee
- Bill Mellon, Associate Dean for Research Policy
- Jon Miller, Associate Dean of L&S
- Kim Moreland, Director of RSP
- Tim Norris, Director of Budget
- Paul Peercy, Dean of Engineering
- Jim Tracy, Associate Dean, School of Veterinary Medicine

* Steve Hahn will serve as the Campus Advisory meeting facilitator

• Administrative Advisory Committee

The Administrative Advisory Committee will participate in monthly status updates and business process/policy discussions as directed by the Project Sponsors related to research administration at UW.
Responsible include:

- Participate in monthly status meeting
- Assist with the communication of the project vision across campus
- Communicate issues and proposed solutions to the Project Sponsors
- Review business process enhancements and issues
- Provide advice and direction on process and policy changes related to research administration

Representatives for the Administrative Advisory Committee include:

- Deletta Anderson, Assistant Dean, School of Business
- Darrell Bazzell, Vice Chancellor of Administration
- Jo Beth Dudley, Director of Computer Services, School of Veterinary Medicine
- Robert Dye, Associate Dean, Engineering
- Paul Jelle, Assistant Dean, CALS
- Jim Knickmeyer, Associate Dean, Grad School
- Pennie Maclean, Associate Dean, Education
- Donald Miner, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Business Services
- Kim Moreland*, Director of RSP
- Ken Mount, Associate Dean, Med School
- Carla Raatz, Director, Human Resources
- Margaret Roth, Associate Dean, L&S
Technical Team
The primary responsibility of Technical Team will be to support the Grants Team.
Responsibilities include:

- Establish reliable environment for the planning phase
- Participate in PeopleSoft Grants system overview
- Provide on-going support throughout the planning phase
- Provide implementation estimates for technical tasks

Representatives for the Technical Team include:
- Elise Barho, SFS Project Manager, Financial Application – DoIT
- Carol Block, IS Supervisor, ADI Financial Applications
- Todd Friske, Project Manager, Financial Application – Madison
- Mark Sweet*, ERA Coordinator

* Mark Sweet will serve as the liaison to the Technical Team.

Non Sponsored Activities Team
Representatives for the Non Sponsored Activities Team include:
- Jeff Arnold, UW System
- Al Benzschawel, Controller, UW Madison
- Cindy Blewett, Med School
- Dave Diericks, Financial Management Supervisor, Accounting Services
- Paul Jelle, Assistant Dean, CALS
- Dan Malacara, Budget Director, UW Cooperative Extension
- Tim Norris, Madison Budget Office
- Hua Ramer, Financial Management Supervisor, Accounting Services
- Bill Richner, Budget, Planning & Analysis
- Steve Schwoegler, Assistant Dean, Grad School
- Mark Sweet*, ERA Coordinator

* Mark Sweet will serve as the liaison to Non-Sponsored Activities Team.

System Integration Team
The System Integration Team will ensure the Grants Suite is fully integrated in SFS and ensure that any needed technical interfaces are developed and tested by the Technical Team.
Responsibilities include:

- Participate in recurring meetings
- Provide guidance on specific issues and work collaboratively to resolve those issues
- Assist in communication of Project vision across UW-System
Representatives for the System Integration Team include:

- Bob Andresen, Assistant Director and Post-Award Services
- Elise Barho, SFS Project Manager, Financial Application – DoIT
- Al Benzschawel, Controller, UW Madison
- Carol Block, IS Supervisor, ADI Financial Applications
- Dave Diericks, Financial Management Supervisor, Accounting Services
- Mark Dorn, Controller, Extension
- Todd Friske, Project Manager, Financial Application – Madison
- Karen Gundrum, Controller, Milwaukee
- Sharon Hughes, Financial Program Manager, Cash Management, Accounting Services
- Ernie Mergen, Consultant, Financial Administration, UW System
- Hua Ramer, Financial Management Supervisor, Accounting Services
- Dwan Schuck, System Financial Operations, UW System
- Mark Sweet, ERA Coordinator
Current State

Business Environment and Use of Systems

- Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

  Function

  The primary responsibilities of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP) are to support the research, education, and outreach initiatives of the University of Wisconsin-Madison through administering externally sponsored programs and activities. RSP is responsible for the negotiation, final review, and submission of grants and contracts applications. RSP also supports financial and administrative tasks through financial report preparations, receipt collections, invoice submissions, and payment processing. Cost studies to determine the university’s Facilities and Administrative cost rate are also performed by RSP. RSP is responsible for the maintenance of several systems, including the Personnel Activity Reporting system (PAR), Pre-Award Login System (PALS), Extramural Support Information System (ESIS), and Sub-Award Tracking System.

- Process Description and Use of Systems

  Proposal Entry:
  Currently, the grants lifecycle at the University of Wisconsin stretches across several systems. Proposal tracking begins with the university’s internal approval form, the T-form. The T-form is passed along for approval from the PI, to the Department chair, to the Dean. The form is not seen by RSP until the day all requisite bodies have approved it and it is ready to be entered into the Wisconsin developed proposal system, PALS. Once the proposal is entered, it must then be reviewed for processing by a RSP staff member. The proposal is submitted once it passes compliance, budget and scope checks, and is approved by RSP and the Institution.

  Compliance is only tracked by the pre-award office and not by the post-award office. The Consolidated Lookup of All Protocols system (CLAP) is used for the query of biosafety and IRB protocols.

  A copy of the proposal record is then uploaded into ESIS via a batch job after the status of the proposal has been set to “complete”. The proposal can also be set up in ESIS manually. Hardcopies of the proposal documents are filed the following day. Following sponsor negotiations, the proposal is awarded, rejected, withdrawn, or purged.

