



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

#### DAY ONE

Tuesday, May 16, 2006, 1:00pm to 5:15pm

#### MEETING GOALS

1. Update from Development Managers on eDocs, COA and GL
2. Review, discussion and decisions on scope that has not been accounted for in Phase I – covered in update report
3. First and Final Budget Year Enhancement design review
4. Sharing from all schools on value added of Budget Year Enhancement
5. Discussion of fit with Budget Year Enhancement compared to deferred items

#### PRESENT

University of Hawaii	Kathie Egami, Henry Ito
Michigan State University	Dave Brower (Phone), Vince Schimizzi
rSmart	Dick Barber
San Joaquin Delta College	Claire Tyson
Indiana University	Kathleen McNeely (Chair, Functional Council) Barry Walsh (Executive Director, Board) Joan Hagen Ailish Byrne (Configuration Manager) Brian McGough (Lead Architect, DM Financial Transactions, DM Workflow) Phil McKown (Project Analyst) Sterling George (Lead Subject Matter Expert, GL) Bill Overman (Lead Subject Matter Expert, COA) Jim Thomas (Project Manager) Scott Heise (Quality Assurance Manager) Jay Sissom (Development Manager, GL) Laura Kress (Development Manager, EPIC) Lora O'Connor (Development Manager, RA, CnG) Randall Embry (Development Manager, COA)
University of Arizona	Kymber Horn, Mark McGurk, Andrew Hollamon Mary Vega (scribe)
NACUBO	David Lyons
Cornell University	Arthur Mintz, Mary Wheeler, Lisa Stensland (Phone) Aaron Godert (DM Nervous System, DM Financial Transactions)



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

#### **AGENDA**

- A. Announcements
- B. Update report from Development Managers
  - 1. General Ledger – Jay Sissom
  - 2. Chart of Accounts – Randall Embry
  - 3. eDocs – Aaron Godert
- C. Review and detailed discussion of Budget Year Enhancement – Mary Wheeler

#### **DECISIONS MADE**

- 1. APC will be used in place of the Object code restrictions table.
- 2. Deferred items list for edocs: when entries are added to the page, email communication will be sent to Jim Thomas. Jim Thomas or Phil McKown will provide weekly updates to KFC during the weekly conference call. KFC makes final decision on what is deferred.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Object code restrictions table: Aaron will send an email regarding APC global restrictions for object code 8160.
- 2. Program code enhancement: Aaron Godert needs a consolidated idea of the enhancement and will contact Chris directly.
- 3. Budget Year Enhancement: all lead SMEs need to read and understand the budget year enhancement: Labor, CAMS and Purchasing/AP.

#### **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

- A. Announcements
  - 1. Kuali t-shirts: send Kathleen an email and cc Mardi Leonard. Be sure to include the size for the t-shirt.
- B. Update Report from Development Managers
  - 1. General Ledger – Jay Sissom
    - a. Sterling George identified other areas for flexible off-set enhancement. Process that generates transaction – need extra time, still need test data for proper testing.
    - b. Any process that creates ledger entries that bypass the scrubber. Still need to work on.
    - c. Bin is currently coding the ICR encumbrance enhancement. The code is almost finished but test data is needed.
    - d. Budget year enhancement was skipped – this topic will be discussed later in the day.
    - e. Broc Nelson, the new resource from rsmart, will start working on the next task. Broc is currently setting up his development environment and is working with Tony Potts to get familiar with the project.
    - f. Unit testing for all Phase Ia batch processes is complete. Using IU production data, load and parallel testing will begin. Running the IU's production data through the new module is a good test. The goal is to produce the same results that are in FIS.
    - g. Working on year-end processes, nominal balance and carry forwards. For the GL, the general error correction document (GEC) will be used to correct errors.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- h. Overall, the GL team is in good shape. Jay Sissom does not see any problems meeting June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2006 deliverables with exception of the budget year enhancement. Code will be complete but testing will still need occur. Testing will move into the QA period; testing will begin mid-June. Jay recognizes that this time frame is close to the code freeze.
  - i. There are some concerns about testing. There are a lot of variables at play. The flexible offset and budget year enhancement create additional permutations. We need to ensure that adequate testing is performed.
  - j. Per Kathleen, July and August are not a good time to be testing the GL for people with a fiscal year-end close of June 30. Kathleen requested that developer be aware of the timing; testing may not be a high priority.
2. Chart of Accounts - Randall Embry
- a. Institutional object consolidations are one way to define categories for org reversion.
  - b. Object code restrictions table
    - 1) This functionality will be replaced by the Application Parameter Constants (APC). The financial edocs have used the APC to meet the business needs; however, the APC may not be robust enough for the chart of accounts. Bill Overman has identified a specific case where the APC functionality does not work. For example, the business rule to allow object code 8160 only on the journal voucher and auxiliary voucher. The APC does not have global capability. [Aaron will send an email regarding APC global restrictions for object code 8160.](#)
    - 2) Randall confirmed a lot of the needs would be met by the APC; the remaining functionality will be enhancements. Randall needs to review the list to ensure that APC can meet the requirements – ensure APC functionality covers what the current object code restrictions table handles.
    - 3) APC has the same functionality of the object code restrictions table but has a different structure. APC is updated using a document and values are externalized.
    - 4) Object code restrictions in the APC are customizable by each institution.
    - 5) Some ongoing development for APC will extend beyond June 30; [Randall will consider object code restrictions officially done by way of APC.](#)
  - c. Organization reversion
    - 1) A full blown rules engine is complicated and out of scope. Business rules are tied to “institution specific” consolidation levels.
    - 2) Charts responsibility for budget year is the new reversion categories table. The table will replace the fixed list of categories that are hard-coded in FIS (specific consolidations). Since institutions may want different categories, the criteria needs to be configurable by



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

institution and tied to the “institutionally defined” reversion categories.

- 3) Jay Sissom has some proposals:
    - a) Kuali will ship with a standard “special consolidation”. Changes will be made by the implementing school and will need a java developer to code the changes.
    - b) Build a rules engine in an edoc, define rules in the edoc. This is a larger solution but is more flexible.
  - 4) Another factor in the user interface - XLM or user class. Arthur Mintz has prepared a proposal and wants to review with Randall Embry, Jay Sissom and Aaron Godert. Kathleen requested that Sterling George and Bill Overman participate in the discussion.
  - 5) What ever is built could be configured down the road (ie. more complex engine). Carry forward and reversions need flexibility. Arthur’s proposal is an interim solution and the KFC is open to the interim solution. The solution will influence when IU implements the GL.
- d. Custom attribute testing
    - 1) Was turned off for the test drive and has been turned back on. Custom attributes is ready for testers to begin testing.
  - e. Program code enhancement
    - 1) Chris Kirshenman is the dedicated developer for this enhancement. Chris is working on initial displays and reviewing details on how it will work. A piece of the program code will go into the edocs. [Aaron Godert needs a consolidated idea of the enhancement and will contact Chris directly.](#)
    - 2) The program code enhancement is not a Phase I deliverable.
  - f. Global documents
    - 1) Work is underway. A rough draft for the User Interface – modified lookup framework, will be forwarded to Bill Overman.
  - g. Organization extensions
    - 1) Need to reference implementations to PeopleSoft – common org table.
  - h. Other items that were omitted from the detailed status report – not practical because they are dependant on other modules:
    - 1) Account for CnG lookups
    - 2) Accounts Receivable
3. eDocs – Aaron Godert
    - a. Overall, the edocs team is averaging one document per week. Aaron has prepared a project plan and has assigned developers. The team is on target for items in the Gantt chart.
    - b. Build 52 on reg has a few core bugs and some issues with adhoc routing. Budget Year is not fully implemented; there are no lookups or GL data structures supporting the information.
    - c. Review Financial Transaction Processing Release Status



