

<b>To:</b> President Gamble Business Process Review Oversight Committee	<b>From:</b> BPR Treasury Team (LeAnn Anderson-BL, Ed Binkley-GF, Chris Fastnow-BZ, Heather Halverson-BL, Bob Snyder-BZ, Chris Wendland-HV)
<b>Date:</b> 29 January 2007	<b>Document Number:</b>

**MSU Business Process Review Business Case: Treasury Team  
Debt Management**

**Executive Summary**

Debt Management at MSU consists of:

- Application and set-up of loans
- Issuing bonds
- Spending loans or bonds
- Repayment of MSU Indebtedness
- Monitoring compliance
- Providing reports for auditors, departments, and administration

The Treasury Team reviewed our current Debt management processes and found remarkably similar processes with the exception that Bozeman was considerably more automated in its payment function, using an Access program developed for this purpose. The Oversight Committee endorsed our Phase I recommendation to explore employing the Bozeman Access tool on the other campuses and to investigate bond reporting with an eye to streamlining it.

We have created a detailed description of the steps in the process employed on each campus. We used this description to generate estimates of the time spent on debt management each year and the attendant salary costs. Finally, we developed an estimate of the implementation needs, in terms of employee time. No software or hardware purchases are required to implement our recommendation. Analysis of these data suggest very small savings over the long term through adoption of the Access tool. We cannot estimate the impact of reporting improvements for the annual bond audit, because we do not know yet how much we will automate or which reporting tool is most appropriate, however we believe it will decrease the time involved in creating the annual audit reports and increase accuracy. Time spent on implementation of our recommendation will outweigh the annual operational time saved, at least in the first year.

We have identified many non-financial benefits to the recommended option, including:

- Reduction in error,
- Enhanced technical support,
- Greater cross-training and back-up,
- Enhanced reporting
- Improved bond audit reports with less need for error checking.

It is these non-monetary and non-quantifiable benefits that convinced the Treasury Team of the merits of adopting the Access tool on all four campuses and enhancing our annual reporting tools.

The team has endorsed combining weekly bond payments for Northern and Bozeman, however we feel strongly that centralizing other bond or Intercap payments would not be an improvement. There is very little efficiency gained from centralizing the payment, which would be offset by conversations between the payment maker and the debt manager on each campus. Management decisions would still be made on each campus. Each campus has responsibility for its own accounts, and each debt manager believes in continuing to monitor their own accounts for this reason.

Internal Audit and IT Security personnel have reviewed our proposal and voiced their concerns. We address their specific goals – data confidentiality, integrity, and availability, in the case of Security, and division of responsibility and internal controls in section D and in the detailed process description in Appendix A.

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>A. Introduction</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1. MSU Business Process Review .....	5
a. Summary of Treasury Processes to be Redesigned or Modified. ....	5
b. Business Process Review Objectives .....	6
c. Scope of This Case – Debt Management .....	6
d. Recommendation .....	6
2. Business Process Review Business Case Purpose.....	7
3. Background.....	7
a. Problems and/or Opportunities Addressed by Business Process Review.....	7
b. Connections to other Projects/Products or Programs.....	7
c. Other, Alternative Actions.....	8
d. Current Problems or Limitations.....	8
e. Other Important Historical or Situational Information .....	8
<b>B. Methods and Assumptions</b> .....	<b>9</b>
1. Financial Metrics .....	9
2. Business Case Scope and Boundaries .....	9
a. The Analysis Period.....	9
b. Geography or Location.....	9
c. Organizations .....	10
d. Functions and Positions .....	10
e. Technology .....	10
3. Scenario Design.....	10
4. The Cost Model.....	10
5. The Benefits Rationale.....	10
6. Data Structure .....	11
7. Data Sources and Methods .....	11
a. Data Sources .....	11
b. Methods for Estimating Costs and Benefits .....	11
8. Assumptions.....	11
<b>C. Business Impacts</b> .....	<b>11</b>
1. Analysis.....	12
a. Operational Costs.....	12
b. Set-Up, Training, Implementation.....	12
c. Financial Analysis Summary .....	13
2. Analysis of Results.....	13
3. Non-financial and Non-quantified results.....	13
<b>D. Sensitivity, Security and Risk Analysis</b> .....	<b>13</b>
1. Assumption Sensitivity Analysis.....	13
2. IT Security and Internal Audit Concerns .....	14
a. Programming and Documentation.....	14
b. User Authentication .....	14
c. Data Extracted, Entered, and Stored .....	14
d. Location and backups .....	14
e. Record-keeping and Reconciliation .....	15

f. Upgrades and Support .....	15
g. Training.....	15
3. Risk Analysis.....	16
a. Confidentiality .....	16
b. Integrity .....	16
c. Availability.....	16
<b>E. Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>F. Appendixes and References .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## A. Introduction

### 1. MSU Business Process Review

The 4 campuses of MSU were invited to participate in a business process review of all administrative and financial business processes across the 4 campuses.

There were several strategic objectives:

- develop a single process to be used by the 4 campuses,
- have a consistent set of definitions for all data elements, and
- improve institutional and system efficiencies and effectiveness.

Each of the processes will be:

- Redesigned,
- Modified, or
- Remain unchanged.

Each process will have a business case and cost benefit analysis to support the final recommendations.

The investigation and development phases (Phases I and II) occurred during 2006. Implementation of approved recommendations will occur during 2006 and 2007 in alignment with business cycles and resources availability.

#### a. Summary of Treasury Processes to be Redesigned or Modified.

<b>Process Title</b>	<b>June 28<sup>th</sup> 2006 Recommendations</b>	<b>Interim Recommendations</b>
Cash Management	Modify	Modify
Bonded Indebtedness	Modify	Combine
Other Debt Management	Modify	
Capital/Plant Funds	Modify	No change
Endowments	No Change	No change

The Treasury Team reviewed five processes in Phase I and brought the above recommendations to the Oversight Committee in June. In the meantime, we have reviewed in greater depth the four modifications. This document describes Bonded Indebtedness and Other Debt Management in its current state and our recommendations.

After in-depth review, the Treasury Team concluded that the bonded debt and other debt processes are similar, as are our proposals. Therefore we will combine them in this recommendation.

