# University of Alaska
# Banner Human Resources
# Process Improvement Assessment Report

**Prepared by:** Kathy Ray
**Last Revision Date:** November 28th, 2007
**Create Date:** November 6th, 2007

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4

2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION 5

3 SYSTEM SET UP REVIEW 6

4 BUSINESS PROCESS REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS 7

5 ACTION PLAN 21

6 CONCLUSION 23

# 1 Executive Summary

The purpose of this document is to serve as a resource for the management and staff of the University of Alaska System to evaluate and assess recommendations for improvements in current business practices using the Banner Human Resource Module within the Human Resources, Payroll and Budgeting Offices.

This document contains general observations, problem identification and specific recommendations on ways to enhance the overall use of the Banner Human Resource Module.

In relationship to current functionality, the University of Alaska System's Banner Human Resource Module is fairly well configured and maintained. However, recognizing that the University would like to use the Banner Human Resource Module to its fullest capabilities has brought us to this point. Several business processes were evaluated and assessed during my visit to the University:

- User Navigation
- General Person/Bio/Demo Information
- Applicant Tracking
- Position Control and Position Budgeting
- Employment and Compensation
- Leave Accruals and Administration
- Benefit Administration
- Payroll Processing and Tax Administration
- Time Entry Methods
- HRIS Security
- Interfaces
- Employee Self Service
- Electronic Personnel Action Forms

The evaluation of how the system is used to accomplish these business processes, how it can be improved upon, and the reasons for improvement are expressed in the document that follows

# 2 Background Information

The University of Alaska System spans three separately accredited urban universities in Anchorage, Fairbanks and Juneau, and includes a dozen community campuses, from Ketchikan in Southeast Alaska, to Kotzebue, in the state's far north. They have been using the Banner Human Resource module since January 1997 and have been consistent in staying current with the latest releases.

The Rule and Validation Tables are maintained and updated by the Statewide HR Systems Office with data entry responsibilities de-centralized to the three main campuses and to a few of the rural locations. Time entry is also done at the same level using paper timesheets, but the actual payroll processing still occurs centrally at the statewide office in Fairbanks.

The original University of Alaska Banner Human Resource implementation primarily focused on the goal of payroll go-live. Since then the University has taken advantage of some of the functionality not implemented and some new functionality delivered in subsequent releases of Banner Human Resources, but certainly not all of it.

The University of Alaska has already recognized the need to provide ongoing discussion concerning Banner Human Resources and has kept in place what it calls its ‘A Team’. Many members of the A Team were a part of the original implementation and have carried that knowledge forward to new members of the University System, thereby negating what can and has happened in other universities using Banner Human Resources as they experience turnover. The overall purpose of the A Team is to review and test new releases on their existing processes, but they don’t necessarily test and help to implement new functionality coming out with those releases.

One other note of background information is that the Statewide HR Office does define policy and procedure, but each campus can choose to interpret that policy or procedure slightly differently. This has led to each of the campuses doing some business processes slightly different than each other and they may not all be taking advantage of the same functionality.

# 3 System Set Up Review

As mentioned in the Executive Summary, the University of Alaska System has been set up and well maintained in the intervening years since their original go live. Upon my original review of their database tables including all HR Rule and Validation ones, I had some concerns regarding the set up and use of certain items, most specifically in the Benefit/Deduction area. However, after conversation with the Statewide HR Group, I soon realized that based on their reporting requirements it was actually a very sound design that met very specific reporting requirements for their benefit plans.

Their position control set up is good and has been working for them since their original implementation and I would not recommend any serious changes to it at all. As for position budgeting, they do not really use Banner HR to accomplish their yearly budget preparation, but they are ensuring the proper position budget rolls required by Banner HR every year. I will discuss in more detail later on under the Business Process Review section more about their Position Budgeting.

The University of Alaska system does not encumber salaries, process deferred pay and they are not really using the available Banner HR Security features. Also, in order to process the fringe benefit charges correctly, the original SCT consultant modified processes that they have been maintaining with each subsequent release of Banner HR. A brief conversation about this took place and I can see how baseline Banner HR would not have met their needs and in order to ensure correct future processing, especially to maintain effective grant usage for leave accruals I would not recommend changing this modification at this time. They do not wish to encumber salaries at this time, nor do they have a need to process deferred pay.