  Generate Award:
  Once a sponsor accepts a proposal, the proposal can be set to “awarded” within the ESIS system. Accounts are setup for the award, and ESIS generates the appropriate account number. The award file is then sent to the post-award team leader for accountant distribution. The post-award team examines the award file against the original agreement for accuracy. After the information is verified in ESIS, the award is entered into electronic and/or paper tracking systems. If the award is non-federal and non-letter
of credit, then a corresponding account will be created in the GAR system. Account data in GAR and data in ESIS can be inconsistent, as the two databases are not consolidated.

**Monitor and Maintain award:**
The award is primarily maintained within ESIS, with data interfaced from ESIS to other systems for reporting and tracking needs. Budget amount, department changes, project begin and end dates, and other modifications are examples of those items maintained in ESIS. Award Expenditures – salaries, requisitions, non-salary payment transfers, etc. – are monitored and approved to make sure they are reasonable, allowable, and allocable according to sponsor, federal and state guidelines. Monitoring of the awards is done primarily by using WISDM; however, some monitoring is done through the pre-audit approval of certain expenditures. Much maintenance of the award is also performed by Accounting Services (See Accounting Services). Sub-awards are established and maintained on the Sub-Award Tracking system.

**Reporting:**
Reports and invoices are generated through ESIS, WISDM, GAR, and other reporting systems when appropriate. Data for University of Wisconsin’s reporting tool, WISDM, is populated by data from the SFS General Ledger and ESIS. WISDM is the primary campus reporting tool for project grants, and is available to all campus users for reporting needs.

**Budgetary Control:**
There is currently no control on spending at the University of Wisconsin. Funding edits – otherwise known as combination edits – are performed on budgets by Accounting Services through the Master File Edits system: see Accounting Services.

**Fringe, Facilities & Administration, Tuition/Fee Remission Allocation:**
See Accounting Services.

**Cost Sharing:**
Salary cost sharing for federal projects is tracked in the ESIS system and is allocated to a department designated fund number.

**Billing and Accounts Receivable:**
Prior to invoice printing and submission, expenditures in WISDM are compared with authorized project budgets. Invoices and reports are generated using the GAR system and then submitted to the sponsor. Revenue receipts for non-federal letter of credit grants, contracts, and other agreements are monitored for accuracy and timeliness through the GAR system. Receipt transfers are corrected, balanced, and processed using the DREV system. RSP suspense accounts are reconciled against the DREV system.

**Purchasing:**
Currently, the University of Wisconsin-Madison is not using the PeopleSoft Purchasing Module. Consequently, purchasing is still performed through the Legacy accounting purchasing system. Paper requisitions are filled out manually, passed through an approval process, and then an encumbrance is entered into the Legacy accounting system. Encumbrance information for external vendors is loaded from the Legacy accounting system to the Legacy purchasing system. Purchase order invoices are paid
through Legacy accounts payable. Direct charges are paid through the PeopleSoft Accounts Payable module.

At other UW campuses, the PeopleSoft Purchasing module has been successfully installed and used.

**Award Close-out:**
Prior to award closeouts, final expenditures are verified, accounts are balanced, and final invoices and financial reports are prepared. When the requisite closeout procedures are complete, the award files in ESIS/ACMF and GAR are deactivated. Electronic files in ESIS are periodically purged.

- **Accounting Services**
  - **Function**
    Accounting Services at the University of Wisconsin-Madison is responsible for all of the university’s financial management and reporting needs. In regards to grants management, Accounting Services plays a significant role as the manager and facilitator of many financial tasks. Specifically, Accounting Services supports project grants through funding edits, fringe calculations and allocations, F&A calculations and allocations, tuition/fee remission calculations and allocations, revenue collection, billing and accounts receivable, cash receipts collection.
  - **Process Description and Use of Systems**
    **Funding Edits:**
    Funding edits – also known as combination edits – for project grants are performed by the Master File Edits system through funding data that is pulled from the ESIS system. Funding edits guard against certain chartfield combinations from being entered into the system.

    **Fringe and Tuition/Fee remission encumbrances:**
    Fringe and tuition/fee remission encumbrances are calculated “on-the-fly” in WISDM based on the assigned rates and salary encumbrance balances. Because salaries are paid out at different times during the month, fringe and tuition/fee remission encumbrance balances change accordingly whenever a salary payment is posted. The expenditures for fringe and tuition/fee remission allocation are calculated and posted at the end of the month, therefore each month there is a period of time where the current real online financial data does not reflect the true encumbrances for these expenditures. This method of calculation is intended only to reflect the end of month balances.

    **Fringe, F&A and Tuition/Fee remission allocations:**
    The Legacy accounting system allocates fringe, F&A, and tuition/fee remission expenditures at the end of month.

    **Billing and Accounts Receivables:**
    The Billing and Accounts Receivables system for non-LOC project grants is the GAR system. GAR has the ability to print invoices and hold billing invoices until all transactions have been collected. Billing and Accounts Receivables for federal LOC
project grants are performed using a combination of ESIS, DoIT generated reports and DREV.

Cash receipts:
Currently, the DREV legacy accounting system is used for the collection and distribution of cash receipts.

Year-End Closing Processes:
Moving balances forward, moving budgets forward, and handling changes in department number (UDDS code) are all part of the fiscal year-end closing processes performed by Accounting Services. A legacy program is used to convert UDDS codes and roll forward year-end balances from old UDDS codes to new UDDS codes.

Budgets:
Annual budget loads and mid-year budget transfers are performed by Accounting Services using the Legacy system and interfaced to SFS.

Interface to DOA
In conjunction with UW System, Accounting Services also administers the interface between the SFS PeopleSoft system and DOA. There are currently some processes in the interface that still rely on Legacy programs.

Internal Transfers
An internal transfer is an automated load of large quantities of transactions by campus departments into the Legacy accounting system.

Payments
Payments against purchase order encumbrances are currently performed through legacy accounts payable. Non-purchase order encumbrances are paid through the PeopleSoft Accounts Payable module.