Finally, Plant and Capital Funds have been reviewed by the Treasury Team and will not be modified as part of the BPR process. This was approved by Craig Roloff as of 11/28/06. Bozeman has the largest number of transactions in this arena by far, exceeding the other campuses' combined total by several factors. Further, most of the process is decision-oriented and specific to the potential or realized purchase; hence the processes are very specific to

each campus. For capital programs, much of the process is regulated and beyond our control. Finally, much of this process is being considered in pieces on both the Treasury Team and other teams. Business officers involved in these processes will accommodate any revisions they recommend.

**b. Business Process Review Objectives**

The Treasury Team's goals for Debt management are to:

- increase efficiency,
- maximize communication and reporting with all parties,
- build in redundancy or backup across the campuses.

**c. Scope of This Case – Debt Management**

The debt management process includes determining need, applying for loans or issuing bonds, spending funds, monitoring of repayment schedules, review of invoices for errors or delays, monitoring of payment source balances, making payments, and providing users with complete and accurate information for all debts incurred. Regular and *ad hoc* reports result from these activities but are not the focus of debt management.

The Treasury Team reviewed our debt management practices in Phase I. The four campuses use strikingly similar processes, following nearly identical steps in nearly identical order. Great Falls does not have any bonds and only one InterCap loan, while Bozeman maintains several bonds concurrently and up to 30 InterCap loans, so volume does differ. Bozeman's process is considerably more automated, which allows for review and management of many more funds without significantly adding to the time or salary costs. Therefore, we recommended a modification at the end of Phase I: adoption of the basic process used in Bozeman at the other campuses. The Oversight Committee endorsed this recommendation.

**d. Recommendation**

In this business case we present our preferred modification recommendation: **employ an Access interface to Banner** that was developed on the Bozeman campus several years ago. The Access tool has been used successfully in Bozeman and can be expanded for use by the other campuses. We propose consolidating Northern and Bozeman's weekly bond payments, because of their frequency – there may be some small efficiency gains here – and the thin resources at Northern. We also propose developing reports, through either Access or SAIS, to streamline bond audit and bond rating reports.

Access is programmed to maintain all debt, stored in one location that is backed up by ITC on a regular basis. The information can easily be shared with other programs.

No data are entered into Banner directly through the Access tool. The repayment journal entries and electronic fund transfer forms are loaded into Banner either manually or using the x-feed process established by ITC.

Interest rates, payment schedules, and other information used in this program have no natural home within Banner and are stored in a table in the Access program.

Using the Access program allows for a quick and careful view of repayment schedules and overall charts showing debt trends. There is virtually no ability to report out of Banner because

debt data have no home there. The Access tool allows for graphs and text reports on past and future debt/payment in user friendly formats.

Annual bond audits and debt rating reports take considerable time from our highest levels of financial employees. Developing a finance report, either within or outside of Access, will free up several hours and minimize errors in the annual reporting process.

## **2. Business Process Review Business Case Purpose**

This business case describes the Debt Management process, the data the Treasury Team collected to review it, and the recommendation we have developed. It also addresses security and software concerns raised during our review. The Oversight Committee and President Gamble, may use this document to inform their decisions to approve our recommendation. We do not expect any purchase to follow from this decision.

## **3. Background**

The Treasury functions at MSU are largely invisible to the bulk of university constituents, but they may have a large impact on our operational budgets. Debt management, in particular, has few direct clients and low visibility. Further, appropriate Debt management keeps the university in good fiscal health, out of legal trouble, and away from errors resulting from bookkeeping or keypunching errors. Finally, the annual reporting processes for bond audits and rating review are a bit onerous.

The Treasury function is under review in BPR because of its location within Administration and Finance, not because of any errors or major inefficiencies. However, the Treasury Team sees BPR as an opportunity to learn across campuses and improve each campus' efficiency in this area as well as to maximize investment revenue.

### **a. Problems and/or Opportunities Addressed by Business Process Review**

As with the entire BPR process, the Treasury Team sees several opportunities presented by BPR. Not all of the overall issues are applicable to the Treasury functions. Those that we explicitly addressed during our review include:

- Single process across 4 campuses to promote efficiency, succession planning, and training.
- Data consistency to improve the reliability of management reports both from an individual campus perspective and a comparative, cross campus perspective.
- Quality process to improve quality, reduce error rates and improve the targeting of training and reference materials,
- Improved technical functionality by implementing Banner functionality *where possible*.
- Development of Business Continuity Plan (BCP) based on a risk assessment of improved processes. A BCP will also link in with an IT Disaster Recovery plan.
- Implementation of Front Office/Back Office concept *if appropriate*.

### **b. Connections to other Projects/Products or Programs**

The Treasury Team BPR project has ongoing links with:

- Accounting Functions BPR

The Debt Management Process review is related to:

- SABHRS
- Banner Finance Reports
- Accounting Functions
- Debt Management

**c. Other, Alternative Actions**

If the Oversight Committee or President Gamble does not approve our recommendation for streamlining and standardizing debt management across the campuses, we propose reverting to the *status quo*.

**d. Current Problems or Limitations**

There are no major problems to address in the debt management process. Occasionally a transaction review produces a red flag, and the parties in accounting functions track down the error and correct it before it becomes a problem. The bonding agency (US bank) requires funds be present in the bank prior to the repayment date. In recent memory, no campus has been punished for a violation of this kind.

The main constraint on the Treasury function is a lack of time to do other things. The Treasury actors on all four campuses also have other obligations within accounting, capital programs, and other areas. Streamlining the debt management and reporting process will lead to more attention and time to those other important aspects of their jobs.

**e. Other Important Historical or Situational Information**

Each campus has responsibility for their own financial affairs; each campus' relevant actor would be held accountable to ascertain if the funding source was able to repay the debt at the proper time. Because there is specific, campus-based information involved in the decision to loan InterCap funds, and because there is local discretion in payment sources for bonds, the Treasury Team recommends keeping the decision-making portions of debt management decentralized.

The Treasury Team does recommend having the Bonded Indebtedness for Northern be monitored and paid at the Bozeman campus using the repayment sources established ahead of time by Northern.