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

	Document	Ready For Testing	Released For Testing	Final "Signed-Off On" Release
1	<a href="#">Budget Adjustment</a> Plan to be ready June 30, 2006			
2	<a href="#">Cash Receipt</a>			<a href="#">Build 11</a>
3	<a href="#">General Error Correction</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phase III enhancement, check reference document number and validate current reference document</li> <li>Great goal for the future: talked about reversal feature that will tie back. Currently, it is very flexible – do not have to tie back to the previous document.</li> <li>For certain fund groups, CnG, you have to enter the doc reference and it must validate. You can only validate origin code documents for "01". If the origin code needs to be changed, then an enhancement must be submitted.</li> </ul>			
4	<a href="#">Journal Voucher</a>			<a href="#">Build 11</a>
5	<a href="#">Pre-Encumbrance</a>			
6	<a href="#">Transfer of Funds</a>			<a href="#">Build 11</a>
7	<a href="#">Year End General Error Correction</a>			
8	<a href="#">Year End Transfer of Funds</a>			
9	<a href="#">Auxiliary Voucher</a>			
10	<a href="#">Distribution of Income and Expense</a>			
11	<a href="#">Indirect Cost Adjustment</a>			
12	<a href="#">Internal Billing</a>			
13	<a href="#">Non-Check Disbursement</a>			
14	<a href="#">Service Billing</a>			
15	<a href="#">Year End Distribution of Income and Expense</a>			
16	<a href="#">Disbursement Voucher</a>			<a href="#">Build 11</a>
17	<a href="#">Procurement Card</a>			



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

	Should be completed May 19, 2006			
18	<a href="#">Cash Management Document</a>	✓	✓	<a href="#">Build 11</a>
19	<a href="#">Advanced Deposits Document</a> Split out documents	✗	✗	
20	<a href="#">Credit Card Receipts Document</a>	✓	✓	

d. Review TP edocs enhancements page

- 1) GL-E2/TP-E1 - Budget Year Enhancement
  - a) Accounting lines and GLPEs for all TP eDocs now account for a four digit numeric budget year at the transaction level ✓
  - b) The user interface allows for entry of this on an accounting line by accounting line basis ✓
  - c) Budget year does get pushed into GLPEs appropriately ✓
  - d) Field is a free form numeric field for now; waiting on data structures to be put in place in the GL module
  - e) TP eDocs Budget Year Enhancement
  - f) How flexible do we want the "mixed budget years vs. document level choice" features? Is this a toggle-able option per document?
- 2) TP-H1 - View multiple balance scenarios in balance inquiry screens
  - a) Handled by GL team ✓
- 3) TP-H2 - Systematic transaction upload into TP documents
  - a) User uploads of transactions as CSV files is implemented ✓
  - b) Systematic uploads of transactions, which create new TP eDocs ✓
  - c) Aaron to work with Jerry on estimates and preliminary design for May 2006 KFC Meeting ✓
  - d) TP eDoc Systematic Transaction Uploads
  - e) Data feeds from another system to create a transaction
- 4) GL-H3 - Flexible Offset Enhancement
  - a) TP eDoc integration is complete ✓
  - b) Still need to look at the bank account aspect ⚠
  - c) TP eDoc Flexible Offset Enhancement
  - d) Two aspects: normal offset generation portion (completed for test drive), and bank specific to cash receipts (touch bank accounts). The status is not clear; Aaron will summarize and will send a list of questions to the SME group to discuss next week. No specs are done, only the enhancement request. Arthur Mintz will be helping Aaron over the next few weeks.
- 5) TP-H3 - Multiple accounts on non-general fund accounts in Budget Adjustment
  - a) This is another business rule for the BA document that has been accounted for in the functional specification by Arthur ✓
  - b) Analysis and review is close to completion



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- c) Development has not been started on this high priority enhancement. It is easier to do this now than to code the budget adjustment without it. Arthur Mintz has rolled this into the Budget Adjustment enhancement.
- 6) TP-H4 - Service Billing Control Table Enhancement
  - a) Database aspect is implemented ✓
  - b) Still need to update the maintenance document and include in the checking service ✓
  - c) Enhancement Specification - Enhancement is complete ✓
- e. Future TP eDoc Work and Features

Kathleen was not aware that some functionality was being deferred and tracked through a list that is maintained by Aaron. The list of "deferred" functionality was not Kathleen's idea of taking items out of scope; the list is not the right way to handle deferring items, KFC should be deciding what items are deferred.

**It was decided to keep the list. When entries are added to the page, email communication will be sent to Jim Thomas. Jim Thomas or Phil McKown will provide weekly updates to KFC during the weekly conference call. KFC makes final decision on what is deferred.**

- 1) Budget Year Enhancement
  - a) Partially implemented
  - b) Not in current TP eDoc plans
  - c) See latest TP eDocs work breakdown: TP eDocs Budget Year Enhancement
  - d) See complete enhancement here: KULGL:Budget Year
  - e) How flexible do we want the "mixed budget years vs. document level choice" features? Is this a toggle-able option per document?
- 2) Flexible Offset Enhancement
  - a) The "Normal Offset Enhancement" portion is implemented
  - b) The "Bank Offset Enhancement" portion is not yet implemented; however, it is roughly accounted for in plans
  - c) This page summarizes what it and isn't completed, and the issues that still need to be addressed for the "Bank" portion: TP eDoc Flexible Offset Enhancement
  - d) See the GL aspect of this enhancement here: KULGL:Flexible Offsets - Offset Generation
  - e) **Decision: will be delivered for Phase 1b**
- 3) Sales Tax Collection
  - a) There is a process that can be turned on or off for all Edocs to run a sales tax routine. It checks some accounting line attributes, and if they match will prompt the user with a subscreen to capture the sales tax information. Jerry implemented this one in the FIS.
  - b) See Sales Tax Collection page.



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

c) Plans do not account for this yet

d) **Decision: Defer to Phase IIa or IIb**

4) EFT Integration

a) System interaction with the CR and DI (the Cash Receipts page has an email and diagram from Jerry explaining the system)

b) Cash Receipts^Electronic Claims related to DI, CR - Email from Jerry.eml

c) Jerry thinks it integrates with the TOF also and possibly instead of the DI

d) Plans do not account for this currently

e) **Note: it was decided that # 4 and #5 are the same and should be combined. Decision: Defer to Phase IIa or IIb**

5) Electronic Payment Claims on the DI document

a) Is this the same as the EFT feature above or is this different?

b) Plans do not account for this currently

c) **Note: it was decided that # 4 and #5 are the same and should be combined. Decision: Defer to Phase IIa or IIb**

6) Printing - ability to print documents (can always print the browser pages, but some FIS documents (like Cash Receipts) allow the user to print the document's information in some alternative format)

a) Note: we've used PDFs for the DV and CR documents

b) **Note: it was decided to print using a web browser.**

7) C & G Routing - on workflow's radar for configuring

a) Part of the workflow team's plans??? Check on before KFC.

b) **Decision: Defer to Phase IIa or IIb**

8) Cashiering and Revolving Funds for the CR business processes

a) Plans do not account for this

9) Routing code configuration

a) Most of this is replaced by workflow's latest features and not warranted for 3/31 because only four documents were delivered.

b) **It was decided to cut this from the list**

10) Recurring documents - where does the priority stand for this?

a) Plans do not account for this

b) **It was decided that Joan Hagen's subcommittee can talk about the scope for recurring documents.**

11) Forward feature for all documents that allows fyi forward with a note only scoped for the forwarded individual

a) Plans do not account for this

b) **It was decided to take this back to the routing subcommittee – this is not a Phase I deliverable.**

12) CAMS Integration - interface to institutional capital asset system for provision of additional information when accounting line contains "capital asset" object code on certain documents (Service Billing, Internal Billing, Transfer of Funds, General Error Correction, ...)

a) Phase II

b) Plans do not account for this



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

**c)Decision: defer to Phase IIa or IIb**

- f. Future Chart of Accounts Work and Features
    - 1) Labor
      - \*\*KULLAB-1 - Before an Account is closed, it "Must have no pending labor ledger entries"
    - 2) Genesis
    - 3) Accounts Receivable Objects - these may be implemented in an incomplete fashion due to dependencies on AR infrastructure
      - a)Bursar Drawer
      - b)Lock Maintenance
      - c)Lock Type Maintenance
    - 4) C&G
      - a)We do not have lookups on many C&G fields (used for Account creation) as the C&G infrastructure is not in place
  - g. Future General Ledger Work and Features
    - 1) Modified Org Reversion Process
    - 2) Budget Year Enhancement?
- C. Review and detailed discussion of the Budget Year Enhancement – Mary Wheeler
- 1. Understand the objectives of the Budget Year feature
    - a. Associate budgets with a budget year instead of a fiscal year
    - b. Identify, track, and report transactions by a budget (funding) year which can be different from the fiscal year in which the transaction is posted
    - c. Accommodate situations when multiple budgets from the same funding source are "active"
  - 2. Understand the design
    - a. Assign a "budget year" to every transaction, creating the ability to calculate a balance by both budget year and fiscal year
    - b. A budget year will be associated with a funding source and will have different statuses base on the "cycle" of the funding source.
    - c. Create budget year balance tables for recording budgets by budget year
  - 3. Summarize the changes and estimates for Chart, edocs, GL programs, Sufficient funds checking, Year-end programs
    - a. Impact to the chart of accounts
      - 1) Create tables and maintenance documents for funding source and budget year.
      - 2) Add the funding source attribute to the account table and maintenance document
    - b. Impact on edocs
      - 1) Add the budget year field to each transaction line and pending entry (done – but needs to be updated)
      - 2) Create budget year business objects and other core tasks
      - 3) Analysis and creation of budget year status rules for each transaction document.
    - c. Impact to the GL
      - 1) Create budget year on/off switch on system set up table