Non-salary encumbrances
Campus departments currently create non-salary encumbrances within the legacy accounting system.

Check Printing
Accounting Services is responsible for printing checks.

Systems Environment

- PeopleSoft Applications

UW System currently manages the PeopleSoft Shared Financial System (SFS) with the General Ledger module being utilized and shared across all University of Wisconsin campuses. Each campus is a separate Business Unit within General Ledger. In addition to the General Ledger module, Madison is also using the PeopleSoft Accounts Payable module for direct charges that do not involve a purchase order. Currently, no University of Wisconsin campus is using the Project Costing Module. However, the project chartfield is being used by all campuses to track project ID’s. The use of the projects chartfield is not limited to project grants. Internally funded projects, auxiliary activities, trust funds and gifts are some examples of project chartfield use for
non-grant projects. There is also duplication in the use of project ID’s across campuses, departments, and sometimes fiscal years.

The current SFS PeopleSoft system is heavily interfaced with other University of Wisconsin systems including ESIS, the Payroll system, and Legacy accounting. Data from ESIS, Payroll, and Legacy accounting is accumulated in the General Ledger within SFS. In November of 2005, the SFS was upgraded from PeopleSoft 7.5 to PeopleSoft 8.8. Due to the loss of the project header record in 8.8, Wisconsin no longer had a place to track project status or project manager information. As a solution, Wisconsin created a modification to add five additional fields under the Design Projects Chartfield page so that manager information and project status can be tracked. The five fields are: Manager, Manager effective date, Project Status, Project Status effective date, Project Long Description.

Both UW Milwaukee and UW Extension are currently using the PeopleSoft Purchasing module. Only UW Extension is using the PeopleSoft Billing and Accounts Receivable module. Recently, Madison has made efforts to move more of its business over to the SFS. However, Madison utilization of PeopleSoft is currently limited to 30 users.

**Other Systems**

In addition to the existing PeopleSoft system, the University of Wisconsin is currently using several other systems to support the management of sponsored, and non-sponsored, programs and activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Owner/Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PALS</td>
<td>A web-based system used by the pre-award office for the tracking of grant proposals and agreements. PALS tracks the workflow information, as well as the status of agreement negotiations. The requirement that an Outside Activity Report has been filed by a PI is tracked in PALS via a yes/no indicator. Data stored in PALS flows into ESIS.</td>
<td>RSP maintains PALS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIS (Extramural Support Information System)</td>
<td>ESIS is a 3270-based, legacy system. It is primarily used for tracking proposals, setting up accounts, organizing data, and generating Regent notices for externally funded projects. Data from ESIS is pulled from PALS and fed into the PeopleSoft General Ledger, Legacy accounting system and WISDM.</td>
<td>RSP maintains ESIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAR (Personnel Activity Reporting)</td>
<td>PAR is a 3270-based, legacy system. The PAR system is used for tracking time and effort spent on federally funded external projects. ESIS and payroll data is pulled from the SFD into PAR.</td>
<td>RSP maintains PAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Maintainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAR</td>
<td>GAR is a 3270-based, legacy system. It is one of many University of Wisconsin’s billing and collection system. Its primary functions include the preparation, maintenance, and printing of invoices and financial reports related to externally funded projects. Expenditure data in GAR is collected from the SFS Datamart, with some additional data flowing in from ESIS. Payment information from DREV flows into the GAR system so that payments can be deposited into the appropriate accounts.</td>
<td>Accounting Services maintains GAR. However, RSP is the primary user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFD and Payroll</td>
<td>The SFD and Payroll systems track wages, taxes, FICA, and other deductions for the University of Wisconsin payroll, at the employee level.</td>
<td>UW System and Business Services maintain SFD and payroll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Purchasing</td>
<td>The system used by the Madison campus for all purchase order transactions.</td>
<td>Purchasing Services maintains Purchasing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREV (Decentralized Revenue Entry System)</td>
<td>DREV is part of the Legacy Accounting system. It is primarily used for the entering and transferring of grants and non-grants receipts, including receipts with sales tax collections. DREV is also used for posting expenditure refunds.</td>
<td>Accounting Services maintains DREV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISDM (Wisconsin Datamart)</td>
<td>WISDM is a web-based system used for reporting on the financial status of project grants. WISDM provides project grant balances, expenditures, and encumbrances by account code category and by individual transaction. Inquiries are also available on individual requisitions. Reports can be run by PI, department, fund, project grant, or project grant range. The SFS Datamart is the primary data source for WISDM, with descriptive project data flowing in from ESIS.</td>
<td>UW System and Accounting Services maintains WISDM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Data Warehouse (InfoAccess) & SFS Datamart      | The data warehouse is an Oracle database that stores information from various systems such as ESIS. In particular, the data warehouse is used for reporting and web lookup screens.  

The SFS Datamart stores accounting information and is the primary structure used by the WISDM reporting system.  

DoIT maintains the data warehouse.  

UW System maintains the SFS Datamart. However, the owner of the data source is considered the owner of the data within the systems.  

| Sub Award Tracking System                       | The Sub Award Tracking System is a web-based system used for tracking sub-awards relating to sponsored activities when the University of Wisconsin is the primary recipient. Sub-recipient names are linked to the Agency table in PALS, fund-account project information is pulled from ESIS, and the requisition number is linked to WISDM. This system also tracks sub-recipient compliance with A133 audit requirements. | RSP maintains this system.                                                                   |
| Research Compliance Systems | IRB Webkit – The IRB Webkit is a commercial product that runs on a SQL Server database. Its tables are populated from the campus data warehouse. The IRB Webkit is linked to the Outside Activities database, and the Conflict of Interest database.  

IACUCA – The IACUCA has an internal FoxPro database for tracking protocols.  

Biosafety – The Biosafety office has an internal MS Access database for tracking biosafety protocols.  