In my inspection of the database set up, I came across the fact that they are not using the delivered reports for Tax Deposits and Quarterly 941 reporting. They have an in house system that they have been using to reconcile and it has been working of them, but I will be including information about setting up PXAREPT to be able to run these two reports in the future.

The University of Alaska system is still capturing time entry on paper timesheets and having each campus enter their time into PHAHOUR. I will discuss this more under the business process review section.

They are also not using the Electronic Personnel Action Form capabilities at this time. I will discuss this further under the Recommendations section.

Finally on set up, there are differences in how the Banner Finance Chart of Accounts was set up and the actual reporting structure on the Banner HR side. To handle this difference, the University did create ‘dummy’ organization codes in Finance known as Time Keep Locations. These TKL Organizations are also used to distribute payroll reports and other information.

# 4 Business Process Review and Recommendations

**User Navigation:** The Statewide HR Office has maintained ongoing training for new hires as they come on board. This has enabled them to maintain consistent on Navigation even with turnover. All in all though, their turnover rate in HR has been relatively low, which also benefits the ongoing knowledge transfer of Banner HR to new hires.

**Recommendation 1**: Continue to provide new hire training regarding Banner HR. I would also recommend that they look into refresher training for their onsite trainers to ensure that they are up to date on Navigation. Courses are provided through the SGHE Education Center or through Computer Based Training that the University can purchase from SGHE.

**General Person/ Bio/Demo Information:** The data entry and maintenance of person information is the responsibility of each of the campus HR offices and is directly entered or updated through the PPAIDEN (Person Identification Form) in Banner HR. At this time address updates are not allowed through self service.

**Recommendation 2**: Currently address changes are updated manually. The University could allow address changes to be made through the Employee Self Service feature. Changes made to addresses via the web, will be captured by the Audit Report (PORAUDT). This report can be run as many times as needed. If the University decides not to allow address changes by employees, staff could still utilize the Audit Report for address changes made to PPAIDEN. The Audit Report also can be used for tracking changes made to Benefit/Deductions, Dependent/Beneficiary, and Beneficiary Coverage information.

In the 7.x release the Common Matching (CM) tool was released and is used to help prevent the accidental creation of multiple identification records (PIDMs) for the same person or non-person. It uses a rule-driven process that can help institutions determine whether an entity (person or non-person) is truly new to the system before the record is added to the database. They asked a question regarding the use of this feature with the People Admin Interface and I did confirm that it would be used in that process.

As a side note, the University is also looking into using Clean Address and I did let them know that Clean Address will also work in Self Service for address changes.

**Applicant Tracking:** Banner HR Applicant Tracking is not currently used by the University. However, they are using third party software that SGHE is partnered with called People Admin. People Admin is a hosted service that provides the applicant tracking functionality for which Universities are looking.

**Recommendation 3**: Continue to use People Admin and work towards utilizing the People Admin/Banner HR Interface. I discussed in detail the process regarding the interface as there are two components to it; one from People Admin and one from SGHE. The first is used to take data out of People Admin and the second is used to put data into Banner HR.

**Position Control:** The University is using the Position Control functionality fairly well. They keep track of vacant positions used for new postings, re-use position numbers as appropriate and overall have a good handle on maintaining position information. There is some variance between each campus in the use of position information and there might be some benefit to be gained by bringing each campus into a more aligned use of positions.

**Recommendation 4:** The only thing I might suggest here is the creation of pooled positions by Department for Student – Workstudy and Student – Non Workstudy, Temporary Workers, and Overload/Adjuncts. This will provide them with a couple of things; 1) The ability to keep track of who is or has been working in a given department at any point in time and 2) The ability to control the Labor Distribution associated with each pooled position so that Labor Distribution Overrides are lessened upon data entry into NBAJOBS.