Although it is possible for one person or location to have responsibility for "pushing the button" to repay debt, we do not believe it is appropriate to centralize this task completely. First, because of the nature of the Banner tables and campus accounting, there must be four separate triggers. Second, though one person could pull all four triggers, that person must rely on the decisions made on each campus, informed by each campus' needs. Efficiency gains from consolidating the actual debt repayment would be foregone by communication time and effort. Third, by keeping the process decentralized, four different people have intimate knowledge of the debt management process and can provide backup for each other in the event of a disaster or more benign event. Fourth, housing the program on all campuses allows for each campus to monitor and report on debt quickly and easily using the existing reporting tools built into the program.

## **B. Methods and Assumptions**

In Phase I, the Treasury Team developed flowcharts for each process under review, comparing steps involved on all campuses. We collected data on the amount of time each step takes (flowchart analysis) as well as how much of each employee's FTE is devoted to the process overall (workload distribution analysis). There is significant agreement among the campuses in the steps of the process, data definitions, and reporting needs in debt management. The only visible difference at the end of Phase I was the amount of time it takes to make payments in Bozeman relative to Billings, Great Falls, and Northern. That is, Bozeman appears to be more efficient.

Because the Oversight Committee gave us fairly explicit direction to explore and if possible employ the Bozeman Access tool, in Phase II we focused on modifying the Bozeman process to fit the needs of the four campuses. We created detailed process descriptions (see Appendix A) for each campus with specific time estimates for all of the detailed steps. This allows us to compare the actual time spent at the three campuses with more manual processes against the actual time spent in Bozeman. This analysis appears below.

### **1. Financial Metrics**

For financial metrics, we calculate lower bound time and salary costs devoted to InterCap and bonded debt management separately. We offer a lower bound for two reasons: we do not have data on the time spent by departments to fill out InterCap loan applications, for example, and many other steps in the process involving decision-making vary considerably by case. We exclude these from our analysis, because they are unlikely to be affected by our recommendation.

There are also non-financial considerations, such as reduction in error, backup/redundancy and succession planning.

Additionally, there are one-time implementation costs of training, setup, testing, documentation, and succession planning. We will make gross estimates for these to fully account for the true impact of adopting the recommendation.

### **2. Business Case Scope and Boundaries**

This business case covers the four campuses. Only the time (and related salary costs) of those directly involved in debt management – reviewing applications, repayment schedules, processing paperwork, and reconciliations – are included.

#### **a. The Analysis Period**

We predict time involved over one projected year based on estimates of actual time spent over the last year.

#### **b. Geography or Location**

Billings, Bozeman, Great Falls, and Northern are involved in this analysis. The Extension and Experiment Station accounts are managed in Bozeman and are therefore tacitly included, though no personnel from those two agencies have been included in the analysis. For the most part, we will compare the three campuses against Bozeman, since we propose extending the Bozeman process to the other campuses.

**c. Organizations**

Financial Services or the equivalent office is included on each campus.

**d. Functions and Positions**

Bozeman is the only campus with an explicitly defined Treasury function, vested in the position of Director of Capital Programs. On the other campuses, the Controller, Budget Officer, and Director of Financial Services are principal actors in Debt management. Others within Financial Services offices also participate.

**e. Technology**

No technology costs are included in this business case. Both the status quo and the recommendation use tools already on hand.

**3. Scenario Design**

This business case compares continuing the *status quo* on all four campuses to adopting the Bozeman Access tool on all four campuses. The main difference between these two scenarios is the adoption of the Access program on the three campuses not currently using it. Therefore, we will consider the costs of expanding its use and the expected benefits based on experience in Bozeman. Of course, use on the other campuses will not be exactly like use on the Bozeman campus. For example, Bozeman's debt management process involves dozens of Intercap and Bonded indebtedness accounts while the other campuses have far fewer or none at all. However, we can use the Bozeman case as an upper bound – after appropriate training and set-up to allow the other campuses to "ramp up."

**4. The Cost Model**

The financial consideration we have included is time spent on the Intercap and bonded debt management process with attendant salary costs. No other costs appear to be relevant to the change we are proposing. We will include implementation costs (set up, training, documentation), as well as regular operational costs. Implementation costs are inclusive of both debt areas, because the program addresses both Intercap and bonded debt.

**5. The Benefits Rationale**

We also consider non-monetary benefits:

- error reduction, which will in turn reduce time spent within Accounting functions on error correction;
- consistency across campuses, leading to;
- backup and cross-training, especially for campuses with few employees in this function;
- and enhanced reporting at minimal additional programming cost.

## 6. Data Structure

N/A

## 7. Data Sources and Methods

We employed the following in our analyses:

Data	Source	Method
Workload Distribution Charts	Employees involved	Self-report
Detailed Flowcharts	Employees involved	Self-report, validated by team
Debt Payment Charts	Employees involved	Self-report, validated by team

### a. Data Sources

All sources are internal to the BPR process, stored in the Access database, or extracted from Banner.

### b. Methods for Estimating Costs and Benefits

We use estimates of time spent based on Bozeman activity to predict other campuses' future time expenditures. Prior time spent on all campuses is self-reported.

We predict time involved over one projected year based on estimates of actual time spent in the previous year.

We will not explicitly estimate a dollar figure associated with expected benefits.

## 8. Assumptions

For time and salary analyses, we assume that time spent at Bozeman is indicative of the time it will take to run similar processes at the other campuses, once the program is fully implemented and everyone is fully trained. We further assume that unchanged steps will continue to take the same amount of time by the same people.

## C. Business Impacts

Appendix A shows the current Intercap Loan process on all four campuses in detail, alongside the proposed process. Time spent by all actors and attendant salary costs appear for each campus. Total costs for the fully implemented new process are compared to the current total costs on the final page.

Appendix B shows the current Bonded Debt process on all four campuses in detail, alongside the proposed process. Time spent by all actors and attendant salary costs appear for each campus. Total costs for the fully implemented new process are compared to the current total costs on the final page.

Implementation time estimates appear in Appendix C.

## 1. Analysis

### a. Operational Costs

See Appendix A for InterCap and Appendix B for bonded indebtedness.

Adoption of the tool for bonds implies adoption for InterCap and vice versa, as the program is written to manage both.