Outside Activities Reporting System – The Outside Activities Reporting / Conflict of Interest System includes a reporting form for faculty and staff, and tools to help administrators assess the impact of potential conflicts between outside activities and sponsored research. The Web-based tools use an Oracle database. Some of the tools query ESIS information from the data warehouse.  

| The Graduate School maintains IRBWebkit.  

RARC maintains IACUCA.  

OBS maintains BioSafety  

The Graduate School maintains the Outside Activities Reporting System. |
| CLAP (Consolidated Lookup of All Protocols) | CLAP is a web-based system, run on an Oracle database, which offers IRB and Biosafety data to RSP and other users. IRB data is queried from the IRB Webkit database, while the Biosafety data is uploaded monthly.  

| The Graduate School maintains CLAP, while its primary user is RSP. |
Current Areas of Risk Addressed by Implementation

Effect Reporting

The Department of Health and Human Services’ (DHHS) Office of Inspector General (OIG) continues its increased scrutiny and interpretation of effort on federal awards. The November 28, 2005 Federal Register (70 FR 71312) contains new draft guidance that identifies eight basic elements for a comprehensive compliance program. Time and effort reporting, along with reporting financial support from other sources, are specifically mentioned as areas of high concern.

The PAR effort reporting system is nearly 30 years old and does not fully address current federal standards of compliance, much less the proposed federal changes. The system does not allow PIs to see their total effort; only effort on federal awards where PI salary is paid. Because of this, PIs are also unable to match their future commitments with the Other Support documentation they must provide to federal funding agencies at the time of award with their actual expended effort.

Accuracy and Timeliness of Reporting

The current SFS used by the UW System was not built to handle grants. Thus, there is little ability for a PI, department administrator, or RSP to get accurate reports regarding grant expenditures, and to do so in a timely fashion. The importance of enabling PI’s and research administrators to receive timely and accurate information about research projects cannot be overstated. The same DHHS Guidance referenced above points out that “failure to account accurately for charges to various award projects can result in significant disallowances or criminal or civil fraud investigations.” It is vital that a robust infrastructure for accurate grant monitoring across campus be implemented as soon as possible. In order to provide that infrastructure, the following functional areas must be addressed.

Cash Management

The ability to monitor UW accounts receivable and billing system adequately has decreased over time as research volume has grown. There are currently nearly 15,000 active grant accounts being monitored by 19 staff in RSP. The lack of automation in the current system adds risks to downstream revenue as volume continues to increase. Letter of Credit draws, along with the billing of over 3000 sponsors, far outpaces the ability of the staff to accurately monitor accounts with outmoded legacy capabilities. The delays in charges being added to the SFS as paper works its way through the University leads to inaccurate reporting and thus to an increasingly large number of cost transfers to correct errors after the fact.

Letter of Credit Management

The current system of determining revenue draws against Federal letters of credit does not provide an effective means of calculating the cash position of the University. Federal guidelines require the University to provide interest to the government if our cash balances exceed our current expenditure levels. Because the letter of credit draw reports do not indicate which specific projects have cash balances or deficits and the University does not have an effective method to determine interest payment amounts, the University must use an estimated adjustment amount before drawing cash to ensure that no cash balance is on hand. As a consequence, UW draws less than the sum of its accrued costs, resulting in a delayed income stream.
Cost Transfers

Costs transfers have rapidly become a focal point for OIG audits. Large numbers of cost transfers draw the attention of auditors, and this is one of the areas addressed in the DHHS Guidance. Problems with cost transfers and project overruns were also a finding in last year’s LAB audit. The current business processes and the inadequate technology supporting them ensure that cost transfers will continue to be an issue if not addressed. Accurate reporting, in real time, will greatly reduce this risk, as appropriate costs can be allocated and monitored on a regular basis and prior to the closeout of an award.

Control and Monitoring of Project Budgets and Expenditures

One method to help make certain that cost accounting standards are applied to sponsored projects is to use budget monitoring to help control spending. There is currently no effective pre-audit mechanism to do such monitoring for unallowable costs.

Cost Overruns

Current systems are unable to stop expenses beyond the approved award amount. Because of this lack of control, it is increasingly difficult for campus to manage multiple projects and funding sources. Without the ability to stop expenditures from being charged to a specific project, accounts become overspent, and correcting transfers are required. Federal Circular A-21 specifically prohibits the shifting of expenses between projects solely for the purpose of covering overruns. This area is also one of the eight basic elements of concern in the DHHS Office of Inspector General’s (OIG) draft guidance on comprehensive compliance programs.

Cost Sharing

Because the current system is paper-based, the only cost sharing that the current system tracks is the mandatory, committed cost sharing of salary on federal accounts. It does not collect voluntary cost sharing or cost sharing from non-salary sources. That means the University is not compliant with federal standards. In addition, because of the system’s limitations, the UW must overcompensate by adding an inordinate amount of money to the F&A calculation base. This gap has a direct effect on the negotiated F&A rate.

Current Areas of Risk Not Addressed by Implementation

Grants.gov

Grants.gov is the federal government’s response to P.L. 106-107, which requires sponsoring agencies to use a single portal for all funding applications. Because of many delays in achieving full functionality in grants.gov, and the unwillingness of the agencies to use the system until adequate functionality is achieved, the OMB now has tied agency appropriations to their use of grants.gov. For instance, NIH must receive 80% of their proposal applications through grants.gov by October 2006. Grants.gov does not have a user-friendly or robust method to assist faculty in developing their grant proposals. It also does not currently offer an electronic “system-to-system” interface for transmission of the proposal data, greatly adding to PI and administrative burden, as each proposal has to begin anew.
Infrastructure for Campus-wide Research Administration

While the capabilities for robust reporting and monitoring will be a major focus of the new implemented and integrated systems, no electronic system replaces the need for highly qualified and professional research administrators. The highly decentralized infrastructure at the University, coupled with its large research volume, makes standardized business processes difficult. The University needs to improve its training programs, business practices, and monitoring activities to fully support the vital and complex research programs of the faculty.