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- 2) Change the unit of work in the transaction poster to include budget year
  - 3) Create a business rule to determine budget year when blank on transactions
  - 4) Replicate the edocs budget year business rules in the transaction scrubber
  - 5) Update budget year balance tables as appropriate
  - 6) Modify balance inquiry to include choice for budget year
  - d. Impact on sufficient funds checking
    - 1) FTGL committee recognizes incorporating budget year into sufficient funds checking may have to be deferred to Phase II or later.
    - 2) Current year budget is a component of the calculation; the presence of budget year will have an impact
    - 3) Further analysis is needed to coordinate budget year with the contract and grant inception-to-date balance
  - e. Impact on year-end
    - 1) Change the “key” of the organization reversion table to be: fiscal year + budget year + funding source + organization. This is needed to meet the closing requirements for 5 of the 6 Kuali partners, independent of the budget year feature
    - 2) Modify the Org reversion program to use the Organization hierarchy, so rules can be set more efficiently
    - 3) Modify the “org reversion table” to associate carry-forward or reversion rules with funding sources and budget years
    - 4) Make it possible to run the “close budget year” process at any time during the year
4. Open discussion
- a. Kathleen is concerned about the on/off switch, this can affect many things. Expectations need to be clear before a school moves forward with implementation – you can’t toggle between the on/off switch.
  - b. Change to balance inquiries would change the standard reports. We will need to offer additional reports that factor in the budget year.
  - c. ICR attributes are tied to accounts. We need to calculate ICR by budget year, add to the unit of work and to the reference tables that drive ICR. This will be an automated entry.
  - d. One account may have different rates for ICR; ICR is more complicated. This is not a huge deal breaker for Cornell (currently ICR not estimated).
  - e. The basis is to be able to tag transactions and associate a budget year. Using the same account number for various budget years is new depth. Will the user understand how this will work?
  - f. Where will the information be stored? Information will be stored in the balance inquiry, which will be used to create reports.
  - g. Encumbrance balances are used to create the new budget at Hawaii.
  - h. Cornell keys new budget for each new budget year.
  - i. Org reversion takes care of both sets of needs.
  - j. What is the future impact to other modules? [All lead SMEs need to read and understand the budget year enhancement: Labor, CAMS and Purchasing/AP.](#)



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- k. 1,794 or 1,800 hours are needed for Phase I. KFC will discuss tomorrow after reviewing resources. Carry-forward and reversion need to be configurable. Budget year needs to have the infrastructure but what about a compromise? The scope has grown from the initial enhancement – the ability to tag transactions with a budget year. The effects on standard reports and Phase II modules is not estimated (Labor, CAMS, AP)



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

### DAY TWO

Wednesday, May 17, 8:00am to 5:15pm

#### MEETING GOALS

1. Information sharing on current status of resource budget
2. Final decision on Budget Year Enhancement and Phase assignment
3. Establishment of timelines and products for Phase II a and b deliverables
4. Transference of knowledge on GL Y/E functionality
5. Discussion and decision on Delete capability
6. Review and transference of knowledge on Kuali University
7. Sharing and discussion on FODS proposal
8. Sharing and discussion on financial policies and plan
9. Understanding of how to use directory tool and review of org charts
10. Discussion and decision on what Help Content should be and how it should be maintained.

#### PRESENT

University of Hawaii	Kathie Egami, Henry Ito
Michigan State University	Dave Brower (Phone), Vince Schimizzi
rSmart	Dick Barber
San Joaquin Delta College	Claire Tyson
Indiana University	Kathleen McNeely (Chair, Functional Council) Barry Walsh (Executive Director, Board) Joan Hagen Ailish Byrne (Configuration Manager) Brian McGough (Lead Architect, DM Financial Transactions, DM Workflow) Phil McKown (Project Analyst) Sterling George (Lead Subject Matter Expert, GL) Bill Overman (Lead Subject Matter Expert, COA) Jim Thomas (Project Manager) Scott Heise (Quality Assurance Manager) Jay Sissom (Development Manager, GL) Laura Kress (Development Manager, EPIC) Lora O'Connor (Development Manager, RA, CnG) Randall Embry (Development Manager, COA)
University of Arizona	Kymer Horn, Mark McGurk, Andrew Hollamon Mary Vega (scribe)
NACUBO	David Lyons
Cornell University	Arthur Mintz, Mary Wheeler, Lisa Stensland (Phone) Aaron Godert (DM Nervous System, DM Financial Transactions)



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

#### **AGENDA**

- A. Review of Resources Budget Status – Phil McKown
- B. Composition of Phase II Detailed Timeline and Deliverables – Kathleen McNeely and Jim Thomas
- C. Detailed review of FL Y/E closing functionality – Sterling George (DMs meet separately)
- D. Kuali University Data and Test Plan – Scott Heise and Mary Wheeler
- E. Kuali Days Planning – David Lyons and Liz Taylor
- F. Fiscal Officer Development Series Update and Plan Proposal – Kymber Horn
- G. Financial Policies Update and Plan Proposal – David Lyons
- H. Review of Kuali Directory Tool and Org Charts – Phil McKown
- I. Delete Capability – Jim Thomas
- J. Help Content and Maintenance – Jim Thomas

#### **DECISIONS MADE**

1. TP-H2: Upload transactions into edocs. The title of this enhancement will be changed to read “Systematic Creation of Financial eDocs”.
2. Budget Year Enhancement is in scope for the following:
  - Table changes
  - Financial edocs
  - Chart edocs
  - Nightly out changes
  - Scrubber changes
  - Collector changes
  - Poster changes
3. Budget Year Enhancement items that are deferred:
  - Reversion and carry forward
  - Close budget year process
  - ICR generation changes
  - ICR enhancement changes
  - Balance inquiry changes
4. FODS: KFC's role is to review and sign-off on the final products
5. Sterling George is one of the three Lead SMEs for the GL
6. Delete capability: going forward we will add active/in-active. Others will be fixed later. Review of exposure will be done during the QA period. Analysis will be done upfront for new maintenance tables. A list will be developed for previous work (here are the impacts).
7. Help Content and Maintenance for Phase I deliverable
  - Field Level will use the data dictionary. Others will leverage the APC.
  - APC will be setup by the developers
  - Hourly student will cut and past the information into the APC rule

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. TP-H2 needed to be clarified to reflect “upload” capabilities.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

2. TP-H2S – Systematic upload to create an edoc: move to deferred enhancement list and move out of Phase I; KFC will readdress in August 2006.
3. TP-H3: Budget adjustment, change the number of hours to 100.
4. GL-H3: Flexible Offset, Aaron Godert needs to provide an estimate for the bank account piece
5. Need to reconsider estimates hours for deferred items. DMs need to review the deferred enhancements for August 2006
6. Mary Wheeler will create individual enhancements for the items listed that were deferred for the Budget Year Enhancement.
7. Phase II composition: send the list out to all Lead SMEs to provide dates in the first column for each of the items. KFC will review as a group in a few weeks and provide final approval on the dates provided for functional specification documents.
8. GL Reports: The GL subcommittee needs to provide a list of required reports; the subcommittee will perform an evaluation of what reports are required. They will categorize into closing and regular operating reports – assurance reports (system assurance and year-end reports). Vince Schimizzi was assigned this task – due at the end of June 2006.
9. Talk to Jim Thomas about demo data for Kuali Days, November 2006
10. Identify the speaker for the Budget Module – Kuali Days, November 2006
11. Add FODS review as an agenda item to weekly KFC meetings.