In the case of InterCap Loans, each campus (except Bozeman) would see minor time savings. This process takes so little time to begin with, and payments occur just twice a year, so there is little room for improvement. Still, the payment process is shortened by adoption of the Access tool, and reporting ability is improved and may be faster.

Bonded indebtedness presents a slightly different story. Most of this process occurs outside of the Access interface – determining need, payment sources, applying for bonds, participating in the annual audit and in ratings reviews, etc. Still, for the two campuses that have bond payments weekly (Bozeman and Northern), employing the Access tool is a greater enhancement. Northern could cut its bonded indebtedness time commitment nearly in half, though again the starting point is small to begin with. All four campuses will gain small efficiencies and reporting ability.

Further consolidation across the campuses might yield additional time savings, but it is unlikely. The bulk of the debt processes are campus-specific – determining need, payment sources, reporting. There is too much institutional knowledge required to consolidate with much efficiency gained.

Even if we consolidated repayment activity, each of the other campuses' main actors would still likely monitor their debt to insure compliance with the loan covenants as well as balances in the funds designated to pay the debt, giving the single debt monitor their input prior to any decisions being made. This would not save much time on each campus. However, we do endorse combining management of the weekly bond payments for Northern and Bozeman on the Bozeman campus, because some efficiency gains are possible and because of Northern's especially thin-spread personnel.

Time savings from reporting enhancements are difficult to estimate at this point. We do not know the reporting capacity that can be developed nor the best tool with which to develop the reports. However, we do know from experience with the other reports that are already included in the Access tool that "push button" reports are possible and desirable. We anticipate any automation of the annual reporting process will be an improvement.

### b. Set-Up, Training, Implementation

See Appendix C.

Set-up and training times for Access are not trivial. Bob Snyder expects to invest about 66 hours programming, 80 hours installing on the other three campuses' servers (in concert with campus IT personnel), and 45 hours on continued training. [If both of our team's proposals are adopted, the campus installation time and much of the training time will cover both programs.] It will take several years of operational time savings to make up this implementation time. There are additional costs (not included in the Appendix) for user and technical documentation, however those costs will be incurred whether or not the other campuses adopt the tool as long as Bozeman continues to employ it.

Apart from training costs, these implementation resources are required whether the process remains on all four campuses or is consolidated on one. To make the appropriate interface to

Banner, there must be four separate campus tables. Additionally, to properly interact with SABHRS, payments must come from the individual business units and bank codes.

To improve annual reporting, programming by Bob Snyder or the Finance IT group will also be required. We cannot estimate these costs at this time because we do not know the extent of automation possible nor the best way to create the reports. During implementation, we will explore any university-wide reporting tool alongside web and Access reports.

The Treasury Team believes the non-financial gains from this recommendation outweigh the quantifiable costs.

### **c. Financial Analysis Summary**

- Time savings on an annual basis are positive but small.
- Implementation costs are non-trivial.

## **2. Analysis of Results**

Apart from implementation costs adopting Access will save the campuses about 13 hours a year on managing Intercap and bonded debt. Reporting enhancements should also improve efficiency. However, the implementation costs are significant. Still, the team believes that the non-monetary benefits (below) tip the balance toward implementing the Access program on all four campuses.

## **3. Non-financial and Non-quantified results**

- Error reduction through greater automation and reduced dependence on key punching, which will in turn reduce time spent within Accounting functions on error correction;
- Consistency across campuses, leading to;
- Backup and cross training, especially for campuses with few employees in this function;
- Existing reporting capacity is an improvement over currently available finance reports.
- Enhanced reporting, though potentially relying on already stretched Finance report writers' resources, will make annual bond audits less stressful and more accurate.

## **D. Sensitivity, Security and Risk Analysis**

### **1. Assumption Sensitivity Analysis**

Time and training costs may deviate from our assumptions. Updates to Banner or Microsoft will affect the Access interface with Banner creating a need to spend additional time modifying the Access tool. We do not know how much time or knowledge must be spent with each instance. However, Bob Snyder is likely to invest that time anyway to make his own version of the tool compliant. Extending the fix to all four campuses will not appreciably affect that investment.

## 2. IT Security and Internal Audit Concerns

### a. Programming and Documentation

The debt management program was originally written by Bob Snyder in Access and is regularly run by him. The Finance IT group is taking on responsibility for cross-training and technical documentation, along with Bob Snyder, both for internal controls and for succession planning. Technical documentation will be developed over the next year. User manuals will be developed by those within the Treasury functions at each campus before full implementation.

### b. User Authentication

Users may only access the program and the attendant Banner data (below) after receiving a security role as established through Paul Lambeth in ASG. The MTLs approve a Banner role and Jim Bratsky implements the permissions. The program is not accessible if the password fails 3 times. Bob Snyder, or his backup in the Finance IT group, can reverse the lockout.

### c. Data Extracted, Entered, and Stored

No sensitive or private information is used in this process.

No data are entered into Banner directly through the Access tool. After determining amounts to repay, the user inputs the relevant information in an Access form. An e-mail is sent from the user's account to US Bank with the fund code, the total amount to repay, and the total routing information, as requested by US Bank. The email does not trigger payments but does describe the distribution once the money is transferred to US Bank. A clearing account is used for this purpose (clearing accounts will be created for the other campuses).

An x-feed is created to move the repayment amounts from the source to the clearing account, from the clearing account to the EFT, and to make the NIIP entries. The x-feed is delivered via email to the Business Office (or an appropriate accounting tech) for separation of responsibility. The accounting tech actually processes the x-feed but need not re-enter all of the data, eliminating one likely source of keypunch error.

Debt tables and other information used in this program have no natural home within Banner and are stored in a table in the Access program.

### d. Location and backups

The program will reside on a network server on each campus. Housing the program only in Bozeman with access granted to the other campuses appears to be prohibitively slow, with delays up to 15 minutes for tables to refresh from Havre. To increase speed and efficiency, we propose housing a copy on each campus with tables only for that campus. However, each campus will have the ability to log on to the other campuses in the event of a disaster or to temporarily backup another campus user.

