TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The PeopleSoft system records and provides information to assist in the managing, developing, implementing, and advising on a wide variety of human resources (HR) management programs and policies. PeopleSoft information is used to prepare reports for departmental managers and the central agencies.

This audit reviewed and assessed the reliability and integrity of data processed and stored in the PeopleSoft system. The audit included examination of operations and activities at headquarters (HQ) and regional offices relating to the management and use of PeopleSoft.

PeopleSoft is an off-the-shelf system tailored for the federal government. It has not been designed to meet the exact requirements of the Department of Justice. It is a complex system and not well understood by most users. As well, software changes take much staff time to be tested. The Department is constrained by the need to wait for an interdepartmental committee to agree and approve software version changes, which are made by the supplier. The Department has implemented some customization of PeopleSoft to better meet requirements, and with good results. The difficulty of this approach is that every time the supplier issues a new software version the Department must make its customized changes to the new version and test them.

One essential factor in maintaining good quality data is the appointment of clearly defined and accountable data owners. However, we found that there are no well defined data owners.

Data integrity plans were to be based on this audit's findings. Plans should be prepared at HQ and regional offices for improving the accuracy and usability of the PeopleSoft information. A system interface between PeopleSoft and the Online Pay System will be available in 2003. This will provide single data entry for both systems for several data elements resulting in significant data improvements.

Staff is not sufficiently aware of the impact of errors and errors in one area may affect the use of other data. Training is available but it is not well matched to workflow (i.e. data entry is not well matched to the logical order of paperwork), is insufficient for the regional offices and sector administrators, and there are no handouts provided for trainees to help them remember what they have learned. Also, training is not always timely, especially for the regional offices. Training should be improved and supplemented with automatic tutorials and proactive tips addressing difficulties being regularly encountered.

While HQ has provided some good support to users, such as that offered by the PeopleSoft Help Desk, more support is needed. Communications with the users have been infrequent and insufficient. A PeopleSoft Intranet site should be implemented including information such as plans, contacts, tips, manuals, a list of problems found and resolution status, frequently asked questions, and a list of change/enhancement requests and their status.

There are few written procedures for the various data entry functions of the system; in many cases they are either inappropriate or have not been seen by most users. Written procedures that match the workflow and the data entry to PeopleSoft should be developed and include tasks on how to control data quality as part of regular data entry.

There is a strong link between the quality of the data and the degree of use of PeopleSoft as a reference for queries and for reports. Sector administrators and regional offices make little use of PeopleSoft. They consult it as a second reference, after using their own records. They maintain separate records that are more up-to-date and accurate and that duplicate PeopleSoft data. The lack of use of PeopleSoft reduces the incentive to keep data accurate. A strategy should be developed to make PeopleSoft the Department's primary data reference, increasing the incentive to maintain accurate data in this system.

There are two types of reports, standard and ad hoc. Standard reports are difficult to access and print. Also, not all reports on the menu work correctly. Some cannot be accessed or printed. As well, the reports that are accessible cannot be displayed before printing them, which deters users. Standard reports should be made more useful and easier to prepare. The HR Directorate in HQ provides good service preparing ad hoc reports, even though users' data requests are not always clear enough to supply the type of report expected.

Departmental HR and sector users commented that errors are usually introduced when there are system upgrades. On the other hand, we were informed that decisions have been made on what to change in consultation with a previously active departmental working group. Not all users were made aware of these decisions. It was reported that the system has several software errors, which have an impact on data quality. More importantly, the system lacks many basic edits (automatic rejection or warning of errors at data entry time). Improvement of PeopleSoft software edits and resolution of software errors should be pursued.

There are delays in data entry, often due to missing or incorrect information. The three main serial processes responsible for some delays in entering data occur when a position is classified, when staffing actions take place, and when pay and related data is updated.

With few exceptions there is no immediate or systematic verification of data entry by the person who entered it, by a second person, or monitoring by supervisors. Data should be verified shortly after it is entered.

Multiple screens are used to enter and view data and there are no screens or reports that allow easy verification of entered data at a glance. Reports or screens for easy verification of entered data should be made available.

Our tests, along with existing reports and estimates of data error rates that we were given in interviews, show that the basic data is generally good. Other current (not historic) data shows a 30 percent error rate. There are lower error rates when advisors/assistants review the data after entry. Regional data is not as good as HQ data since it has not yet been checked as much as HQ data. The results of our tests should not be used to predict the accuracy of all data since we did not use scientific sampling.

There are other measures in place to correct data but those are not enough to bring the data to acceptable accuracy levels. Data integrity has been recognized as a major problem and a Data Integrity Unit was created at HQ in October 2001. This unit was created as a temporary measure to supplement data integrity efforts by all HR staff and it has made excellent progress. The Data Integrity Unit’s services should exist as long as they are needed. During the audit the unit was meeting with HQ sector administrators and correcting basic data. The unit also visited a region and planned to visit all regions. However, the follow-up work to maintain accurate data needs to be defined, implemented, and communicated.