#### **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

- A. Review of resources budget status – Phil McKown
  1. Deferred items discussion has been deferred until August 2006.
  2. Phase Ia was in deficit 976 hours
  3. Focus for today is on Phase Ib, we are using the same developers and 15 people are available for the 2nd quarter of '06. Resource estimates are not accurate; we are ½ way through Phase Ib.
  4. Development work ends June 30th, and then the QA period begins.
  5. Estimates provided by the DM's have been updated and during the discussion Phil McKown updated the spreadsheet.
  6. Edocs, there is nothing to move off
  7. Chart, there was a fair amount of clean up after the test drive.
  8. Overall, the development teams were regrouping after the test drive and work on Phase Ib did not start right away.
  9. Per Sterling, two standard reports are outstanding. Resources for standard reports are not accounted for in the resource estimates since IU is providing those as additional resources.
  10. During the QA period, all 15 developers need to be available for the three months. Developers will not be assigned to other tasks during the QA period.
  11. TP-H2: upload transactions into edocs. The title of this enhancement will be changed to read "Systematic Creation of Financial edocs".
  12. TP-H3: Budget adjustment, change the number of hours to 100.
  13. GL-H3: Flexible Offset, Aaron Godert needs to provide an estimate for the bank account piece – 62 hours was entered as a place holder.
  14. GL-E1: Budget Year – Carry-forward Flexibility includes chart and financial edocs. Jay Sissom will split out the hours into the appropriate category. For the GL, the estimated hours are 1,794.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

15. Based on the discussion, Phase Ib deficit is 1,778.
16. Org conversion changes are not factored in; the simple version is estimated at 550 hours and is included in the budget year. Org reversion hours may move to Chart team from the GL team.
17. There are three large projects in Phase Ib – edocs, budget year and systematic entries.
  - a. Systematic entry to create docs is the ability for external systems to communicate with Kuali and create an edoc for the data. Shadow systems can create the accounting lines for the document. The benefit of workflow is to configure documents to route to “Final” or people. The key point is system to system as oppose to user interaction; a prototype is the pcard transaction document.
  - b. MSU would use the Disbursement Voucher for participant support. Units performing the research would upload transactions and create Disbursement Vouchers for payment. Also, athletic ticket refunds could also use this functionality. The purpose would be to save data entry.
  - c. What about institutions that do not implement Labor? A new edoc would be created for payroll positions.
  - d. Initially, this functionality was for service billings; the transactions are already approved and we did not want them to route for additional approval. This functionality would create an edoc that would route to “Final” in KFS. People would perform a search on the edoc to locate the transaction, if needed.
  - e. The benefits are search capability and the potential to perform error corrections. What about ledger analysis, how are we going to feed entries? How do we take advantage of the document architecture? Create a sequential file to feed transaction lines. Create an edoc if it does not currently exist.
  - f. This functionality was discussed months ago and Indiana is not interested. This is a replacement to loading sequential files. A large percentage was taken care of by using the import feature.
  - g. TP-H2 needed to be clarified to reflect “upload” capabilities.
  - h. TP-H2S – Systematic upload to create an edoc: move to deferred enhancement list and move out of Phase I; KFC will readdress in August 2006.
18. Need to reconsider estimates hours for deferred items. [DMs need to review the deferred enhancements for August](#) – are we on target or not?
19. Discussion on the Budget Year Enhancement
  - a. The enhancement will not be done by 6/30; certain parts can be done. Maybe split into a few pieces? The Budget Year enhancement has few options and leaves a high level of discomfort. What is the compromise? Mary Wheeler does not agree with voting on the enhancement. Mary believes the enhancement is already in scope. Kathleen reminded her that the current documented enhancement is much larger than was originally voted on.
  - b. At a minimum, the infrastructure needs to be in place. Each transaction is assigned a budget year, edocs have to be changed to accumulate the balance.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- c. KFC had no discussions about the open/close process, balance inquiries, etc. KFC did not agree to the new features. The enhancement has grown in scope and Kathleen is concerned about the effects on other areas.
- d. Per Mary Wheeler, as analysis was done the enhancement grew. Kathleen asked if this is two systems - it is going to touch everything. If the enhancement is deferred, will it create a need for another system?
- e. Budget year adds complexity, the basics need to be available in Phase Ib. Sufficient funds checking and org reversion can be deferred.
- f. All agreed that the minimum is to be able to track a budget year in transactions. Is there a way to develop what everyone has agreed to? We need a more in-depth analysis for functional scope. Can we implement without all the business rules? These questions need to be scoped out and defined. We do not want to add new functionality during the QA period.
- g. We can change the accounting key and add the funding source attribute. The budget tables would be the buckets that are used to accumulate balances.
- h. Do not change sufficient funds checking and balance inquiries, carry-forwards and reversions. What is the value of sufficient funds checking?
- i. In Phase II, the infrastructure will be provided. Developers can start the work in Phase Ib and deliver in Phase II. Additional analysis can continue and the deferred items will be prioritized with the others.
- j. Mary Wheeler does not want to collapse the deferred items into one line; Mary requested to keep them separate. Mary Wheeler will create individual enhancements for the items listed in the Deferred Items below:
- k. Org reversion is still on the table and is open for discussion.
- l. The following was proposed:
  - Deliver in Kuali – 474 hours
    - Tables changes
    - Financial edocs
    - Chart edocs
    - Nightly out changes
    - Scrubber changes
    - Collector changes
    - Poster changes
  - Deferred items to be discussed and prioritized with other deferred items
    - Reversion and carry forward
    - Close budget year process
    - ICR generation changes
    - ICR enhancement changes
    - Balance inquiry changes
- m. Aaron can get started in parallel with other efforts. Jay and Aaron can start the work but do not want to promise any functionality for Phase I.
- n. DMs stated Phase I is not possible and Brain McGough emphasized delivering a quality product. Kathleen agrees the above proposal is a good compromise for the enhancement.



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- o. Jim Thomas updated KFC with another issue that is being discussed with the DMs. The Technical Council recommended that referential integrity be turned on in the database. In order to do this a fairly significant amount of work needs to be done. Jim has no idea of the time estimate and is waiting on Jeff Morris. The DMs need to talk and come back to KFC with more information. Approval of this recommendation will impact some of the decisions made at KFC.
- p. Kathleen asked each institution if they supported or did not support the proposal for the Budget Year Enhancement as stated below. Discussion about timelines was not part of the decision:

### Deliver in Kuali – 474 hours

- Tables changes
- Financial edocs
- Chart edocs
- Nightly out changes
- Scrubber changes
- Collector changes
- Poster changes

### Deferred items to be discussed and prioritized with other deferred items

- Reversion and carry forward
- Close budget year process
- ICR generation changes
- ICR enhancement changes
- Balance inquiry changes

Institution	Decision (support/not support) Timelines are not part of the decision
Arizona	Agree in scope with deferred items as discussed
Hawaii	The entire list to be in scope
Cornell	The entire list to be in scope
Delta	Agree in scope, move other items added to deferred for prioritization
IU	In scope, if not in Phase I – developers know what fits. Second group deferred – do not lose track of
MSU	Agree in scope with deferred items as discussed
Rsmart	Agree in scope with deferred items as discussed
NACUBO	Agree in scope with deferred items as discussed

Move items listed under Deliver in Kuali to “inscope”,  
 Move deferred items to the enhancement list for discussion in August 2006.  
 The original requirement to “turn off” still exists and needs to be factored in.