Campus	Server	Backups
Billings	SAN	Incremental nightly, full weekly, tape
Bozeman	Opal	Incremental nightly, full weekly, tape
Great Falls	LEDA	3x/week, disk-to-disk
Northern	Rigel	Incremental nightly, full weekly, tape

**e. Record-keeping and Reconciliation**

Daily and monthly reports have been created to serve the users' needs as well as those of departmental contacts. Currently copies of the journal vouchers that recorded the Bozeman transactions in Banner via x-feed are stored in hard copy in the office of the Director of Capital Programs. Hard copies may be stored on the other campuses as they use the tool, and all four campuses may move to digital imaging as that becomes available.

The repayment dates are also saved in Excel on the BPR shared drive (Treasury Team folder) and hard copy (with other BPR documents) for performance metrics for the BPR process.

Reconciliation is performed at least monthly with the US Bank statements.

**f. Upgrades and Support**

On login, Access verifies the version of the program. Earlier versions will not open. Bob Snyder and the Finance IT group will make new versions available to each campus after testing.

Bob Snyder originally developed the program and continues to maintain it. He has a vested interest in its functionality because he uses it daily. However, good business practices mandate additional support for succession planning and disaster mitigation. The Finance IT group, under Kevin Ward's direction, has taken on responsibility for cross-training and backup.

In the event of an upgrade or patch from Microsoft or Banner, the Finance IT group will work with Bob Snyder to test for compatibility before launch. During previous Banner upgrades, Bob Snyder has tested during the general test period, and he will continue to be in that pre-test loop. In the unlikely event of a significant delay, each campus can revert to the current method of debt management – all reports and data used to monitor and repay will remain independently available.

**g. Training**

On most campuses only one person is typically involved in the part of the debt management process using the Access interface. At most, two people on a campus will need to know how to use the bulk of its functionality. Because each campus can use the same program, further backup on a campus for everyday use is unnecessary.

All current users have been trained on the program by Bob Snyder through tutorials both in person and on the phone using remote desktop or Net Meeting. As new users are brought on board, the user manuals being developed by the current users should suffice for training. Those manuals will be complete as of the implementation date and will be kept on each campus network as Word documents along with the program itself. Upgrades to the program will be accompanied by addenda to the user manuals. Additional training in person or using Net Meeting can be accommodated if necessary.

Technical support is currently being developed. Bob Snyder is working with Kevin Ward to write technical documentation (beyond the code itself, which is transparent to programmers though vast). As new Finance IT group members come along, they may be trained using the technical documentation as well as tutorials with Bob Snyder and Kevin Ward.

### **3. Risk Analysis**

To summarize the above information, we examine three security concepts here: confidentiality, integrity, and availability.

#### **a. Confidentiality**

None of the data used in this process is confidential. We use no personal data, only financial, and all of the fields used are subject to scrutiny by auditors. We do employ email to transmit some information, which is subject to its own security issues. Regardless of the recommendation, however, email has been employed for this purpose for many years without incident. If one were intercepted, the nature of the information is unlikely to harm the institution.

#### **b. Integrity**

As our enterprise security manager has written, controls must be in place to ensure the accuracy of all information. Automating more of this process with the Access tool actually improves our data integrity. Key punching errors are minimized with one entry point followed by several opportunities to review the data – first by the user within the Treasury function, then by an accounting tech in the Business Office, and finally during regular reconciliation processes. No data are directly entered into Banner through Access. The x-feed process has already passed muster as a tool for changing data in Banner, and our recommendation only expands its use on the other campuses.

#### **c. Availability**

This is the most likely cause for concern, but we believe we have mitigated the risk of unavailable data. In the case of an upgrade, regular testing will occur before a Banner launch, as it has in the past on the Bozeman campus.

Availability risk on this tool for non-upgrade reasons, based on past performance, is minimal – one crash in near daily use over three years. Should the program crash, backups from the night before can be used and paper reports from any change that was processed outside of Access (through an x-feed, for example) during the program's down time can be used to re-set values to their appropriate amount.

Downtime on the application is well tolerated. Debt management processes can be achieved outside of the Access program if necessary, as they are now on three of the four campuses. In the worst case, where Access, Banner, and SABHRS are all unavailable (the latter two outside of the control of the Treasury function), debt payments may be made manually to correct the problem.

The responsibility for developing, upgrading, testing, and using this program has rested in one person. The BPR process has given us an opportunity to review this practice and correct it. With appropriate support from the Finance IT group, we are more confident that we can move forward in the unlikely case of a disaster or the eventual case of a personnel change.

### **E. Conclusions and Recommendations**

For the reasons summarized below, the Treasury Team recommends implementing the Access Debt Management program developed at Bozeman for four-campus use. We encourage the Oversight Committee and President Gamble to maintain four-campus debt management – with some

consolidation for Northern and Bozeman – and approve housing a copy of the program, customized with tables for each campus, on each campus for speedier service.

- We already use very similar detailed processes, with consistent data elements, definitions, and outcomes.
- Developing the Access interface for monitoring and disbursement on all four campuses will allow for streamlining the already similar processes.
- Enabling the Access program and developing the skills across campuses will build redundancy across campuses, especially where the debt management function is not very deep. Using the Access program on a weekly or daily basis will develop those cross-trained skills more thoroughly than cyclic or occasional use.
- Deepening our in-house support, with the Finance IT Group, lends greater depth to a tool we already rely on in Bozeman.
- Automation through greater use of x-feeds as well as the Access interface to Banner decreases possibility for user error.
- We can employ these efficiency gains and backups while maintaining the campuses' autonomy where appropriate. Monitoring debt balances should continue at each campus because the responsibility for legal compliance (three days prior to payment) rests on each campus.
- Reporting functionality is enhanced at minimal cost and without depleting overburdened ITC resources. Many reports are not possible through Banner because the data are not housed there. The Access tool allows for much greater flexibility in monitoring future and past debt/payment.
- Enhanced reporting for annual bond audits will minimize time involved in compiling documentation for those reports and maximize accuracy.
- Costs of implementing are not trivial, however the non-financial benefits tip the balance for the team in favor of adopting this tool on all four campuses.

## **F. Appendixes and References**

Please see attachments.