**Recommendation 5:** My second recommendation isn't necessarily regarding Position Control itself, but how the pooled positions are utilized with the Employee Jobs Form (NBAJOBS).

My base recommendation is to have a pooled position by department, then to use the suffix to create multiple contracts. That way each contract can be tracked for that semester.

For example:

AJ9999 (Biology Adjunct)
AJ9998 (Chemistry Adjunct)

Then a naming convention for the suffix:

F = Fall
W = Winter
S = Summer

So suffix F1 would be Fall Contract 1, F2 would be Fall Contract 2 (assuming they are working in the same department). If they aren't working in the same department they could have two F1 suffixes.

Example 1:

Employee A is teaching two classes in Biology for Fall Semester. That could be handled by one job for the total amount because it is all charged to that FOAP.

Job would be AJ9999 F1

This could also be broken out into two different contracts if that is what the school really needs to know.

Job 1 would be AJ9999 F1
Job 2 would be AJ9999 F2

Example 2:

Employee B is teaching two classes, one in Biology for Fall and one in Chemistry for Fall

Job 1 would be AJ9999 F1
Job 2 would be AJ9998 F1

Then each semester would have its own suffixes and those could be used again for the following year. The job would just need to be re-started for the new contract in fall.

So if employee A came back next fall and did the same type of assignment the history would look something like this:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| AJ9999 F1 | Active 16-Aug-2005 | Term 15-Dec-2005 |
| | Active 16-Aug-2006 | Term 15-Dec 2006 |

The pooled position by department means more work up front, but less worry about overriding labor distributions. The use of the Suffix in association with a semester means that they would have handy history at their finger tips about what any given adjunct has done.

**Position Budgeting:**

As mentioned in the system set up section, the University is not completely utilizing the Position Budgeting features within Banner HR, including Salary Planner. There are many reasons as to why they are not using Banner HR with the main one being that the State Government does not require hugely detailed information for each position budget and they have been able to report using Banner Finance.

**Recommendation 6:** After much discussion with the Budget staff, I see no need to change their current business process regarding position budgeting.

However, the Fairbanks Campus has been adding the position number to JV transactions in the description field. This addition allows them to do fairly sophisticated budget reporting. During the discussions with the Budget Staff, it came to my attention that the other campuses were not doing the same thing. This is okay from a system perspective, but I think that each campus would find significant value in adding this feature to day-to-day budget processing.

Side note – I have worked with the University of Alabama on a baseline modification to the Journal Voucher Transaction Quick form. I shared that modification with the Statewide Support Group so they could determine if they would like to do something similar. This would enable them to process budget transactions through Finance Self Service module for position related transactions.

**Employment and Compensation:**

The Employee Class Rule form is one of the most powerful rule forms within BANNER HR and its attributes "trickle down" to many other areas of the system. For most higher education clients, between 15 and 25 Employee Classes are sufficient and the University of Alaska is currently working with 20 Employee Classes. So far this structure has been sufficient to handle their day to day needs. However, the idea of allowing some campuses to encumber was briefly discussed and in order to handle this well, the University would need to add additional Employee Classes to control this functionality as the encumbrance method is established at this level.

**Recommendation 7:** At this time I would not change their existing Employee Class structure.

The Earnings Rule Code form is another powerful form within Banner HR. During the initial review it looked to me like the University had a satisfactory set of earnings codes. There was one area that I thought they could use additional earn codes and is mentioned in the recommendation below.

**Recommendation 8:** The University was having issues on calculating employer retirement contributions for employees on sabbatical leave. I recommended the use of a non-cash earn code, excluded from everything but retirement plans. This will enable them to calculate and account for the employer contribution portion of retirement.

****Note** – I do believe they have actually put this recommendation into play already.

The University is already using the Mass Job Update capabilities whenever possible.

**Recommendation 9:** I have no further recommendations for them at this time on the mass update process.

**Employment and Compensation cont:** They are using the Employee Jobs Information Form (NBAJOBS) very well, with the exception of the job change reason. I would just encourage them to take better advantage of the Job Change Reason code as this can help to identify the reason a change was made to the job record.