### B. Composition of Phase II Detailed Timeline and Deliverables – Kathleen McNeely and Jim Thomas

1. Jim asked the KFC to visit Phase II items to assist developers with planning. Jim would like a ballpark idea – what are the expectations for deliverables? Functional specs need to be ready for developers to start working.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

2. Phil McKown walked KFC through the coding scheme and the tentative dates that were assigned.
  3. It was discussed that approved enhancement requests should be incorporated into the functional specification documents – this is what happened with financial edocs but has not been consistent among all functional specification documents.
  4. After some discussion, it was decided to [send the list out to all Lead SMEs to provide dates in the first column for each of the items](#). The dates need to reconcile to the second column. If they do not reconcile, then individual discussions will occur with the Lead SME to resolve the variance.
  5. Deferred items will stay on the list but dates will be extended out.
  6. [KFC will review as a group in a few weeks and provide final approval on the dates provided for functional specification documents.](#)
- C. Detailed review of GL Y/E closing functionality - Sterling George and Vince Schimizzi
1. Overview of closing schedule
    - a. Pre-closing
      1. GL closing reports are the minimal reports needed to produce the results; these are a core part of the management process. Assurance reports are also used.
      2. Everyone agreed that system generated reports are needed to ensure that data is correct.
      3. [The GL subcommittee needs to provide a list of required reports; the subcommittee will perform an evaluation of what reports are required. They will categorize into closing and regular operating reports – assurance reports \(system assurance and year-end reports\). Vince Schimizzi was assigned this task – due at the end of June 2006.](#)
      4. Resources are unknown at this time; however, it would be valuable for other partners to develop the SQR reports. This will provide an opportunity to learn the Kuali data module.
    2. Year-end edocs
      - a. Departments has access to the year-end documents
      - b. There is not a systematic check for validating when transactions are processed.
    3. Sufficient funds checking without beginning balances
    4. Primary year-end GL processes
      - a. Encumbrance forwards
      - b. Org reversions and carry-forwards
      - c. Nominal balance closeouts
      - d. Balance forwards
    5. Interspersed sample reference tables
- D. Kuali University Data and Test Plan– Mary Wheeler and Scott Heise
1. Objectives
    - a. Prove functionality with a database populated by non-IU data
    - b. Exercise specific non-IU parameter configurations
      1. FASB values



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

2. GASB values
  3. Community College values
  4. Others
  - c. (Secondarily) Learn about system set-up
    1. Record the set-up process
  2. Methods – specific scenarios should be tested during normal testing
    - a. Are we planning to try to exercise the existing module test plans on this new set of data? Particularly the GL module. Setup of data in excel tables is underway
    - b. Are there special scenarios/cases that need to be devised for a Kuali U. test plan?
    - c. Will “keep it small”; the aim is to test features and configurations not volume
    - d. Care will be taken to not disrupt ongoing development or functional testing
  3. Data
    - a. Progress is steady but slow
    - b. Fund, Sub-Fund, Function - have been shared with other reviewers
    - c. Organization and Object codes almost done
    - d. Next steps to work with Bill and Sterling to complete all values in the key tables. The group does not understand what some attributes are used for and plan to start meeting next week (work through a table and brainstorm.)
    - e. The team is proposing three charts – this is in Confluence in the testing pages.
    - f. The GL team have this topic as an agenda item – testing GL back-office functionality. Same period of time during the GL testing. Is this an opportunity to expand the knowledge base by bringing in new testers?
    - g. Need to see kuali.reg and the process of “back-office” – integration testing.
    - h. Need to configure APC data when Kuali U is ready to start testing.
  4. Participants
    - a. Data Creation – Mary Wheeler, Dick Barber
    - b. Consultants – Sterling George, Bill Overman, Claire Tyson
    - c. Technical Assistance – Nathan Hamlich, Steve Stein
    - d. Testers – TBD
  5. Timetable
    - a. May – data definition
    - b. June – data review, system set-up, and data load
    - c. July – test planned scenarios – who is going to perform the testing is to be determined. Nathan is helping setup the tables – leveraging the resources. Data will be passed back to Indiana. Indiana will be hosting the Kuali U data. Testing may extend past July.
    - d. Need a decision on how to populate Kuali U – need consistency between Kuali U and Kuali reg. Data is still being collected via spreadsheet.
    - e. Oracle tool will enforce Referential Integrity.
- E. Kuali Days Planning - David Lyons and Liz Taylor
1. David Lyons reviewed the draft agenda for Kuali Days in November 2006, Tucson, Arizona.



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

2. David will refer people to the Kuali Test drive before coming to Kuali Days. The test drive site is the base system.
  3. Kuali Days may become the Kuali Users Conference in spring 2007.
  4. The following are comments made:
    - a. Show Phase I, not the test drive, populated with real data; Kuali U data will be ready. **Someone needs to talk to Jim Thomas.**
    - b. CAMS needs to be added to the agenda - 10:30am; functional session
    - c. Offer a session for in-depth discussion on the GL – 10:30am; functional session
    - d. Add workflow as a concurrent session; functional session
    - e. Have roaming experts available for concurrent sessions – this will require more Indiana resources. Experts will be available to facilitate discussions. Have lab sessions available for every concurrent session
    - f. Parallel track on Wednesday – more hands on. This would require more IU resources.
    - g. Shorten breaks to 15 minutes
    - h. **We need to identify a person to speak on the Budget Module - need to know within the next month.**
    - i. Mark Barton from Arizona has volunteered to present on Accounts Receivable
  5. Kuali events in November
    - a. We need to define “all hands”, is this anyone on a Kuali subcommittee?
    - b. IU needs to review – Kathleen will need to talk to the VP about the cost, cash, resources, risk.
    - c. There was additional discussion about SME face-to-face meetings in addition to Developer face-to-face meetings.
  6. NACUBO pre-conference
    - a. Saturday July 8th, head count was 30 or more last year. The agenda looked good to everyone.
- F. Fiscal Officer Development Series Update and Plan Proposal - Kymber Horn
1. FODS committee has not gotten together; the hand outs are Kymber’s thoughts.
  2. Kymber used a checklist approach for schools that may consider implementing a fiscal officer development series - things to think about and suggestions for meeting items.
  3. A question was raised about maintenance - has Kymber thought about maintenance? For example taxes, is the committee going to discuss how to maintain? Who is responsible? This should be the responsibility of the presenter to maintain the information contained in the slides.
  4. Do we need to check for copyright information? Yes, Kymber will assign out to the subcommittee. They will be responsible for clean up and organization.
  5. Kymber is waiting for feedback from the subcommittee.
  6. Per Kymber, we are still on track for the June 30th, 2006 deadline. At the KFC August meeting, KFC will discuss the final product.
  7. **It was decided that KFC’s role is to review and sign-off on the final products.** FODS review will be part of the regular weekly meeting; the plan will start when Kymber is ready to start reviewing materials.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- G. Financial Policies Update and Plan Proposal – David Lyons
1. David Lyons reviewed the draft policy for the chart of accounts, including the backup document for creating the overall policy. Cornell does not follow this structure for policies.
  2. Base system will have 7 overall policies: Internal Control, Chart of Accounts, Cash Receipts, Cash Disbursements, Journal Vouchers, Workflow and Reports. The other 7 will come later. The review committee will develop one policy per week. The policy will be sent to KFC for final review.
  3. Internal control will be general – provide guidance on role and responsibilities.
  4. Cash disbursements will be generic – what is and is not allowable.
  5. This is not what Kathleen expected but this is a good fit for Kuali; identifies major topics that an institution would need. The agreement with Mellon was a financial policy template; the template will need to be modified if an institution wants to customize. The body looks like what the Kuali document would look like. If someone reads in the wrong context, it can be misleading. Take out Kuali terminology - this may solve the problem. Use standard accounting terminology.
  6. General financial policies – should not be functional. It will be interesting to see how they evolve.
  7. David has encouraged comments. Consider a checklist of policies that you may want to consider (allowable and unallowable expenses, etc.) Fundamental policies in addition to others that should be considered – this can merry with FODS. Templates will align with the fiscal officer training.
  8. David stated that he will make the June 30, 2006 deadline.
  9. Should Kuali Days have a concurrent for financial management products? This is a good idea and David will mention in Honolulu.
- H. Review of Kuali Directory Tool and Org Charts – Phil McKown
1. Phil is keeping an official list – roles, responsibilities, contact information, etc.
  2. The Kuali directory is located in Oncourse – Phil encouraged everyone to review. If information needs to be updated, send Phil an email.
  3. Phil will add the following people/groups to the Kuali directory:
    - a. Becky Kindred
    - b. Mardi Leonard
    - c. FODS committee
  4. It was requested to link the email address (mailto:)
  5. **It was decided to recognize Sterling George a Lead SME on the GL.**
- I. Delete Capability – Jim Thomas
1. FIS has delete capability. At some point, we need to make use of active and inactive tags – good audit history. In general, this is a good decision.
  2. This would be a change in the functionality and needs to be discussed with KFC. What does this mean and is the approach acceptable to KFC?
  3. For example, codes that are no longer active. A list of object codes gets changed which can make some codes inactive. When genesis runs, it does not bring over inactive object codes. Current FIS has the capability to delete records.