Debt Management Business Case Appendix A  
Detailed Process and Cost Estimates

Step	Intercap Loan Process																			
	Billings					Bozeman					Great Falls					Havre				
	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost
<b>LOAN APPLICATION:</b>																				
Inquiry received and recorded	CFO					Dir Cap Prog	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	CFO	1	\$0.60	0.02	\$0.01	CFO	1	\$0.72	0.02	\$0.01
Determine need, etc	CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var	
Fill out application	CFO Admin or Dept	5	\$1.17	5	\$1.17	Dept	var		var		Controller	var		var		CFO Admin	var		var	
Approve application	CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var	
Copy and send application to OCHE for approval	CFO Admin	5	\$1.17	5	\$1.17	DCP	5	\$2.28	5	\$2.28	Controller	5	\$2.15	5	\$2.15	CFO Admin	5	\$1.16	5	\$1.16
File hard copy of application	CFO Admin	1	\$0.23	1	\$0.23	DCP	3	\$1.37	3	\$1.37	Controller	5	\$2.15	3	\$1.29	CFO Admin	3	\$0.69	3	\$0.69
Send application to BOI (as FYI)					\$0.00	DCP	5	\$2.28	5	\$2.28				5	\$2.15				5	\$1.16
OCHE officially sends to BOI																				
BOI sends approval and promissory note to applicant																				
Distribute and file approval hard copy	CFO Admin	2	\$0.47	2	\$0.47	DCP	2	\$0.91	2	\$0.91	CFO	2	\$1.20	2	\$1.20	CFO Admin	3	\$0.69	2	\$0.46
<b>SET UP LOAN:</b>																				
Receive interest table from BOI via email				0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01
Load interest table into Access annually				0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01
Input loan info - principal, payments, and interest				5	\$1.25	DCP	5	\$2.28	5	\$2.28				5	\$2.15				5	\$1.60
Assign debt allocation	DFS	1	\$0.52	1	\$0.52	AVPFS	var				Controller	30	\$12.93	30	\$12.93	Budget Officer	10	\$3.20	10	\$3.20
Input payment sources				5	\$1.25	DCP	5	\$2.28	5	\$2.28				2	\$0.86				5	\$1.60
Assign spending index	DFS	1	\$0.52	1	\$0.52	DCP	0.25	\$0.11	0.25	\$0.11						Budget Officer	1	\$0.32	0.25	\$0.08
Set up spending index	Accountant	2	\$0.50	2	\$0.50											Budget Officer	5	\$1.60	5	\$1.60
<b>Occasional Total 1:</b>		<b>17</b>	<b>\$4.57</b>	<b>27.03</b>	<b>\$7.07</b>		<b>25.30</b>	<b>\$11.54</b>	<b>25.30</b>	<b>\$11.54</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>\$19.03</b>	<b>52.05</b>	<b>\$22.77</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>\$8.37</b>	<b>40.30</b>	<b>\$11.55</b>
<b>SPEND FUNDS:</b>																				
Obtain/Receive copies of invoices	Accountant	30	\$7.48	30	\$7.48	dept					dept	1				dept	1			
Send copies to BOI to request reimbursement with loan proceeds	Accountant	10	\$2.49	10	\$2.49	DCP	5	\$2.28	5	\$2.28	Accountant	5	\$0.83	5	\$0.83	Budget Officer	15	\$4.79	5	\$1.60
<b>RECEIVE FUNDS:</b>																				
BOI wires proceeds																				
Determine where to put wired funds	DFS	1	\$0.52	1.00	\$0.52	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Controller	1	\$0.43	0.02	\$0.01	Budget Officer	1	\$0.32	0.02	\$0.01
Record proceeds in spending account with Hdoc	Accountant	5	\$1.25	0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	5	\$0.83	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	5	\$1.16	0.02	\$0.01
Abate loan proceeds in GAAP fund and record liability in gen ldr through journal entry	Accountant	5	\$1.25	5.00	\$1.25	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	10	\$1.67	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	5	\$1.16	0.02	\$0.01
Create payment/amortization schedule	DFS	10	\$5.17	0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	30	\$5.00	0.02	\$0.01	Budget Officer	15	\$4.79	0.02	\$0.01
Email schedule (on application or inquiry)				0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01
<b>Occasional Total 2:</b>		<b>61</b>	<b>\$18.15</b>	<b>46.05</b>	<b>\$11.74</b>		<b>5.08</b>	<b>\$2.32</b>	<b>5.08</b>	<b>\$2.32</b>		<b>52</b>	<b>\$8.76</b>	<b>5.08</b>	<b>\$0.87</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>\$12.22</b>	<b>5.08</b>	<b>\$1.62</b>