**Recommendation 10:** Define additional job change reasons to truly capture business process reasons for job changes on PTRJCRE and utilize them on the Employee Jobs Form (NBAJOBS). Updating the Job Change Reason can provide better information and reporting capabilities within Banner HR.

**Leave Accruals and Administration:** All in all this functionality is working well for the University. Upon the original implementation they did write a custom process to accomplish their Leave Roll Process. At this time, baseline Banner HR still does not fulfill this requirement.

**Recommendation 11:** Continue to support RPEs for Leave Processing Enhancement.

The University did explain a cascading problem that they were having with certain earnings code not processing leave accrued vs. leave taken correctly. I took a look at this while onsite and was able to make recommendation to fix this issue right away. The problem was the affected earnings codes were set to go to the leave taken field on PTREARN instead of the Leave Accrued field. This minor change was made while I was onsite and was able to be fully tested.

**Benefit Administration:** My first impression of their Benefit and Deduction set up was that they could probably reduce the number of codes they were using by establishing Plan Code Options instead of multiple BDCA codes. However, after serious discussion with the Statewide HR Support Group, it became clear to me that for state reporting purposes, this was the best possible solution.

They are also experiencing some navigation issues on PDADEDN with scrolling effective dated records and PDABDSU with core/contingent set up. I requested that they submit a Service Request right away for these particular issues as I could not re-create it in SGHE's consultant database.

**Recommendation 12:** Continue to use their current Benefit and Deduction Set up. Also, due to the nature of this setup I would not recommend using the Open Enrollment Feature for many of the benefits at this time. They could, however, open up the ability to process voluntary deductions through Employee Self Service.

**Payroll Processing:** The University is currently running everyone through a Bi-Weekly Payroll with a two week lag time. This is a great payroll calendar set up and allows them time to complete data entry for new employees and time reporting. However, they are still processing much of this information centrally (at each campus location, including some of the rural sites) that could be processed electronically. I will discuss this further under the Time Entry Methods and Electronic Personnel Action Form sections.

The University is also not utilizing Banner HR Security, so each campus does have wide open access to PHAHOUR. This is a situation that I would be concerned about and will talk about in more detail under the HRIS Security section.

Overall, there were no significant issues with the actual payroll process, other than a sincere desire to begin using Web Time Entry. However, as a heavy grant institution, the baseline Banner Web Time Entry does not provide sufficient means to capture actual time worked on each grant to ensure Effort Certification is properly accounted for.

**Recommendation 13:** Banner HR will have new functionality in the 8.1 release in September of 2008 that will provide an enhancement to the Effort Certification process. At the time of this release I recommend that the University take a look at what it offers and see if that can be used in conjunction with Web or Department Time Entry to accomplish their business process needs.

**Recommendation 14:** I am also recommending that they rethink allowing each campus to have access to PHAHOUR. They can accomplish the same data entry through Department Time Entry and better control their Payroll Process. Having fairly wide open access to PHAHOUR could potentially lead to errors and is something that could be remedied fairly easily.

**Tax Administration:** Currently the University is not subject to state income taxes in Alaska, but they do have employees that are paid to work out of other states.

**Recommendation 15:** We talked through the fact that SGHE supports each state's income tax set up and I referred them to Chapter 3 of the Banner HR User Manual. The section on setting up PTRBDCA, references each state's particular tax set up and can be used as a guide to set up those additional state tax deduction codes. The University will also need to establish tax ids with each state they are required to report taxes for before they begin to deduct those taxes. This set up will also affect their W2 set up on PXAREPT and I recommended that they read through the Year End Regulatory Release Guide that will be posted on December 8th.

**Time Entry Methods:** As mentioned under the Payroll Process section, the University has wide open access within their MAU units across all campuses and some rural locations to the PHAHOUR form to accomplish their Time Entry. Even though their salary information is public record, the ability to control who can affect PHAHOUR might be worth taking a look at different time entry methods.

They currently have one time clock system that is brought into the PHRMTIM table and they could expand this capability if they so chose.