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

4. Does the internal auditor have an issue? Maybe, but probably does not know the functionality to delete records is there. IU when through an audit, they looked at users and their capability. The result was a shortened list. Super user can change values in a table and is contained.
  5. What is the cost? This work is not currently accounted for June 30<sup>th</sup> – if we want to stick to dates something needs to fall off.
    - a. GL – Jay did not write with active and inactive. Jay has three opinions on the cost to recognize the fields but they need to be analyzed. Some are active and some are in-active. Jay is not sure all tables have this.
    - b. eDocs – this is also true for TP edocs; some have checks but it is not all inclusive. If it existed in the current FIS it was coded.
    - c. Chart - Per Randall it does exist in some. There are 76 different java classes that need to be changed; Randall did not correlate – number may be less. Maybe perform an analysis of high risk tables – Jeff can produce quickly.
  6. Referential integrity can be controlled to some point.
  7. Is this the direction we want to pursue? If yes, need to prepare a proposal and it needs to be prioritized with everything else.
  8. This has the potential to be big and we need to draw the line somewhere. How many instances and what are the resources to get it done?
  9. What is the strategy? Going forward, we need to build in active/inactive flags
    - a. Put on the list for review – Phase II functionality and do nothing. We will lose some functionality. Most of the work would be on the functional side – what does the active and inactive flag do for this business process?
    - b. Make a conscious decision if the flag should be there. Development for each reference table on whether it should be added.
    - c. Auditors like to be able to back into who made changes. Could we recreate the activity to show who did what? In Kuali this is covered in the edocs.
    - d. It is the DBAs responsible to verify if active or inactive is there.
    - e. We need to recognize that this has to be done before Phase II is complete.
    - f. Ongoing strategy, we do not know the cost. Analysis needs to happen and the product needs to be quality. We need to fix it.
    - g. **Going forward we will add active/in-active. Others will be fixed later. Review of exposure will be done during the QA period.**
    - h. **Analysis will be done upfront for new maintenance tables. A list will be developed for previous work (here are the impacts).** This will become the work list for Phase II. Low risk and minimal work for Phase I.
- J. Help Content and Maintenance – Jim Thomas
1. Documentation efforts for context sensitive help.
    - a. Requires someone with XML experience
    - b. Requires deployment of the application.
  2. The issue is how. What are the expectations for ease of content maintenance?
    - a. Need the ability to edit help content (user interface) - we do not have this today



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- b. Out of the box, do we deliver standard defaults for context help? No. Customize help so that it can be specific for institutions. This will require work that is not currently accounted for.
  - c. What is the expectation? Edit on regular basis and change or not? We need to leverage the user documentation project. We still don't know the format for the content.
  - d. We need to understand the expectations – manage and maintain content sensitive help. A developer can update – basic foundation of help and this is provided with the system. The rationale is that people will initially use; however, this will trail off as people learn the system.
  - e. The original design was never intended to have field level help – should be section level help.
3. Documentation will be delivered in a document form – assume in any storage format including html.
4. We can create anchor tags (specific document about an Auxiliary Journal Voucher). This is reasonable. Field level will not be used.
5. Document level to access a document – do not support at attribute level.
6. Deliver with default descriptions; it will not be easy to change without a developer.
7. Who is doing this? Need to identify specific resources. Kathleen thinks this is part of the documentation project.
8. Do we have a data dictionary that describes the fields? Page level out of the box – default or a link to an empty page they can update, use APC and use the database to specify the link. Provide user documentation; create a link to a blank screen that is attached. Confluence pages can be used.
9. Documentation deliverable – help was the documentation online. Link at page and document level – managed in data dictionary files. What is behind this? Need to incorporate the best help content.
10. Leave field level help in the data dictionary – no changes by institution.
11. Page level becomes APC – page level page, default populate that points to JIRA/Confluence.
12. Someone is going to need to populate the blank fields. Can we change in the data base or code level?
13. Other categories for groups of information for KRA module – the proposal would be to use the APC - reference SOP.
14. **Decision for Help Content and Maintenance – for Phase I deliverable**
  - a. **Field Level will use the data dictionary. Others will leverage the APC.**
  - b. **APC will be setup by the developers**
  - c. **Hourly student will cut and past the information into the APC rule**



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

### DAY THREE

Thursday, May 18, 8:00am to 10:30am

#### **MEETING GOALS**

1. Open discussion between DMs and KFC to identify any final issues that should be dealt with in face to face
2. Full review of testing process and identification of issues to be fixed
3. Transference of information on QA process
4. Sharing of information and discussion on QA deliverables for Phase I QA process
5. Discussion and decision on print options for E-Docs

#### **PRESENT**

University of Hawaii	Kathie Egami, Henry Ito
Michigan State University	Dave Brower (Phone), Vince Schimizzi
rSmart	Dick Barber
San Joaquin Delta College	Claire Tyson
Indiana University	Kathleen McNeely (Chair, Functional Council) Barry Walsh (Executive Director, Board) Joan Hagen Ailish Byrne (Configuration Manager) Brian McGough (Lead Architect, DM Financial Transactions, DM Workflow) Phil McKown (Project Analyst) Sterling George (Lead Subject Matter Expert, GL) Bill Overman (Lead Subject Matter Expert, COA) Jim Thomas (Project Manager) Scott Heise (Quality Assurance Manager) Jay Sissom (Development Manager, GL) Laura Kress (Development Manager, EPIC) Lora O'Connor (Development Manager, RA, CnG) Randall Embry (Development Manager, COA)
University of Arizona	KyMBER Horn, Mark McGurk, Andrew Hollamon Mary Vega (scribe)
NACUBO	David Lyons
Cornell University	Arthur Mintz, Mary Wheeler, Lisa Stensland (Phone) Aaron Godert (DM Nervous System, DM Financial Transactions)



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

#### **AGENDA**

- A. August 2006 KFC Meeting – Kathleen McNeely
- B. Update between DMs and KFC – Kathleen McNeely and Jim Thomas
- C. Testing Review – Kymber Horn and Claire Tyson
- D. Review of QA process – Scott Heise
- E. Plans for QA Period July 1 thru September 30 – Scott Heise
- F. Discussion of printing option of eDocs (PDF, creation, etc.) – Jim Thomas

#### **DECISIONS MADE**

1. Referential Integrity: deal with referential integrity after Phase I deliverables. Referential integrity will be turned on in September 2006.
2. Kuali Days: a training lab will be available for each concurrent session - 20 stations. People staffing the stations will be experts; 1 or 2 developers at each lab session (combo of technical and functional).
3. Printing option for edocs: a web browser will be used.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

1. Referential Integrity: DBA and developers will start analysis and identify areas where it would break. A list of items will be created and will be built into plans.
2. Discuss Org Reversion at the next KFC meeting – 30 minutes
  - a. Sterling George and Bill Overman will work on transfers – simplify to fit Arthur's proposal.
3. Sterling George will produce a list of year-end reports and the subcommittee will identify which reports are mandatory; they will keep them to a minimum.
4. Phil McKown will add a placeholder to each module for reports.
5. Delta will prepare the functional specification document for the Program Code
6. Kuali Testers: Kathleen will talk to the Board about funding – no more than three people per school.
7. Program Code Functional Specification document: Delta will prepare

#### **Overall Discussion**

- A. August 2006 KFC Meeting – Kathleen McNeely
  1. Mardi Leonard is making plans for the August 2006 KFC face-to-face in San Francisco.
  2. Everyone seemed to be pleased with the Phoenix facility – conference and hotel rooms were fine.
- B. Update between DMs and KFC – anything to discuss? Kathleen McNeely and Jim Thomas
  1. Referential integrity update – Jim Thomas
    - a. The Kuali Technical Council has asked that we have a plan to turn on referential integrity in the database.
    - b. There are known places where this would be an issue, but turning referential integrity on would not break everything. We can turn it on today and 80-90% of items would work. The situation is that we need to analyze, identify, and have a plan to get them fixed.
    - c. To avoid problems, it was decided to deal with referential integrity after Phase I deliverables. After full QA and the big release of Phase I, referential



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

**integrity will be turned on in September 2006. In the meantime DBA and developers will start analysis and identify areas where it would break. A list of items will be created and will be built into plans.**