Each month, a file with some data elements is sent to Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) and a report is received back listing certain errors. This report was not well understood by the Data Integrity Unit. Also, the unit is preparing data integrity reports. The last report was in June 2001 and listed missing data for four fields. A strategy needs to be developed to make the best use of the PWGSC and data integrity reports.

There is good onsite support at HQ but not in the regional offices. Regional power users should be trained and appointed for PeopleSoft. They could provide support, coordinate local system use and dealings with HQ, and supplement the support provided by HQ.

Once the data is improved, PeopleSoft can be a very valuable tool for corporate and HR management. At present, the system is under-utilized. The main benefits have been derived from the leave module, which works well and is accurate.

The management response to the recommendations contained in this report was provided by the A/Director General, Human Resources, on March 17, 2003.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Department of Justice implemented PeopleSoft, a computer management system, in 1996. This system records and provides information to assist in the managing, developing, implementing, and advising on a wide variety of human resources (HR) management programs and policies, including those in the areas of staffing, classification, staff relations, compensation, employment equity, HR planning, and official languages. The information provided by the system is used to prepare reports both for departmental managers and the central agencies. PeopleSoft was selected as a shared system for several departments. Currently, there are about 17 government institutions using PeopleSoft, including the Department of Justice. They form an interdepartmental committee and decide on changes to PeopleSoft software. The Department of Justice must wait for the interdepartmental committee to approve version changes to the software.

The Department of Justice's costs to implement and support PeopleSoft have been high and initial acceptance of the system by users and HR clients (directorates serviced by the local HR section) have been low. An audit of the system was conducted within a year of its implementation and found that the main concern was with data errors. The Department's staff numbers have increased 82 percent in the last five years to about 4,748 employees. A few regions have more than 500 staff and the system is an important tool for HR management. As will be discussed throughout this report, the system is not well used.

In the Department of Justice, the Human Resources Directorate (hereafter referred to as the HR Directorate) at headquarters (HQ) manages PeopleSoft and the HR functions and operations for HQ. Each regional HR section reports locally to its regional director, enters its own data into the system, and receives functional direction from the HR Directorate. Decisions by HQ in the use of the system are not always accepted by regional offices. The HR Directorate enters data and uses the system for various functions, and the Professional Development Directorate is responsible for data entry of employee training information. Sector administrators do not enter data and have view access to certain functions since they initiate HR actions and need HR information for management decisions. Most employees enter their own leave data into PeopleSoft, which is subject to approval by their supervisors.

The system is supported by the PeopleSoft Team, a section in the HR Directorate, which provides training, and a help desk, represents the Department in interdepartmental meetings, and manages hardware and software changes. Members of the team include permanently assigned IMB staff. The HR Directorate was substantially reorganized in October 2001 and staff supporting PeopleSoft were reduced. At that time a Data Integrity Unit was created in the HR Directorate with the intent to supplement data integrity efforts by all HR staff.

1.2 Purpose and Scope

This audit reviewed and assessed the reliability and integrity of data processed and stored in the PeopleSoft system. The audit also examined:

- the effectiveness of the management and accountability framework in place for the management of HR information at HQ and in the regions;
- the adequacy of controls in place to ensure the accuracy and integrity of information;
- the completeness, reliability, timeliness, and utility of information produced for decision-making and reporting purposes;
- the appropriateness of linkages with HQ and regional PeopleSoft users;
- the extent to which users understand and use the system effectively.

The audit included examination of the activities relating to the management and use of PeopleSoft at HQ and in the regional offices.

1.3 Audit Methodology

The methodology employed in this audit consisted of:

- interviews with HR staff at HQ, including those supporting and using PeopleSoft;
- interviews with the Professional Development Directorate staff;
- visits to the regional offices of Quebec, Ontario (Toronto), and Edmonton;
- telephone interviews with staff in the Atlantic regional office;

- interviews with a sample of section administrators and business managers at HQ and regional offices;
- interviews with the IMB staff assigned to HR to support PeopleSoft;
- interviews with staff using PeopleSoft information to prepare reports on the use of time and costs of departmental legal staff;
- a review of systems, records, and various documents, including those received from Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) and the Treasury Board Secretariat (TBS) related to the matching of PeopleSoft data to data contained in other government systems.

Audit fieldwork was conducted between May 2002 and August 2002.

2. MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

2.1 Accountability

One essential factor needed to maintain good quality data is the appointment of clearly defined and accountable data owners. However, we found that there are no well defined data owners. Many HR staff in HQ and the regions can enter data, yet they only use a portion of it. The rest is used by others. Data corrections are often made by staff other than those who did the inputting.