**Recommendation 16:** I would recommend that they look at Department Time Entry as a method to restrict access to PHAHOUR. Time and Labor Distribution overrides can be entered through Department Time Entry just as they can in PHAHOUR and would allow the Statewide Payroll staff to ensure more accuracy in actual processing of payroll data.

**Recommendation 17:** The University could also push this method farther out to the actual departments, and then the MAUs could complete a first check for accuracy before it goes to Statewide Payroll staff.

Note – I am not sure if or when the University would be able to move to Web Time Entry at this time, due to the nature of their grant funding requirements.

**Notes on Department Time Entry:** Departmental Time Entry is available in Banner to move the collection of time entry from the payroll department to the decentralized department level. A department timekeeper only enters time for the group of employees within their department (timesheet org on NBAJOBS). This enables organizations to decentralize time entry and provide an electronic means to approve timesheets. Timekeepers use a form in Banner (PHATIME) without needing to have the necessary payroll knowledge required for Banner payroll processing.

The department timekeeper enters time for the department and then submits the time to approvers. Once approved, those transactions are submitted for normal Banner payroll processing. This will result in efficient administration of decentralized time entry, electronic approval processing, and overall payroll processing.

Timesheet totals can be verified from an online form that displays all time sheet organization for a specific pay period. Therefore, the payroll department can determine if all timesheets have been entered and can easily identify timesheets that have no time entered, but are part of the current payroll.

The planning of the Electronic Approval Routing Queue is critical for the implementation of correct routing of time transactions. Standard Banner HR reports and forms can help the user research position and incumbent-reporting relationships so routing queues may be effectively planned. Below is a list of some Banner reports to start with.

NBRPINC Position Class Incumbent Report
NBRPSTA Position Status Exception Report
NHRDIST Organization Payroll Distribution
PHRROSTTime Sheet Roster Report

Other factors that may help in determining best method to set up the queues are:

- If the job is being expensed to multiple departments, multiple departments may need to approve or acknowledge time entered
- There may be special approval requirements when an employee is partially funded by one or more restricted funds
- Some departments, jobs, and/or employees will need multiple approvers
- The system is designed to primarily utilize NBAPOSN and NTRRQUE for setting up routing queues

- NBAJQUE is provided for exceptions to the rules set up on NTRRQUE

The system is designed with the idea that most approver positions will be single positions with one incumbent. If the position has multiple incumbents, the approver values will need to be updated as approvers move in and out of the position on NTRRQUE and NBAJQUE. If an approver is in a pooled position, Human Resources may choose to transfer the employee to a single position

A routing queue can be established on NBAJQUE for a position with no queue established on NTRRQUE.

Note: An employee can be an approver and acknowledger for their own time entry

The following is a matrix of approver set-up options and the level of maintenance effort for each one.

| **NBAPOSN** **(**This is the lowest maintenance option.) | **NTRRQUE** | **NBAJQUE** **(**This is the highest maintenance option) |
|---|---|---|
| Single incumbent in approver's position | Single or multiple incumbents in approver's position | Single or multiple incumbents in approver's position |
| Single approver | Allows for single or multiple approvers | Allows for single or multiple approvers |
| Reports To field populated with position number of approver | Overrides the Reports To field on NBAPOSN | Overrides entries on NTRRQUE |
| No acknowledger | Allows for single or multiple acknowledgers | Allows for single or multiple acknowledgers |
| Creates a routing queue by position | Can create routing queue by position or time sheet organization | Creates a specific routing queue for that job |

- Determine who will be approvers, acknowledgers, and super users.
- Payroll representatives should be set up as super users. This will allow them to make queries on PHIETIM and PHADSUM on all organizations at once. This will also allow them to approve entries on PHADSUM if the approver does not complete.
- Determine if multiple or single approvers will be set-up.
- Determine which method/or combination of methods for approvers for each employee group.
- Determine a "Test Group" and an implementation plan. It is recommended to roll out slowly to small control groups at first, and then phase in remaining employee groups.
- Org security is used in Department Time Entry.

**HRIS Security:** The University is currently not using any level of Banner HR Security.

**Recommendation 18:** Consider the benefit of additional HR Security and the ability to roll out certain Banner HR Forms to the departmental level.