Debt Management Business Case Appendix A  
Detailed Process and Cost Estimates

Step	InterCap Loan Process																			
	Billings					Bozeman					Great Falls					Havre				
	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost
<b>PAY LOANS SEMI-ANNUALLY:</b>																				
Receive bill from trustee semi annually	DFS	1	\$0.52	1	\$0.52	DCP	0.08	\$0.04	0.08	\$0.04	CFO	1	\$0.60	1	\$0.60	Budget Officer	1	\$0.32	1	\$0.32
Check bill against JV				1	\$0.25	DCP	1	\$0.46	1	\$0.46				1	\$0.43				1	\$0.32
Email error report to US Bank				1	\$0.25	DCP	1	\$0.46	1	\$0.46				1	\$0.43				1	\$0.32
Receive corrected invoice				1	\$0.25	DCP	1	\$0.46	1	\$0.46				1	\$0.43				1	\$0.32
Create JV/X-feed to transfer from funding account to debt service fund	Accountant	5	\$1.25	0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	10	\$1.67	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	3	\$0.69	0.02	\$0.00
Create JV/X-feed to transfer from funding account to clearing account				0.00	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01
Create HDOC/X-feed to make payment from debt service or clearing acct	Accountant	5	\$1.25	0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	5	\$0.83	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	5	\$1.16	0.02	\$0.00
Create JV to transfer from operating account to clearing account				0.00	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01
Create something like an H Doc to record payment in Banner				0.00	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01				0.02	\$0.01
Input H Doc to record payment in Banner				1	\$0.25	Accountant	1	\$0.22	1	\$0.22	Accountant	5	\$0.83	1	\$0.17	Accountant	1	\$0.23	1	\$0.23
Create and send EFT to State Treas	Accountant	5	\$1.25	1	\$0.25	Accountant	1	\$0.22	1	\$0.22	Accountant	5	\$0.83	1	\$0.17				1	\$0.23
Create BPA and process check																Budget Officer	10	\$3.20		
Process check																Accountant	5	\$1.16		
Fax/email payment detail to US Bank	Accountant	2	\$0.50	0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	2	\$0.33	0.02	\$0.01	Budget Officer	2	\$0.64	0.02	\$0.01
Payment report sent to dept	Accountant	1	\$0.25																	
Repayment schedule emailed to dept				1	\$0.25	DCP	1	\$0.46	1	\$0.46				1	\$0.43				1	\$0.32
<b>Semi-Annual Total:</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>\$5.00</b>	<b>7.05</b>	<b>\$2.02</b>		<b>6.18</b>	<b>\$2.35</b>	<b>6.18</b>	<b>\$2.35</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>\$5.10</b>	<b>7.10</b>	<b>\$2.70</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>\$7.39</b>	<b>7.10</b>	<b>\$2.09</b>
<b>FYE:</b>																				
Fiscal Year End interest accrual	Accountant	5	\$1.25	0.02	\$0.00	DCP	0.02	\$0.01	0.02	\$0.01	Accountant	5	\$0.83	0.02	\$0.00	Budget Officer	5	\$1.60	0.02	\$0.01
Reconcile NIIP	DFS	5	\$2.59	5	\$2.59	Accountant	5	\$1.10	5	\$1.10	Accountant	10	\$1.67	10	\$1.67	Budget Officer	10	\$3.20	10	\$3.20
<b>Annual Total:</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>\$3.83</b>	<b>5.02</b>	<b>\$2.59</b>		<b>5.02</b>	<b>\$1.11</b>	<b>5.02</b>	<b>\$1.11</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>\$2.50</b>	<b>10.02</b>	<b>\$1.67</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>\$4.79</b>	<b>10.02</b>	<b>\$3.20</b>
Loan set-up total * 1 (4 for Bozeman)		17	\$5	27	\$7		354	\$162	354	\$162		43	\$19	52	\$23		28	\$8	40	\$12
Spending/Receiving funds total * 1 (14 for Bozeman)		61	\$18	46	\$12		71	\$32	71	\$32		52	\$9	5	\$1		42	\$12	5	\$2
Semi-Annual total * 2		38	\$10	14	\$4		12	\$5	12	\$5		56	\$10	14	\$5		54	\$15	14	\$4
FYE total		10	\$4	5	\$3		5	\$1	5	\$1		15	\$3	10	\$2		15	\$5	10	\$3
<b>ANNUAL TIME (hours) AND SALARY COSTS</b>		<b>2.10</b>	<b>\$36.55</b>	<b>1.54</b>	<b>\$25.45</b>		<b>7.38</b>	<b>\$199.79</b>	<b>7.38</b>	<b>\$199.79</b>		<b>2.77</b>	<b>\$40.50</b>	<b>1.36</b>	<b>\$30.70</b>		<b>2.32</b>	<b>\$40.17</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>\$20.56</b>

Debt Management Business Case Appendix B  
Detailed Process and Cost Estimates

Step	Bond Management Process																			
	Billings					Bozeman					Great Falls					Havre				
	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost
<b>ISSUE BONDS</b>																				
Determine need, etc	CFO	var		var		CFO	var		var		CFO	var				CFO	var			
Work with underwriter/financial adviser and legal counsel	UFO	var		var		UFO	var		var		UFO	var				UFO	var			
determine need, repayment ability and assign allocation across sources	UFO	var		var		UFO	var		var		UFO	var				UFO	var			
Preliminary Official Statement	UFO	var		var		UFO	var		var		UFO	var				UFO	var			
Update data needed for bonding	UFO	var		var		UFO	var		var		UFO	var				UFO	var			
BOR and campus approval	BOR and campus CEOs																			
Issue Bonds	Bonding Agency (Bank)																			
Record debt in Banner																				
Set up debt service fund	Accountant	5	\$1.25	5	\$1.25	Accountant	5	\$1.10	5	\$1.10						Budget Officer	5	\$1.60	5	\$1.60
Set up spending fund	Accountant	5	\$1.25	5	\$1.25	Accountant	5	\$1.10	5	\$1.10						Budget Officer	5	\$1.60	5	\$1.60
Pay bond issue costs and prepare consolidated spreadsheet to allocate by campus new debt, proceeds, elimination of old debt, costs and amortization																				
Review spreadsheet, prepare & record journal entry in Banner	DFS	20	\$10.34	20	\$10.34	AVPFS	120	\$100.00	120	\$100.00						Budget Officer	10	\$3.20	10	\$3.20
Eliminate bond proceeds and record principal in NIIP fund	DFS	10	\$5.17	10	\$5.17	AVPFS	10	\$8.33	10	\$8.33						Budget Officer	10	\$3.20	10	\$3.20
Add debt to long term debt spreadsheet	DFS	2	\$1.03													Budget Officer	5	\$1.60	5	\$1.60
Load debt, payment schedule, and payment sources into Access				2	\$1.03	DCP	5		5											
Review payment allocation annually						AVPFS	var		var											
<b>REPORTING</b>																				
Annual bond audit	DFS	1800	\$930.95	1800	\$930.95	AVPFS/DCP	4800	\$4,000.00	4800	\$4,000.00						Budget Officer	1800	\$575.24	1800	\$575.24
Bonded indebtedness report (CHE)	DFS	10	\$5.17	10	\$5.17	AVPFS	60	\$50.00	60	\$50.00						Budget Officer	10	\$3.20	10	\$3.20
Final completion report to Trustee	DFS	var		var		AVPFS	120	\$100.00	120	\$100.00						Budget Officer				
Debt rating reports	DFS	var		var		AVPFS	960	\$800.00	960	\$800.00						Budget Officer				
<b>COMPLIANCE</b>																				
Review spending for compliance with bond covenants	DFS	1500	\$775.79	1500	\$775.79	AVPFS	4800	\$4,000.00	4800	\$4,000.00						Budget Officer	25	\$7.99	25	\$7.99
<b>ONGOING MONITORING</b>																				
Evaluate debt structure, meet with financial advisors, investigate alternatives and respond to requests						AVPFS	3000	\$2,500.00	3000	\$2,500.00										
<b>ANNUAL TOTAL</b>		<b>3352</b>	<b>\$1,731</b>	<b>3352</b>	<b>\$1,731</b>		<b>13895</b>	<b>\$11,569</b>	<b>13895</b>	<b>\$11,569</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>		<b>1870</b>	<b>\$598</b>	<b>1870</b>	<b>\$598</b>