Export Controls

Export controls are a new area of intense federal scrutiny at universities. In a limited way, this system assists in the tracking and management of sponsored projects that potentially involve export control restrictions, but it does not significantly remove our exposure. This is an area that will require continual updates, education, and monitoring over time, particularly in view of emerging federal regulations.
Business Needs

Strategic Needs

1. **Build upon electronic research systems to address areas of compliance concern.**

   The volume of work and the growth of award dollars in sponsored activities over the last several years have been tremendous, and projections indicate continued growth as new research facilities are being built and new initiatives are being undertaken. In addition, Federal compliance requirements are becoming increasingly stringent, and changes in the sponsored funding environment, such as system-to-system electronic interfaces (i.e. grants.gov) for submission of proposals, are imposing new burdens upon research universities.

   To manage the mounting Federal and sponsor regulatory pressures as well as the University’s research growth, the need for an integrated, robust, and expandable system is more crucial than ever. Efficiency requires a system where grants and contracts officers are not manually inputting recurring data, grant accounting and financial databases are integrated, and tracking and reporting of proposal/award information is readily available.

   Effort reporting and certification is one of the primary current areas of focus for compliance with Federal policies and regulations. An integrated effort certification system, along with redesigned business processes and training programs, is necessary to demonstrate the University’s continued commitment to meeting Federal regulatory requirements.

2. **Manage System Risk – Protect research-related data and associated revenue stream by transitioning from legacy system technology.**

   Most of the existing business processes in place for managing sponsored research do not leverage system wide electronic tracking and storage systems and consequently the legacy systems do not have strong support in the event of an unexpected system failure. Centralized support of a standard, integrated system reduces the vulnerability of data associated with a $900+ million extramural funding stream.

   Implementing updated business processes and associated systems demonstrates the University’s commitment to responsible management and accounting for research dollars. Increased access to information and the addition of standardized processes enforced by associated systems enhance institutional accountability and responsibility. Credibility is built with sponsoring agencies and auditors, encouraging a more trusting relationship. This ultimately protects the funding stream for the University’s researchers by reducing the potential loss of funding due to audit or compliance findings.

3. **Share Data – Provide information to key university systems and constituencies, at the Madison campus and throughout the UW System.**

   There are other key administrative and analytical systems that have been and will continue to be dependent on subsets of information gathered via research administration processes and stored in the Grants system.

   Beyond the operational need to stay compliant and keep up with the administrative burden of expanding research, the University has a strategic vision to begin building the foundation for a seamless front-end for Principal Investigators, Departmental Administrators, and others with administrative responsibilities related to sponsored research. The user interface would include access to an integrated proposal, award, and compliance management data. At a broader strategic
level, having state-of-the-art integrated systems and processes will give the University a competitive advantage to attract prominent researchers and research dollars.

4. Enhance Reporting – Initiate operational reporting capability and provide for reporting of performance metrics.

Management at all levels need to have access to various types of RSP information to support planning, budgeting, programmatic, strategic, retention and tenure decisions. Management should not expect RSP to manually produce reports for specific management purposes; they should have access to a user friendly, flexible system to access data as necessary and appropriate.

In order to meet current reporting needs and improve reporting for analysis and planning purposes, the following reporting standards must be achieved.

− Consistent and accurate

Data must be collected and reported on the basis of consistent definitions and criteria. Having a centralized, integrated system and data repository will enable and promote this objective.

− Common basis for understanding

Well-defined standards on a number of key operational terms related to proposals and awards should be developed in order for standardized nomenclature to be adopted across the institution. As these standards are instituted, valid performance metrics can be established.

− Timely

There is a need to move to a more real-time view of data, not just a monthly/periodic standard report basis. This transition has been occurring in the post-award side with the implementation of the WISDM reporting system and PALS for pre-award data, but the system is more targeted to traditional accounting, versus research management. PIs and Administrative officials are demanding real-time assessments of both pre and post-award operational and project status.

− Analysis

There is a need for analytical tools to provide good assessment information for decision-making purposes. For example, it is difficult to extract and analyze data as a basis for determining research areas for University investment. There are limited tools in place today to perform this function. PeopleSoft provides the tools to extract data in various formats to perform analytical assessment.

Operational Needs

5. Implement Grants Management System – Implement a system the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs can use to capture critical data elements for tracking and reporting on research activity.

The ESIS legacy system in place at Research and Sponsored Programs captures rudimentary proposal and award information with limited reporting capabilities. It does not efficiently support RSP’s needs for reporting to University administration, Principal Investigators, departments, the Board of Regents, sponsors, and other external constituents. In its current form, it is unable to respond to the increased demand for more and increasingly complex data for operational analysis.
6. Reduce redundant data entry and manual processes and enable more efficient communication, collaboration, and integration of processes between RSP, compliance committees and the research community.

The grant management, billing, revenue, financial, and compliance systems used by the University each operate independently. Integration between the systems has been limited to manual processes to transfer required information back and forth. Inherently, manual processes are inefficient, time-consuming, difficult to track, and prone to errors. All areas involved spend considerable time entering and verifying data previously gathered. Passing information electronically through a shared research administration system with common data elements would greatly reduce the time delay caused by reentry and increase the accuracy of data exchanges. As such a system is implemented, it will require more standardization and closer integration of University business processes, thereby positioning the University for streamlining, implementing best practices university-wide, and increasing technology integration so that end users have a seamless view of applications. Combining more efficient data transfers with more efficient business processes will reduce traditional communication inhibitors so that central administration and autonomous departments have a more collaborative environment with fewer incidents of discrepant data or misunderstandings.

7. Streamline Support Structure – Support one database and one toolset of PeopleSoft. Reduce the need for maintenance of independent legacy systems.