**Notes on HR Security:** Banner Human Resources provides comprehensive security features to control user access to both query and update functions and enables you to establish security by employee class code, organization code, salary range, and employer code.

Employee Class Security is turned on and off at the **Employee Class Security** field on the Installation Rule Form (PTRINST).

The User Codes Rule Form (PTRUSER) establishes user IDs for security purposes and enables you to grant access to all employee classes at the **Master Employee Class** field.

To allow access to some but not all employee class codes, do not check the **Master Employee Class** box on PTRUSER. Then use the Employee Class Security Form (PSAECLS) to set up an access list of the employee class codes the user can see.

Organization security is turned on and off at the **Organization Security** field on the Installation Rule Form (PTRINST).

The User Codes Rule Form (PTRUSER) establishes user IDs for security purposes and enables you to grant access to all organizations at the **Master Organization** field.

To allow access to some but not all organization codes, do not check the **Master Organization** box on the User Codes Rule Form (PTRUSER). Instead, use the Organization Security Form (PSAORGN) to set up an access list of the range of organization codes the user can see.

In most Banner forms, organization code security is linked to an employee's home organization, that is, the organization on the employee's Employee Form (PEAEMPL).

Forms that show sensitive salary and job information, however, look at time sheet organizations. The time sheet organization is defined on the Payroll Default Information window of the Employee Jobs Form (NBAJOBS) and can differ for each of the employee's jobs.

**Notes on HR Security cont:** Salary level security is turned on and off at the **Salary Security** box on the Installation Rule Form (PTRINST). The User Codes Rule Form (PTRUSER) establishes user Ids for security purposes and enables you to assign salary access privileges at the **Max Salary Level** field.

**Interfaces:**

The University is not currently utilizing the following interfaces:

*HR to Advancement (they use a non-Banner Advancement system)
*HR to Student Enrollment for FICA processing
*They have concurrent curricula that are making it difficult to establish the rule forms used in this processing.
*HR (Position Budget Changes and Salary Encumbrances) to Finance

The University is utilizing the Feed to Finance and did not indicate any specific issues with this interface. I noted earlier in the report that they had created a process to handle their staff benefit rates and that there is not any enhancement in Banner HR that would handle how they wish to process these charges.

The University is also utilizing the HR to Financial Aid interface to feed workstudy awards to the Financial Aid modules. No specific issues were indicated with this process either.

**Employee Self Service:**

The University is using partial functionality in Employee Self Service, mainly for viewing information, but not for allowing updates. They have been hesitant to allow address changes, but hopefully with the implementation of Clean Address that will change.

I mentioned earlier in the report that they would have a hard time utilizing the Open Enrollment feature with their current benefit set up, but due to reporting requirements I do not see this changing in the near future.

They are using it, with a slight modification, to display direct deposit statements and W2 statements.

**Recommendation 19:** I believe they could roll additional ESS functionality with benefits and deductions (specifically allowing employees to process their own voluntary deductions) and general benefit and deduction information using the Benefit Statement feature.

**Electronic Personnel Action Forms:**

To recognize the most efficiency, data entry should be the responsibility of the office that receives the source documents. Currently, the Campus MAU personnel are responsible for the data entry of Person, Employee, and Jobs data. The use of EPAFs to decentralize the data entry process would be very beneficial to the University.

**Recommendation 20:** This function and the tasks of data entry can be automated and the procedures standardized with the implementation of Banner Electronic Approvals. Electronic Approvals provide an electronic method of capturing data entry into an electronic personnel action form (EPAF), with pre-defined fields identified that are necessary to complete each table in Banner to hire a person into a job, update labor distribution, change salary information, etc. As a paper Personnel Action Form travels from a decentralized office through the HR/Payroll offices, an EPAF will do the same.

EPAF's can be created to be job type specific (separate EPAF's for Student Hire, Faculty Hire, Classified Hire, etc.) Banner will not allow further progression until all required information is entered. The EPAF will then carry on through an electronic routing queue to the appropriate approver(s) for the transaction. The information is then applied to the database through an electronic process by either a mass transaction application or a second viewer/approver.