Debt Management Business Case Appendix B  
Detailed Process and Cost Estimates

Step	Bond Management Process										Great Falls					Have								
	Billings					Bozeman					Current					Projected								
Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost	Responsible Party	Avg Time (minutes)	Current Salary Cost	Projected Time (minutes)	Projected Salary Cost					
<b>SPEND BOND PROCEEDS</b>																								
Spend and draw																								
Spend funds on project in accordance with bond covenant					Varies										Varies									
Request expended funds from Trustee					DFS					DCP or AVPF!					Budget Officer									
Receive and Record funds in banner					Accountant					Accountant					Budget Officer									
<b>SPENDING TOTAL (1-2/YEAR)</b>					<b>8 \$3 8 \$3</b>					<b>6 \$2 6 \$2</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>10 \$3 10 \$3</b>				
<b>OLP TRANSFERS</b>																								
Ensure pledged funds available for debt service																								
Transfer available funds as requested for other lawful purposes					DFS					AVPFS														
					DFS					AVPFS														
<b>OLP TOTAL (0-30/YEAR)</b>																								
<b>RECONCILIATION</b>																								
Monthly reconciliation of Trustee statement																								
DFS					DCP										Budget Officer									
<b>RECONCILIATION TOTAL (12 /YEAR)</b>					<b>10 \$5 10 \$5</b>					<b>30 \$13 30 \$13</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>10 \$3 10 \$3</b>				
<b>PAY BONDS</b>																								
Receive invoices from Bonding Agency (Bank)					DFS					DCP					Budget Officer									
Compare to debt service schedule and fix any errors					DFS					DCP					Budget Officer									
Create and send EFT to State Treas					DFS					Accountant					Budget Officer									
Email payment distribution to US Bank, AVPFS										DCP														
Create HDOC/X-feed to make payment from debt service or clearing acct					DFS					DCP					Budget Officer									
CreateJV/X-feed to transfer from funding account to debt sevice fund					DFS					DCP					Budget Officer									
Approve HDOC/JV					DFS										DBS									
Input HDOC/JV to record payment in Banner					Accounting Assoc III					Accountant					Budget Officer									
Fax/email payment detail to US Bank										DCP														
Fiscal Year End interest accrual					Accountant					DCP					Budget Officer									
Reconcile NIIP					DFS					Accountant					Budget Officer									
Receive and review invoice for trustee fees semi-annually					Accountant					DCP					Budget Officer									
Create BPA					Accountant					DCP					Budget Officer									
<b>PAYMENT TOTAL (2 OR 52/YEAR)</b>					<b>33 \$14 18.25 \$7</b>					<b>14.5 \$5 14.5 \$5</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>27 \$9 15.5 \$5</b>				
<b>ANNUAL TOTAL</b>																								
<b>SPENDING TOTAL (1-2/YEAR)</b>					<b>8 \$3 8 \$3</b>					<b>12 \$4 12 \$4</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>20 \$6 20 \$6</b>				
<b>OLP TOTAL (5-30/YEAR)</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>				
<b>RECONCILIATION TOTAL (12 /YEAR)</b>					<b>120 \$62 120 \$62</b>					<b>360 \$158 360 \$158</b>					<b>120 \$38 120 \$38</b>					<b>120 \$38 120 \$38</b>				
<b>PAYMENT TOTAL (2 OR 52/YEAR)</b>					<b>66 \$27 36.5 \$14</b>					<b>754 \$252 754 \$252</b>					<b>1404 \$455 806 \$264</b>					<b>1404 \$455 806 \$264</b>				
<b>ANNUAL TIME (HOURS) AND SALARY</b>																								
<b>59 \$1,823 59 \$1,810</b>					<b>250 \$11,983 250 \$11,983</b>					<b>0 \$0 0 \$0</b>					<b>57 \$1,097 47 \$906</b>									

Cash Management Business Case Appendix C  
Implementation Time Estimates

Step	Responsible Party	Time (hours)	Associated Salary
<b>Programming</b>			
Converting the programs from the way they were written to viewing four campuses	Bob Snyder	23	\$607
Converting the programs to accommodate Performance metric monitoring	Bob Snyder	43	\$1,135
Creating Bond Audit reports	Bob Snyder and/or Kevin Ward	unknown	unknown
<b>Programming Total</b>		<b>66</b>	<b>\$1,742</b>
<b>Set-Up</b>			
Travel to a campus	Bob Snyder		
Get IT to set up a server and allow me write access to it.	Bob Snyder		
Get IT to set up a server and allow me write access to it.	Campus IT		
Install the programs and link them properly	Bob Snyder		
Make sure the investing people have all the write access privileges also	Bob Snyder		
Make sure all the reports are working with the proper accounts and names showing on the e-mails and electronic fund transfers	Bob Snyder		
Draw all the investing balances out of Banner and create beginning balances in the Investing program	Bob Snyder		
Add all the loans and repayment schedules and make sure the reports match the previous totals on the financial statements and bond reports.	Bob Snyder		
<b>Set-Up Total (not including IT)</b>		<b>80</b>	<b>\$2,112</b>
<b>Training</b>			
Phone training (completed)	Bob Snyder	6.25	\$165
	Other campuses' employees (1.25*5)	6.25	\$114
Phone training (continued)	Bob Snyder	5	\$132
	Other campuses' employees (1*5)	5	\$91
In person training (completed)	Bob Snyder	12	\$317
	Other campuses' employees (12*5)	60	\$1,092
In person training (continued)	Bob Snyder	8	\$211
	Other campuses' employees (8*5)	40	\$728
<b>Training Total</b>		<b>142.5</b>	<b>\$2,850</b>
<b>Total Implementation Estimate</b>		<b>288.5</b>	<b>\$6,705</b>