- d. Is there an on/off feature? Per Jim, this is an implementation issue. They want Kuali to be delivered this way. If a school wants to turn it off they can do that.
  - e. How much of a change to the underlying architecture? 80-90% of code will work as is. This will not change the underlying system. Schools will be able to interact with the database and skip the code.
  - f. It is good to keep checks in the code. Users will not be able to understand the database errors. If the code is broken, the DB will catch it.
  - g. Issues expressed by Dick Barber
    - 1) Current checking is in the code – this will not be pulled out. People need to understand redundancies will exist.
    - 2) Active/inactive will not be checked with referential integrity.
2. Org Reversion update – Jim Thomas
- a. Arthur had an initial design that was reviewed yesterday. After some discussion it was determined that Arthur's initial design would work and will solve the problem in terms of making Org Reversion more flexible. This involves creating an edoc and additional tables (4 additional tables and one new edoc). We need an estimate of effort; 550 hours approximately to write the Java base. Kathleen wants an estimate of all the hours soon. **At the next KFC meeting, the Org Reversion will be discussed (30 minutes).**
    - 1) 7 rules – changes are not proposed
    - 2) 12 on left side will be made configurable
  - b. The full blown solution which included a rules engine was a very large amount of hours. It would be more than the 550 hours but we do not know the actual number of hours.
  - c. Some options that will work need to be proposed and prioritized. It was asked how often they change. Not often, is it worth spending a lot of effort to design an interface?
  - d. The org reversion maintenance screen is current FIS and this needs to be done regardless. A document to build rules dynamically does not exist today and is optional.
  - e. Campuses will update but will change the combinations. Other schools will have to write Java code to make the code changes for the 7 different rules. Kathleen is worried about small schools that do not have java developers. Some schools will have a simple org reversion process.
  - f. **Sterling George and Bill Overman will work on transfers. They will simplify the log to fit Arthur's proposal.**
  - g. August will be focused on priorities – will not see new resources until the third quarter.
3. High-level on year-end closing – Kathleen McNeely
- a. Standard reports for GL (assurance, year-end closing). New reports need to be part of the core product. There are no dedicated resources to write the reports.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- b. Sterling George will produce a list of reports and the subcommittee will identify which reports are mandatory; they will keep them to a minimum.
  - c. This will happen with each module – this is something we need to think about. Do we have some who can write the reports? We need to think about added reports to the plan – zero resources, but they need to be tracked.
  - d. Phil McKown will put a placeholder for each module.
4. Review of Kuali days
- a. Plan for a full week in November – this is going forward as planned.
  - b. It was decided that a training lab will be available for each concurrent session - 20 stations. People staffing the stations will be experts; 1 or 2 developers at each lab session (combo of technical and functional).
  - c. Brain McGough expressed interest in “all developers” meetings – developers are all in one place. This would be in addition to all hands. This would allow for one-on-one time. Additionally, schools could meet with a group of functional and technical people and have an open discussion.
  - d. We could have a round table in addition to labs – 1 hour discussion. The purpose would be to encourage repeat attendance and continue to foster interest.
  - e. David Lyons will convey in the brochure – David will try to incorporate but it may get complicated.
  - f. Some SME groups have not met as a group; this would be a good time for a face-to-face.
5. Kuali U
- a. Data and test plans are moving along.
- C. Testing Review – Kymber Horn and Claire Tyson
1. Objectives of testing
- a. Ensure that the modules and/or edocs have been thoroughly tested to support sign off by the QA manager, the Lead SME and the Functional Council
  - b. Ensure the partner schools learn the functionality
  - c. Include assurances that issues (usability and bugs) are reported, resolved and retested – release and regression testing
  - d. Modules currently being tested:
    - 1) Chart of accounts
    - 2) General ledger
    - 3) Financial transactions
    - 4) Pre-award budget
2. Financial Transaction general observations
- a. We have a few good testers that are initially assigned new scenarios. These testers test “out of the box” – using the scenario as starting points and feeling comfortable to do weird things to see what happens – they usually generate the most usability issues too.
  - b. More thoroughly tested scenarios are passed to other testers as an opportunity to learn the system.
  - c. Scenarios are primarily remakes of previous scenarios and focus on:
    - 1) Business rules



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- 2) Importing lines
  - 3) Adding notes and attachments
  - 4) Routing, FO, Org, Blanket and Supervisor
  - 5) Disapproving, Copying and Error Correction
  - d. To be added soon:
    - 1) Sufficient funds checking
    - 2) General Ledger interaction
  - e. This process seems to facilitate sign off – we can keep track of what scenarios have been tested, so when we get ready to talk sign off, we have a good idea where we stand and what we need to do.
  - f. The scenarios are not super detailed which I think helps people feel comfortable getting started using a new system – hopefully more will feel comfortable “trying to do weird things”.
  - g. Scenarios are constantly tweaked as testers discover mistakes, or new items, such as sufficient funds checking and GL integration are needed.
  - h. Not sure the linking of scenarios is really necessary – although it does allow you to quickly see what issues were discovered by the scenario and if they’ve been resolved.
3. Chart of Accounts general observations
    - a. The e docs for coa are well developed with rich functionality. Gaining knowledge of the documents, the maintenance tables, custom attributes and the business rules takes a fair amount of time before testing can occur. Testers have not always had the base knowledge or adequate time to test effectively. It might have been better to identify the testers in advance so that they had an opportunity to gain the base knowledge.
    - b. Utilizing Lead SME for communication with Developer has been an effective use of resources.
    - c. Involving all schools and the SME meeting format is a productive use of time. The expectation is that each school would utilize testers who possessed a good amount of knowledge of the Kuali system and had adequate time to fully test each coa document. The rotation of testing chart documents is designed to ensure that testing will occur in a brief time.
    - d. Chart of Accounts testing is to complete by 6/30/06. The timeline for testing has been brief leaving testers struggling to keep up.
    - e. The approach of testing chart of accounts has been aggressive and inclusive.
  4. General Ledger general observations
    - a. The unit and initial functionality tests have been beneficial in catching bugs in the code but put a lot of work on the developers. These tests are very good at identifying specific values that may be incorrect in a GL accounting string and in identifying different behaviors in error checking and functionality.
    - b. There are numerous combinations of data that need to be checked to confirm that aggregations and selection criteria are being triggered properly. In addition separate environments may be needed to test some enhancements and the use of flags for switching items on and off.
    - c. To date testing has been conducted centrally. However, end users testing needs to be conducted to test the functions front to back.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- d. Volume testing will reveal items related to the management of the accounting cycle (access to assurance reports, balancing, system error handling and rollback).
  - e. There are a number of different types of testing for GL: some within the application (e-docs, balance inquiries, and reference tables) and other types (back office and year-end) that will require a combination of testing approaches to cover the functionality.
  - f. We need to determine where the handoff is for e-doc accounting transactions.
5. Pre-Award Budget Document general observations
- a. Testers don't test scenarios against the CNV environment currently.
  - b. We continue to test each tab along with the new tabs that are being released.
  - c. We have assigned some testers to be "wildcard" testers and are not assigned scenarios.
  - d. The scenarios are not super detailed which I think helps people feel comfortable getting started using a new system – hopefully more will feel comfortable "trying to do weird things".
  - e. Scenarios are constantly tweaked as testers discover mistakes, or new items.
6. Recommendations for discussion
- a. DM should provide release notes that identify resolved issues for the testers to retest
  - b. All issues should be reported in user feedback
  - c. There should be a coordinating position that
    - 1) Links and closes duplicate issues, or
    - 2) Categorizes them as usability (component) for review by the Usability Prioritization committee (KUP), or
    - 3) Moves to the appropriate project if new and non-usability issue.
  - d. The quality assurance manager can take an active role helping new testing coordinators identify the best way to test documents based on the four examples listed above: scenarios, test plan and test cases, assisting the DMs set up testing pages that include release notes and ensuring consistency amongst module testing.
  - e. In addition to structured testing, wild card testing should be done
  - f. Clearly define roles and expectations of testing coordinator, lead SME, DM and QA with respect to testing: who is responsible for what, when and how much time is involved.
  - g. Helpful if testers are involved in all the discussions – opportunity learn the module from the beginning.
  - h. Helpful to bring all testers together to a central location to work on testing – education on system and work through scenarios – this may fix the gap.
  - i. [Kathleen will talk to the Board about funding – no more than three people per school.](#)
  - j. When the modules start to grow, we need someone to manage the task queue (solve duplication and manage the issues). This will be a full time job. All user issues come through user feedback – this is necessary for moving forward. Release I has a lot of cross-over – this is more integrated. Release



## Kuali Project

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

It can have user feedback for each module. Regardless, someone needs to manage all user feedback. We need to utilize talents – identify a new testing coordinator for phase II? What does Kymber want to do? [Kymber will talk to Kathleen after discussion with Charlie and Liz – Kymber will be the overall testing coordinator for both Phase I and Phase II.](#)