Electronic Approvals would reduce the end-user training associated with the occurrence of staff turnover. Training on the Banner forms, PPAIDEN, PEAEMPL and NBAJOBS, is unnecessary because users only use the EPAF form with the fields predefined.

**EPAF note -** The University is currently using an EPAF to process their employee terminations, but stopped short of implementing new EPAFs. This was mainly due to staffing issues and they are looking to us to help them out.

**Reporting:**

The University is currently using a reporting tool called "Data Browser". This tool has provided a dependable means of ad hoc reporting to the Banner HR User community, but is currently being de-supported. The University is in the process of looking at new reporting tools, but I caution them in making sure that all current in use reports are identified so that the move to a new reporting tool can be accomplished fairly smoothly.

For more process oriented reports, the Banner HR users rely on IT support and don't necessarily have a dedicated resource for HR. There are staffing limitations due to location and or other reasons and a more robust reporting tool would allow users to more effectively control their reporting needs.

# 5 Action Plan

The University of Alaska System currently has a Systems Project list that prioritizes and identifies staffing needs to complete various HR related projects, both for Banner HR and third party systems.

I commend the University for establishing such a priority list in the first place and highly encourage them to continue with this practice. Using this tool I believe they have been fairly effective at continuing to increase their use of Banner HR functionality whenever possible within the constraints of staffing and time.

In conjunction with their own internal project plan I am making the following recommendations:

**People Admin and Banner HR Interface**

The University's first priority should be the continued use of People Admin and in effectively implementing the Banner HR and People Admin interface. This will contribute to a streamlined New Hire Process, improve the University's ability to properly pay new hires and provide faster access to campus systems as required by the employee's new role within the University.

**Introduce new EPAFs**

The University has successfully introduced a termination EPAF, but would like to continue to provide additional EPAF functionality. This particular area, I believe the University would see great benefit for the time spent to implement. With the help of a SGHE Banner HR Consultant I think we can provide them with some additional support in this particular area. I am recommending:

- a week of onsite discussion regarding current paperwork flow to develop a base EPAF build plan
- three to four weeks of remote consulting to build the designated EPAFs for the University, including testing and documentation
- a week of onsite knowledge transfer

**Implement Address Changes via Self Service**

With the implementation of Clean Address, I would like to see the University open up this capability for an employee to update their address via Self Service for any HR related address types.

**Add Multi State Tax Withholding**

In order to meet regulatory compliance the University should begin work on this item as soon as possible. I have mentioned sources of information in the prior section regarding this topic.

## Continual Process Improvement

- Pursue automation of all practical administrative functionality. Challenge those who wish to retain their manual systems. Although the functional expert should have the final decision in their choice of tools, try to move functionality to automation. Manual systems have a built-in restriction to efficiency. Automation is the first movement to a continual improvement in efficiency

- Seek maximum labor savings. Try to improve those sections of functionality that add maximum value to operations

- Reduce or eliminate shadow systems. Maintaining redundant systems is not an efficient business practice. In addition, when that particular user leaves the position, the system is often a casualty

- Create a long-range plan that takes these concepts into account and moves forward. Provide training and motivation that creates a positive feeling towards improvement as well as “change management” classes/support for any new functionality that is rolled out to end users

# 6 Conclusion

On an overall basis, I am highly impressed with the University of Alaska System's use and maintenance of the Banner HR system over the last ten years. They have maintained a communication structure for changes as well as testing new releases and functionality (the 'A Team'). They have kept up with Fiscal Year End Processes, mainly the Budget and Salary Table Rolls even though they don't use the Position Budget information extensively. And they have worked hard to identify the best possible system set up as new policies and procedures have been developed by the University.

The fact that they have a Systems Project List already in place is of great benefit to their continued success with the system. I have made some basic recommendations, some of which they have already put into place, some of which will take a bit longer to implement, but I have great confidence that they will accomplish what they have set out for themselves.

It was a great pleasure to work with them through the PIA process and I would definitely look to them as an example other clients could follow for ongoing systems design and use.