The University can further achieve efficiencies by continuing to invest in a standard system with common tools, technical requirements, resource skill sets, and support infrastructure. Over time this commitment should reduce the need for and support of independent systems used in existing business processes.

8. Manage Billing and Accounts Receivable – Gain ability to actively manage revenue, unbilled and billed cash balances real-time.

An integrated billing and accounts receivable system would provide the ability to track revenue and the payment status of all invoices real-time and consequently provide an accurate record of open accounts receivable. An aging report would benefit the RSP by providing performance metrics that could actively be worked for disputed items and delinquent receivables. The following features would be part of an integrated Billing and Accounts Receivable system:

- Improved RSP staff productivity gained by automating invoice generation.
- Automated creation of LOC reports (including the 272 report) to manage draws.
- Ability to easily apply a single LOC payment to multiple AR entries.
- Creation of prepaid or scheduled invoices.
- Faster, more efficient, billing and collection cycles.
- Receivables items are created automatically with the Billing interface, with references to invoices.
- Automated aging analyses and reports will enable RSP to track, manage, and report unbilled items and outstanding AR items accurately.
- Ability to identify and collect unpaid invoices will improve cash flow and reduce working capital required.
- Efficient payment processing for outstanding invoices through Payment Worksheets and automated matching processes.
- Refunds create vouchers in Payables automatically.
Automated journal generation of all invoices, payments, adjustments, and other entries.
Automated collection processes (dunning letters) for unpaid invoices.
Ability to apply payments to invoices provides the mechanism to minimize or eliminate unapplied cash.

9. Reduce Need for Supplemental and Legacy Systems – Reduce the need for supplemental systems by colleges, departments, and other UW offices.

With many processes being paper-based and a variety of unique requirements for information across autonomous research areas, a number of systems that address specific needs or serve as tracking mechanisms have been put in place to address summary level information, status, and basic reporting needs. Many of these systems exist to help departments or organizations to be more responsive to information requests and analysis. These mechanisms run the range from spreadsheets to small databases to larger systems with functional features. In most cases, there is little desire to perpetuate these systems into legitimate longer-term solutions; the predominant desire is to have a centralized system that would provide access to the needed information and consistent reporting capabilities. The benefits realized would be increased productivity in not building and maintaining these types of systems and providing more accurate and consistent information.

10. Replace aging data systems – Reduce reliance on systems that are based on outmoded hardware and software platforms.

The UW Legacy system currently includes a number of major central administrative systems that run on the 3270 mainframe and other outmoded hardware and software platforms. These systems do not meet the needs of the University in a number of respects, and they impose limitations on the extent to which the central administration can address those needs. Replacing these legacy systems has been identified as one of the University’s primary and pressing needs that should be addressed within the same timeframe as the Grants implementation project.

Guiding Principles

To provide initial direction for the creation of a feasible workplan to implement the Grants Suite, the Project Team created guiding principles related to the business, technical, and project aspects of an implementation. The principles include a strategy for business process workarounds and modifications, assumptions about system architecture, and the desire for a research process driven implementation. A complete list is available in the Addendum.

Implementation Project Risk Considerations

There are risks involved with any major ERP implementation project which need to be clearly identified, monitored, and addressed at the outset and during the course of the project. These are risks to the success of the project itself, or risks to the institution that are brought on by the project itself, as opposed to the types of institutional risks that the project resolves. Below is a summary of the project risks identified during the Grants Implementation Planning Phase. A full review of these risks and their mitigation strategies will be integrated into the implementation as part of the project management processes.

1. Business Disruption – Projects take key people away from their normal job functions.

The functional groups supporting research administration activities are at capacity. In some cases, the business functions that support research administration are challenged to meet the existing work demands placed upon them. An increasing volume of research awards has added to that challenge.
Without sufficient backfill, key people that need to help define and implement the system may not be able to be effective project participants, nor be able to effectively complete their normal job tasks. This can be a significant distraction and result in impact to the project performance and schedule.

2. **Multiple Concurrent System Implementations**

   The University has identified several initiatives related to its business systems that need to be addressed within the same time frame. Carrying out multiple simultaneous improvement projects, while also supporting the normal business needs of the institution, may exceed the capabilities of the staff groups involved. The University, UW System, and DoIT will need to provide strong central leadership, coordination and oversight of these projects in order to enable all of the concurrent projects to be successful.

   Within the financial management arena, this will particularly impact the groups most heavily involved in the Grants implementation, new effort system, migration from legacy systems to SFS, and development of new reporting infrastructure. There is a significant risk of shortages of skilled and knowledgeable staff, and consequent overtaxing and burnout of key people. The University should make special efforts to develop expertise and capabilities quickly among junior staff who can backfill for senior personnel and shoulder part of the load. Attention should also be given to rewarding and retaining those staff members who are most essential to the systems projects.

3. **Effective Communication – Commitment to prepare all research-related constituencies for system changes by actively communicating prior to and throughout the implementation.**

   The University’s research community is broad and eager to realize implementation benefits. While the central community will see immediate changes in their ability to track and report on data, the decentralized community will not realize benefits as soon in their daily activities until more of the long-term vision is executed.

   Campus-wide acceptance of the changes and use of the Grants Suite as the University’s official system of record will be critical in order for the long-term vision to be carried out.

   Mitigating this risk is the availability and involvement of respected and knowledgeable sponsors and leaders from representative areas of the University.

4. **Ownership and Involvement – Clear ownership lines are not obvious. Many areas overlap and have multiple constituents.**

   Given the broad reach of this project and the diverse constituencies it will serve and affect, involving the right people will be critical in reaching the most desirable outcome for each decision point encountered. Involvement from different areas and campuses must be strategically planned, and participants must be chosen for their ability to represent their areas while demonstrating commitment to the larger goal of serving the entire research administration community.