We reviewed a sample of work descriptions of HR staff and sector administrators and found that they do not mention nor appropriately reflect responsibilities for PeopleSoft data. HR directors said that they are definitely responsible for PeopleSoft data but do not measure the quality of the data or take corrective action. We were told that last year in HQ, staff in HR Operations (a division of the HR Directorate) had individual objectives to improve data in PeopleSoft, but we found that definitions of quantifiable objectives or priorities were not created. This year, data integrity is not a formal objective for individual HR staff.

Managers are responsible for monitoring the quality of leave data entered by staff, but there are few or inappropriately written procedures in place to assist managers to use PeopleSoft to fulfill this responsibility. Also, managers are unaware of the procedures. We noted several areas requiring improved controls.

- Reports on leave balances for easy review by managers are not being produced.
- About 300 supervisors have the authority to approve leave for any employee. In our opinion, only direct and back-up supervisors should be authorized to approve leave for those employees under their supervision. The PeopleSoft Team told us that the system notifies the regular supervisor when another supervisor has approved a leave, but the supervisors we interviewed did not mention this and they did not understand this process. Some sections have a person taking attendance and checking to ensure that the leave request was entered in PeopleSoft, while other sections do not perform these verifications.

- In some cases the pay advisor is authorized to make leave entries and if there is an error the only control is the employee reporting it. We surmise that employees are likely to report errors against them but there is no certainty that they report errors in their favour.
- Supervisors can only see the current leave applications as s/he approves them. They told us they would like to see the leave history, which is only available in a different screen not known to the supervisors we interviewed.

The PeopleSoft system does not offer a screen for employees to regularly confirm their leave balances. Also, employees are not regularly confirming the accuracy of their personal information (accessible by the personal applet). We were informed that at year end employees are asked to report any leave errors to their respective compensation advisor so that adjustments can be made appropriately. However, this process was not mentioned by staff we interviewed and is not as reliable as online certification.

In HQ, sector administrators do not view PeopleSoft as their system, do not feel responsible for PeopleSoft data, and may not report PeopleSoft data errors if they are very busy. Yet, the accuracy of PeopleSoft is a corporate responsibility as the information is valuable for corporate HR management and financial planning. (Note that HR demographic projections provide data for financial planning.)

Recommendations and Management Response

1. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate revise employee work descriptions to define data owners and hold staff accountable for data errors in performance reviews, and that the importance of defining data owners is relayed to regional HR directors. Defining quantifiable objectives for data responsibilities for affected employees should be considered.**

   It is recognized that employee objectives regarding the PeopleSoft HRMS must be clearly established, therefore the Director General as well as the Directors of the HR Directorate have established in the NCR quantifiable data integrity objectives relating to the ongoing accountability for the PeopleSoft HRMS. These objectives will be clearly stated in the HR employee's yearly performance review for the 2003-2004 process and ongoing.

   It is also recognized that the Director General of HR must ensure the establishment of the PeopleSoft data integrity objectives for regional staff given that the HRMS is a corporate application. As such, the DG, HR will write to all regional HR Directors referencing this requirement for the upcoming performance cycle and to seek their input into the development of monitoring and auditing reports for assessment purposes. A communication will also be sent from the DG, HR to the Regional Senior General Counsels given the need to ensure that accountability for data integrity forms part of the performance agreements for all regional HR directors.

2. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) Procedures are put in place on how supervisors are to verify leave data.

Leave Self Service procedures have been clearly established for all areas on the e-application including the verification of employee leave data by supervisors. These Leave Self Service procedures are available online and in hard copy.

The Director General, HR Directorate will ensure the re-communication of the availability of these procedures to all Justice Leave Self Service employees.

b) Only direct and back-up supervisors are authorized to approve leave for each employee.

With reference to those that have authority to approve leave, the PeopleSoft system draws the information from the "reports to" field within the Manage Positions module. However, given that there are numerous actings and assignments situations within the department and that there is a time delay in getting this information into the system, the HR Systems group were asked to override this and allow the employee to change the manager so that there was no impact on leave authorizations and approvals; hence the employees can select from an extensive listing of managers. Therefore, the issue relates to the need for the information to be maintained correctly in the PeopleSoft system and on a timely basis so that this situation does not occur.

c) Supervisors are trained in how to check when leave for their staff is approved by another supervisor and in how to access leave history.

Leave Self Service procedures for the supervisor review of employee leave history are available online and in hard copy within the Leave Self Service application.

