BACKGROUND

THIS SECTION INSTRUCTS AGENCIES ON HOW THEY SHOULD CORRECT THOSE SITUATIONS WHERE THE WISMART TO STAR BALANCE CONVERSION WAS IN ERROR. IT SHOULD NOT BE USED TO CORRECT CODING ERRORS THAT OCCUR DURING THE COURSE OF DAILY ACCOUNTING OPERATIONS

WiSMART GL balances were converted to STAR in four installments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WiSMART GL Period</th>
<th>Accounting Period Loaded into STAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final FY 2015</td>
<td>FY 2015 Period 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016 Period 1 (July 31, 2015)</td>
<td>FY 2016 Period 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016 Period 2 (August 31, 2015)</td>
<td>FY 2016 Period 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016 Period 3 (September 30, 2015)</td>
<td>FY 2016 Period 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agencies reviewed and signed-off on the conversion files before they were loaded into STAR. In addition, the SCO reviewed each of the files before they were loaded to ensure that the balances were converted to the correct Fund, Agency and appropriation.

Still, agencies may need to make corrections to their conversion, to reflect issues inherent in their WISMART to STAR crosswalk. The most common corrections will be changes to the balances at the Department ID and Operating Unit levels.

POLICIES

• All conversion corrections must be submitted to the SCO for review prior to processing.

• The SCO will control the loading of conversion corrections into STAR.

• All corrections will be loaded into Accounting Period 3, with a GL Source of “CNV”. This Source should never be used for any other journal entries within PeopleSoft.

• Agencies should make every effort to forward all correcting entries to the SCO no later than Thursday, March 31st. Files should be sent to Derik Bingner in the SCO.

Below are examples of generic types of adjustments which agencies may wish to record in STAR. These types are listed in order from lowest risk/least problematic to potentially highest risk/highest level of scrutiny. While the SCO wishes to review all of these entries prior to upload, those fitting the criteria of Example 1 and Example 2 will generally be approved without the need for additional follow-up, while entries that move balances between appropriations, funds, allotment lines, or business units may prompt additional
inquiries and greater scrutiny. Please be aware that a single adjustment may fall under more than one example situation below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example 1</strong></td>
<td>Moving $4,000.00 of revenues and expenses between department codes from 1441100000 to 1441212345; and between operating units from 2100 to 4100. All other coding is consistent between debit and credit sides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example 2</strong></td>
<td>Changing an account code from account code 7312000 to account code 7314000. To make use of a new account code that did not exist in WiSMART.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this situation, the correcting entries will likely be approved by SCO as agencies are most familiar with their department and operating unit structure. However, be aware that some such entries may not be able to be processed if operating budgets are configured in a way that makes the entry fail budget checking. For example, if STAR has converted balances in an invalid operating unit with no budget, an attempt to move the balance to the correct operating unit could fail even though the balance is being zeroed out. In this situation, the STAR Support Organization’s assistance will be required to process the entry in order to circumvent the budgetary controls which prevent the clean-up.

The above situation could apply to movements between other chart fields including activity, project, program, product, etc. as well as combinations of two or more of these chart fields.

*The accounts involved must be in the same allotment line and expense category.* In this situation, more care must be exercised because of budgetary controls. If allotment lines were crossed; for example, the budget office would need to get involved in the process to approve or deny the proposed reclassification (see Example 3). Operating budget controls could also prevent some transactions under example 2 from being immediately recordable in STAR and hence assistance from the STAR Support Organization could be required.

When considering adjustments which change account codes please consider whether or not such a reclassification is absolutely necessary. Just because a new or better STAR account alternative exists, if a legacy account code will suffice, agencies should generally refrain from refining account classifications unless absolutely necessary. Adjustments made to reclassify converted revenue and expenditure balances should be accompanied by a sufficient explanation as to why the old account was inappropriate.
Clean up entries that combine features of example 1 and example 2 will be viewed with at least the level of scrutiny afforded to example 2.

### Example 3

**Moving expenditures from appropriation 12900 to 13100**

This type of adjustment will require the greatest level of explanation and scrutiny by the SCO. This pertains to all movement of balances between appropriations (alpha or numeric), allotment lines, fund codes, business unit codes, or budgetary fiscal years.

When submitting this sort of adjustments for SCO to review, a detailed explanation should accompany the upload worksheet to address the nature of the problem that occurred during conversion, how the problem was discovered and the reason that the change is needed. The explanation will make it easier for the SCO to evaluate the entries and get an understanding of the issues involved, for example, if combo edits need to be manipulated to put an adjustment through.

Clean up entries that combine features of example 3 with examples 1 or 2 will be reviewed with at least the level of scrutiny ordinarily afforded in example 3.

### PROCEDURES

Using the journal upload worksheet, prepare the needed adjusting entries. Where possible, utilize a single worksheet journal tab to make as many corrections as possible, thereby minimizing the number of worksheets that the SCO must open and review. Using either the reference field, the description field or both, separate ‘entries, can be grouped into a unit per the example on the following pages.

**Downloading and using the journal upload worksheet**

- The journal upload worksheet can be found on the [STAR SharePoint website](http://star.sharepoint.com).
- The “Spreadsheet Upload v2” file is a zip file that contains several files including required .dll files. You must download the entire zip file and run it to extract the other files. Only unzipping will create a folder with the Excel files and a subfolder of the.dll files.
It is important to remember not to modify the format of the data you enter or paste into a journal sheet. Although the uploader allows it, pasting legacy formats will cause the creation of corrupted upload text files. Such corrupt files will not upload successfully. When pasting data into journal sheets, always remember to paste values only.

If the voucher build fails because of an Invalid User ID Value error, it may be because the user was not authorized to process a journal voucher or the User ID was uploaded in lower case. The user ID is entered in both in the journal sheet and the Main Page, General Setup.

When creating the header, use CNV as a source, and 9/30/2015 as the journal date. Below, screen shots have been presented to demonstrate how for the example transactions above, a single upload worksheet can be used to perform all the identified clean-up transactions in a single journal using the Reference and Description fields to identify separate items.
Agencies may determine that it is necessary to separate the clean-up transactions into two or three journals/tabs. For example, if a small number of lines require that combo-edit rules be manipulated prior to posting, or if budgetary controls would preventing a portion of the clean-up entries from being processed, those transactions should be separated into a separate uploader worksheet. Doing so would speed up SCO’s review process as it should isolate some of the more potentially problematic transactions from those that are more straight forward and easy to approve.