   Also critical will be the need to appoint and empower participants as leaders from the most impacted areas so that the decision-making process is effective and the project can meet its deadlines. Leaders will need to hear and incorporate unique needs, encourage collaboration, and guide the group to consensus or compromise.

5. **Gaining consensus – Standardizing traditionally autonomous business processes.**

   Currently, a wide variety of differing requirements and processes exist across the research community as well as within any particular office. Also, there are a number of independent systems being used to support the overall grants administration process. A Grants Suite implementation will require broad-based collaboration to gain consensus on a standard set of business processes to be used and acceptance of one centralized system.
6. Process Change – Willingness to change business processes when necessary in order to minimize customizations.

As is common in the implementation of systems of this type and magnitude, accommodation and modification of existing business processes is expected and encouraged by the project’s guiding principles. While the software allows for flexibility through configuration, not all existing or unique processes will be compatible with the software. Where possible, the preferred method of amending processes rather than incurring the costs of significant modification of the delivered software and its ongoing maintenance implications will be a necessary and important consideration.

7. Large Project – Large, complex project (both in length of schedule and size of budget).

In its entirety, the project’s scope of implementing the entire Grants Suite of five modules is large. This will require a sizeable investment in terms of money and resources. Risks encountered in projects of this size include complexity, expansion of scope, continuity of resources, and unforeseen product challenges and problems.

Conversion Considerations

Implementation of the new integrated system will include the conversion of some historical data as a basis. The amount of history depends on the nature and intended usage; in some cases, a one-year history is sufficient, in other cases time is not an appropriate selection criterion. An initial approach to conversion is included as an addendum to this report.

Assumptions

Project Staffing

- Workplan estimates include the personnel that will be part of the direct cost to the University, either as a charge from DOIT or External Vendors, or because of backfill requirements.
- RSP and Grad School IT Director roles are assumed to be provided to the project at no cost and are therefore not included in workplan estimates.
- DOIT Management time is assumed to be provided to the project at no cost and is therefore not included in workplan estimates.

8.9 Upgrade

- For planning purposes, we assume that the entire SFS system will be upgraded from version 8.8 to version 8.9, either before or in concert with the Grants go-live.
- The 8.9 upgrade project will be managed by UW System and coordinated closely with the Grants implementation.
- All environments provided for purposes of the Grants implementation will be 8.9 databases, so the Grants team can base its decisions on 8.9 functionality from the beginning.
- The creation and use of version 8.9 databases for purposes of the Grants implementation must be supported and coordinated by UW System. Planning, configuration, and preparation of the 8.9 environment will require resources to “upgrade” the Grants implementation databases so that all modules, not just the Grants suite, reflect 8.9 functionality for purposes of integration.

Multiple campuses
The PeopleSoft Grants suite will be designed for use by the UW Madison campus, with input from UW-Milwaukee and UW-Extension. Other UW campuses will be encouraged to use the product once it is on-line.

Cost Sharing
- Subject to review during the fit-gap phase, it is doubtful that PeopleSoft delivered functionality for cost sharing will be used.
- Other methods of tracking cost shared expenditures will need to be identified, documented and tested, e.g. creating separate project ID’s for cost sharing, and/or using the new effort reporting system to track cost shared personnel expenses.

Budgetary Control for Sponsored Projects
- Commitment Control functions of General Ledger will be the primary vehicle for managing budgets for sponsored projects.
- The University may desire to expand the use of budgetary control for research management by budgeting at a more detailed level, using multiple ledger groups for different types of control, and using the delivered PeopleSoft Financials functionality for budget processing and budget inquiry.

Security
- PeopleSoft delivered security for Grants management will be sufficient to meet the needs of UW, since access to proposal and grant data will be limited to central users in RSP and other key administrative offices.

Use of Encumbrances
- UW will give strong consideration to evaluating its use of encumbrance accounting for a variety of accounting purposes including F&A, salaries, fringe benefits and tuition remission. If continued use of these types of encumbrances is deemed to be within scope, additional time will be required for modifications of PeopleSoft processes.

Billing/AR
- PeopleSoft billing and receivables functions will be used for most, if not all, sponsored projects, and the use of GAR will be discontinued.
- Billing and Receivables for non-sponsored projects, auxiliary activities, and other purposes will be not be within the scope of the Grants implementation.
- Use of PeopleSoft Billing and Receivables functions for purposes other than sponsored projects will be delayed until after the Grants implementation.

Cash Management
- PeopleSoft Accounts Receivable functionality will be used to support payment processing for sponsored projects.

Non-Sponsored Activities
- Non-sponsored activities, i.e. uses of the Project chartfield for purposes other than sponsored projects, will be addressed as part of the Grants implementation. Those activities will be converted to use a modified Project module, with minimal project chartfield functionality. Non-sponsored business processes will not be reviewed or redesigned.
- Billing and Accounts Receivable modules and processing will not be used for non-sponsored activities.

Other Legacy Accounting Processes
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- These processes are not part of the Grants implementation project. They will be addressed with a separate planning phase. Decisions on how to handle them will be determined when this planning phase is completed.
- The Grants team will coordinate with the Steering Committee on applications/processes that involve sponsored projects.

Proposed Implementation Plan

Project Timeline & Sequencing

The proposed Grants implementation project will be carried out in a series of phases. There may be some overlap between phases, to make the best use of available resources. (Note: the calendar time estimates listed here include an allowance for vacation, sick leave, and holidays, based on University of Wisconsin rates.)

1. Project Initiation – 5 weeks

During this phase, we will validate and refine the scope, objectives, workplan, and staffing; develop a detailed Project Plan and schedule; conduct "kickoff" meetings; establish the database environment for the fit-gap phase; and confirm data access and security for team members. We will develop project management policies and procedures, quality assurance procedures, risk mitigation plans, and a status reporting process. We will also update the project communication plan and carry out training of the core team.

