

Penny Knutson wrote:

> Tracey:

>

> Thank you so much for taking the time to review the PPS Mandatory Reviewer checklist. We have looked over your suggestions with respect to reconsidering which units are responsible for reviewing which data fields. We continue to feel, for the reasons explained below, that all the fields on the Departmental Mandatory Reviewer list need to be reviewed timely by the department Mandatory Reviewer. The departmental Mandatory Reviewer is the "front-line" control for ensuring timely the accuracy and correctness of the data entered into PPS by the Preparer.

>

> We agree that each department's Mandatory Reviewer is the most qualified individual required to confirm that the employee actually exists and that the appointment has been approved by the appropriate individuals. Because PPS transactions do not route for approval and post immediately, all items entered by the Preparer should be reviewed timely by the Mandatory Reviewer for accuracy based on the source documents. The Preparer should give the source documents to the Mandatory Reviewer after transactions are entered to facilitate the review.

>

> It is also the Mandatory Reviewer's role to review for appropriateness and compliance. Federal law requires the university to verify via the I-9 that the employee is authorized to work prior to the employee's first day of work. University policy also requires the Oath and Patent Agreement be signed prior to the employee's first day of work. Departmental review of these documents by the Mandatory Reviewer prior to the first day of employment is the most efficient way to ensure timely that the university is in compliance with law and policy, and avoids hiring an unauthorized employee. Having a central office, such as HR, verify these documents would cause significant delays in hiring.

>

> Central offices cannot be relied upon to perform the timely reviews required of the Mandatory Reviewers because delays in getting the source documents occur too often and their staffing levels are not sufficient to ensure a timely review. They perform quality assurance checks. The timely review by the Mandatory Reviewer helps prevent fraudulent payments, loss of University funds and incorrect pay to employees.

>

> The L&S error report is limited to L&S. We, therefore, cannot create a campus policy for a system that is available only to one college.

>

> Even though the following review items you identified are system derived fields, they are derived based on the data entered by the preparer and, therefore, should be reviewed by the Mandatory Reviewer:

>

> Retirement Code (System Derived)

> FICA Eligibility (System Derived)

>

>

> The following review items are also system derived fields based on the data entered by the preparer [Title Code, Employee Relations Code (ERC) and Employee Relations Unit (ERU) code] and, therefore, should be reviewed by the Mandatory Reviewer:

- >
- > TUC (Bargaining Unit) (system derived)
- > AREP (Covered/Uncovered) (system derived)
- > FLSA (system derived)
- >
- > Regarding training and practice requirements, the Security Committee will grant an exception to new PPS users who will be working for a department that employs only staff employees. The PPS user, therefore, will NOT be required to take the Graduate Studies course, the Academic PowerPoint, or do the academic practice transactions. Departments will have to request the exception when applying for entry update in order for it to be granted.
- >
- > If the PPS user transfers to a department that employs both staff and academic employees, the PPS user will be required to take the Graduate studies course, the Academic training and do the required academic practice transactions before they will be granted entry/update to their new department.
- >
- > Please let us know if we can be of any further assistance.
- >
- >
- > Penny L. Knutson
- > Assistant Payroll Manager