- k. No drop-dead issues – we will meet all the goals. Testing has been effective, some areas can be improved.
- l. Scott Heise is concerned about testing. Specifically, what we are testing? Wildcards are fine but Scott is interested in repeatability: developing the scenarios and working through the plans. This will ensure a sound system.
- m. For the Chart, a business analyst was not engaged early on to prepare functional specs. This was a hold-up for chart. Marci is currently working on global account delegate. If Marci is the only resource it will be slow. Rather than complete functional specification documents, a good compromise would be to have the business rules re-written in English.
- n. [Delta will prepare the functional specification document for the Program Code](#)
- o. Other schools will try to help Marci while they test.
- p. Functional specification documents are a deliverable. We need something for the future.
- q. Brian McGough commented that testing the GL is a concern. It is not easy for people to test. GL testing, to date, depends on the process – 130 to 150 test cases are available for the poster and scrubber. Once development is done, a line by line comparison will be completed.
- r. Other processes are unit based – results are known. Run the accounting cycle, load balances and update.
- s. The plan is integration testing using edocs
- t. Year-end – run in environment, run code and compare results. Scenarios will get more elaborate – test all the various combinations – aggregations of positive and negatives – accumulate. A large amount of testing is needed for GL.
- u. We need to test flexible offset.
- v. Budget year is going to raise a lot of issues.
- w. We need to ensure that we do not short Sterling on resources. We also need to identify the gaps.
- x. Scott is concerned about testing for the first time during the QA period. If early in the QA period it may be acceptable – this is not the intent.
- y. We are in good shape for testing everything, except the Budget Year.

#### D. Review of QA Process – Scott Heise

- 1. Identify activities intended to produce a quality system
  - a. Tasks the build quality into development
    - 1) Standards
      - a) Architecture
      - b) Coding
      - c) UI
    - I. Accessibility



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

### II. Usability

- 2) Specifications
  - a) Functional
  - b) Design (Technical)
- 3) Unit Testing
- 4) Code Reviews
- 5) Change Management
- b. Tasks that verify quality after development
  - 1) Functional/Integration Testing
    - a) Functional Test Plan
  - 2) Regression Testing
  - 3) Performance Testing – establish a baseline
  - 4) Accessibility Review
  - 5) Licensing Review
  - 6) Milestone Review (Sign-Off)  
(documentation of the measures supports the determination of whether or not code is eligible for release to the public)
- 2. Define the activities or tasks or processes
- 3. Set measurable targets (and minimum standards) for the activities or tasks (balanced with development deadlines and available resources)
- 4. Implement the activities or tasks
- 5. Measure the activities or tasks as they occur
- 6. Document the activities or tasks and their measures as they occur (a record that demonstrates due diligence (due care or good faith) effort to produce a quality system)
- 7. Monitor measures with respect to targets and make adjustments as necessary
- 8. For the Chart of accounts, it was decided to work from the existing code and no functional specification documents were prepared.
- 9. Going forward we need to assign business analysts to prepare the functional specifications.
- 10. CAMS and AR are doing well in their documentation efforts. Kathleen is worried about the Lead SMEs and developers' time.
- 11. Scott is worried about Phase II since he is not monitoring the progress. Kathleen assured Scott that Phase II is covered.

### Sign-off criteria

Sign-Off Item	Sign-Off Criteria
Functionality complete	Participants agree that all elements of the module scope document have been adequately addressed (and exposed to Functional Testing)
No Critical or Stopper bugs	Participants agree that none of the currently reported bugs are at a Stopper or Critical level. Jira issues for the module should reflect the decision made here.
Functional/Regression Testing	Participants can verify through documentation that this testing has been complete according to the Test Plan



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

Integration Testing	Participants can verify through documentation that this testing has been complete according to the Test Plan
Test Plan	Participant verifies that a reasonably complete and accurate test plan is documented in Confluence
Accessibility	Participant verifies that a sampling of the module has been subjected to and successfully completed automated testing for accessibility features
Code Review	Participant can verify through documentation that key module functions have been through the code review process
Unit Test	Participant can verify that the full set of Unit Tests for the module run successfully
Performance	Participants agree that according to documented tests of key module functions, the module functions perform within a defined range in a simulation of actual operating conditions
License Review	Participant can verify that the review has been completed and all required license information is included in the appropriate source code library
Documentation	Participant and a committee of SMEs and developers have reviewed the documentation and found it to be complete and accurate

### Functional Testing Sign-Off

Kuali Module	Name
Lead SME	
Testing Coordinator	
Development Manager	

Sign-Off Item	Role(s)	Yes/No
Functionality complete	Lead SME, DM	
No Critical or Stopper bugs	Lead SME, TC, DM	
Functional/Regression Testing	TC, Lead SME	
Integration Testing	TCs, Lead SMEs	



# Kuali Project

## Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

Kuali Module	Name
Lead SME	
Testing Coordinator	
Development Manager	
Project Manager	
Quality Assurance Manager	

Sign-Off Item	Role(s)	Yes/No
Functionality complete	Lead SME, DM	
No Critical or Stopper bugs	Lead SME, TC, DM	
Functional/Regression Testing	TC, Lead SME	
Integration Testing	TCs, Lead SMEs	
Test Plan	QA Mgr	
Accessibility	QA Mgr	
Code Review	DM	
Unit Test	QA Mgr	
Performance	DM, Lead SME	
License Review	QA Mgr	
Documentation	QA Mgr	

### Color coding

Red participants and items are required for Functional Testing Sign-Off.

Blue item is required for Documentation Sign-Off.

All participants and items are required for Module Sign-Off.

12. Per Jim Thomas, he reserves the right to use all developers over the 3 month period for QA.
13. If California schools come in, it will be during the QA period.

### E. Plans for QA period activities– Jim Thomas and Scott Heise

1. Once the code is frozen, there will not be any significant changes to the code. Some developers will be working on bug fixes.
2. Another group will be focused on performance testing and tuning. They will be looking for places to fine tune code for efficiency. This group will consist of the best technical people.
3. Another team will be looking at infrastructure and the Nervous System; others will be working on usability issues.
4. The documentation effort: user and technical documentation. Development resources will be required to assist with documentation development.



## Kuali Project

---

### Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

5. Release packaging and serving of the software: we need to put the application somewhere so people can download it. We need to find a host (identify a place and get packaging together).
6. Jim is pulling the team together – assignments will be coming soon.
7. Transition from Test Drive delivery to a public release delivery
  - a. Pre-March 31 we primarily focused on previously established QA processes and standards
  - b. Post-March 31 is a “ramp-up” period to the full range of QA processes defined in the QA Plan
    - 1) Add Code Reviews
    - 2) Add Accessibility Review
    - 3) Add Usability Review
    - 4) Add Licensing Review
    - 5) Add Milestone Review (Sign-Off)
    - 6) Add Kuali U. Testing as a component of Functional Testing
  - c. Post March 31 review of previously established QA processes
    - 1) Functional Specifications
      - a) Phase 1 modules
      - b) Phase 2 modules
    - 2) Unit Testing
    - 3) Change Management
    - 4) Performance Testing
    - 5) Functional Test Plans and Testing
      - a) Repeatability
8. QA Methodology and QA Plan
  - a. Objectives
    - 1) Produce a quality product
    - 2) Demonstrate (document) that we made a “good faith” effort to produce a quality product
  - b. Plan (1-3)
    - 1) Participation
  - c. Execute (4-7)
    - 1) Participation
9. Define “Full QA Period”
  - a. QA activities before June 30
  - b. QA activities after June 30 – Full QA Period
  - c. Issues
    - 1) Development “bleeding” over into the QA Period
    - 2) Resource allocation
    - 3) Sign-Off process
10. Are we going to update the test drive? Barry Walsh recommends separating the issues at this time. The QA process is a separate issue. The test drive could be updated November 1, 2006 in order to be ready for Kuali Days.
11. The hard deadline for coding is the end of June 2006. We can image any code changes except bug fixes identified by testers. If bugs are identified during testing, Jim and Kathleen will identify as “fix” or “won’t fix”.



## Kuali Project

---

**Meeting Minutes for Functional Council Face-to-Face – Scottsdale, AZ  
May 16<sup>th</sup> – 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006**

Web Address: Web address: <http://www.kuali.arizona.edu>

Submitted By: M. Vega

- F. Discussion of printing option of E-Docs (PDF, creation, etc) – Jim Thomas
  - 1. We will look at for Phase III. It was decided to use a web browser for printing.