2. Fit-Gap – 12 weeks

This phase consists of a detailed review of the current state of systems related to sponsored project management, definition of requirements for system functionality, definition of reporting requirements, and documentation of the "fit" or "gap" between the requirements and the software. As a result of the fit-gap analysis, software modifications may be requested, prioritized, documented, and approved. Reporting requirements will be documented, prioritized, and approved. The technical architecture environment will be reviewed, and the future state architecture will be designed.

3. Analysis – 8 weeks

During the analysis phase, we will conduct "future state visioning" workshops, and then refine, finalize, and document the following: future business processes, reporting strategy and plans, report inventory, data warehouse strategy and plans, conversion strategy and plans, forms, policies, procedures, requirements, and gap resolutions. We will also conduct deployment planning with key stakeholders.

4. Design – 16 weeks

The design phase involves the preparation and documentation of detailed designs for all elements of the implementation, based on the foregoing analysis. This includes approved modifications, interfaces between systems, reports and reporting systems, security configuration, batch programs, automated workflow, and data conversion.

5. Development – 24 weeks

The development phase is when we will carry out the development of the elements identified above. During the development phase, a certain amount of initial verification will be done to validate that the developed pieces work as designed.
6. **Testing – 21 weeks**

The testing phase consists of a series of increasingly stringent and comprehensive tests to verify that all delivered and developed processes, data structures, and reports function without error and meet the requirements as designed. In addition, we will test the security configuration for all user roles, and system performance.

7. **Implement – 2 weeks**

This is the final phase before moving the new software modules into production in SFS. This is when we will carry out the real data conversion, as well as end-user training. This phase will conclude when the Grants suite "goes live" in the production SFS database environment.

**Total estimated time to “Go-Live” is 88 calendar weeks from project start.**

8. **Post-Implementation Support – 12 weeks**

The implementation plan includes 12 weeks of post-go-live support by the implementation team. During this period, we will implement all planned changes in policies and procedures, resolve any issues that arise in the production environment, continue transferring knowledge to key central staff and end users, conduct project reviews and document "lessons learned," and consolidate gains.

**Total estimated time including post-implementation support is 100 weeks.**

**Resource Requirements**

- **Implementation**

  The successful execution of the implementation workplan will require commitments of time by the following key resources:
  - 1 RSP Project Manager, full-time
  - 3 RSP Functional Leads, each .75 FTE
  - 1 Graduate School IT Lead, .8 FTE
  - 1 Accounting Services Lead, .5 FTE
  - 1 UW Milwaukee representative, .4 FTE
  - 1 UW Extension representative, .4 FTE
  - 1 DOIT Project Manager, full-time
  - 3 DOIT Technical Leads, full-time
  - DOIT Developers and outside technical contractors, approximately 24-26,000 hours.
  - 1 Huron Consulting Project Director, .3 FTE
  - 1 Huron Consulting Project Manager, full-time
  - 5 Huron Consulting Functional Leads, full-time
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- **Ongoing Support** – to be determined

**Resource Concentrations:**

Representatives of RSP, Accounting Services, DoIT, UW System, other UW Campuses and external consultants will staff the PeopleSoft project collaboratively. This allows for leveraging multiple expertise concentrations, including:

- **PeopleSoft Product Depth** – Provided by PeopleSoft, DoIT and other external consultants.
- **UW Business Area Knowledge** – Provided by key stakeholders from RSP, Accounting Services, and other UW Campuses.
- **Best Practice Collateral and Application** – Provided by external consultants and project leadership.
- **Project Management** – Provided by the project leadership.
- **Quality Assurance** – Responsibility of the Executive Committee, augmented by an external consultant focusing on project risk management.

Staffing (internal and external) is the area most susceptible to cost increases as a result of scope changes and/or schedule delays. These will be closely monitored throughout the project.

**Costs**

- To be discussed in a separate document.

**Recommendations**

1. Make an institutional commitment to implement the PeopleSoft Grants Suite in order to address the compliance risks and business needs outlined in this document, including the development of an electronic transmittal form ("T Form") and new reporting mechanisms for faculty and research administrators.

2. Allocate the funding and commit the resources required for a successful Grants implementation, as identified in this document and its addenda.

3. Begin the Grants implementation as soon as possible, with a timeline of approximately 20 months from project start to go-live, plus 12 weeks of post-implementation support to ensure a successful rollout.

4. Organize the Grants implementation project as described herein, in order to provide the institutional guidance, support, input, and control required.

5. Structure the project with DoIT as a full partner and provider of technical services, including support of database environments, infrastructure management, software development, report development, design and development of a data warehouse and other reporting mechanisms, and coordination of testing across the SFS system.

6. Utilize the services of an external vendor that specializes in Research Administration and PeopleSoft Grants to jointly manage the implementation project with RSP and DoIT, under the direction of the Executive Committee and Project Sponsors, and to support and facilitate the Grants project.
7. Ensure that the Guiding Principles identified by the Grants Team are applied throughout the project.

8. Carry out a separate project to select, acquire, and implement a new Effort Reporting System, to be operational before the end of 2006.

9. Make an institutional commitment to support other solutions to the research compliance risks that are not addressed by the Grants implementation, including Grants.gov, improved campus-wide infrastructure for research administration, and export control.

10. Carry out a system-wide upgrade of PeopleSoft Financials (SFS) from version 8.8 to version 8.9 in concert with the Grants implementation. Version 8.9 provides significant improvements for grants management and will serve as a step toward a later upgrade to the “Fusion” version of Oracle/PeopleSoft Financials.

11. Carry out the Communication Plan in order to ensure positive, accurate and timely communication about the project to all constituencies within the University.

Addenda

- Grants Implementation Communication Plan
- Grants Implementation Guiding Principles
- Grants Conversion Approach
- Workplan Summary
- Budget Summary