It is agreed that re-communication of these Leave Self Service procedures will be actioned by HR Systems.

d) **Communication related to the certification of leave balances and the accuracy of personal information occur on a regular basis.**

Prior to the implementation of the Leave Self Service, all employees received a hard copy statement at year-end for their review and approval. However, with the leave self service, it was confirmed by Treasury Board that there is no longer a requirement to provide the hard copy of the leave statement, as the employee can review their leave balances and transactions as needed. At year end, the leave system is shut down for a period of two weeks and all employees are advised that the leave year end process is underway and that they are to report any errors in relation to their leave utilization to their respective compensation advisor so that adjustments can be made as appropriate. This is currently done through an InfoPersonnel, which is distributed through JustInfo.

The DG Human Resources will ensure that communication related to the leave year-end process as well as the importance of the accuracy of personal information is communicated to departmental employees on a regular basis.

3. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate explore ways to ensure that all sector administrators are reporting errors to the HR Directorate for correction.**

During the last year, the Director General, HR has implemented a comprehensive data integrity initiative and has dedicated resources to this initiative. These resources have and continue to work closely with the HR employees, sector administrators, business managers and the HR Systems team to review all data relevant to the different regions, portfolios and branches in order to ensure that information is correct including organizational structure and reporting relationships given the impact on leave (see rec. 2-b). As a result of these meetings, Psoft data is very accurate and up-to-date.

The focus now will be placed on implementing ongoing auditing and monitoring functionality and reporting and working in collaboration with HR Directors both in the NCR and regions to agree on a process and timeframes for this ongoing requirement. In addition, as part of the ongoing process, there will be regular communication and a verification process implemented with clients (i.e. business managers) to ensure that HR staff is maintaining the data in a timely and accurate manner.

2.2 Planning

The HR Directorate had no strategic and yearly plans for the management of PeopleSoft. This report reviews a number of key areas (e.g. training, eliminating duplicate data, data entry processes and activities) in which more planning is required.

The only new HR initiative at HQ was for staff of the newly established Data Integrity Unit to meet with sector administrators to correct basic PeopleSoft data. The preparation of further plans was awaiting the completion of this audit report. Recommendations throughout this report outline the areas that should be addressed through strategic and yearly plans.

A systems interface between PeopleSoft and the Online Pay System is in development and its testing is scheduled for 2003. This will provide single data entry for several data elements, elements that are now more accurate on the Online Pay System. This will result in a significant improvement for a portion of the PeopleSoft data. This is further explained in the section "System Interfaces."

Regional offices also have limited plans to improve data. One regional office we visited was matching PeopleSoft data to the information on the Pay Cards. Another one intended a similar exercise. A third one was awaiting training before improving data. It is our opinion that these are good verification exercises, but more needs to be done.

Recommendations and Management Response

4. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that plans are prepared for improving the accuracy of the PeopleSoft information, and the importance of preparing PeopleSoft plans is relayed to regional HR directors.**

   As stated above, the Director General, HR Directorate has implemented, during the last year, a PeopleSoft data integrity initiative. This data integrity initiative, which was launched prior to the commencement of this audit, will continue the audit & monitoring of the PeopleSoft information.

   As well, regular communiqués and teleconference meetings are held with the regional HR directors keeping them informed of the ongoing plans of the HR Systems team.

2.3 Training and Support

Training

Although the HR Directorate is broadly responsible for developing and providing training on the use of PeopleSoft, we found that these responsibilities are not clearly delineated. At present, the Data Integrity Unit and the PeopleSoft team are both doing some parts of the training.

PeopleSoft is a complex system, which requires a good understanding of the concepts behind it in order to use it properly. However, the system is not well understood by most users and staff lack awareness of the impact of errors. Lack of understanding results in data errors in the system. For example, coding errors for employee exclusion status (excluded employees do not belong to unions) and official languages status have an impact on pay. The complexity of the system can make it difficult for some employees to learn how to use it.

Training in system use is given but PeopleSoft screens are not provided in the same order as the logical order of paperwork. We found that the available training is insufficient for the regional offices and administrators. There are no handouts for trained staff to help them remember what they learned. New employees are usually trained by colleagues and, therefore, receive limited training. Although the training by the PeopleSoft Team is good, there is no refresher training. At HQ, training is available to HR staff several times a year; there are formal sessions and one-on-one training. Some staff received very short training (fifteen minutes to two hours). We noted that many users in HQ are not taking advantage of available training. On the other hand, there is no requirement for users to have formal training before using PeopleSoft as there is for the Integrated Financial Management System.

Some training is unavailable. One region was to start doing its own data entry for employee training (PeopleSoft provides a function to record and report on any training received by employees) but training on how to enter the data was unavailable. Some sector administrators (some spend 75 percent of their time on HR duties) had received only two hours of PeopleSoft training even though more training is generally required. Employees and managers often do not know how to amend leave applications and require training on this function.

Three out of five regions each had five days training for multiple staff during the last year. Training is not always timely, especially for the regional offices. PeopleSoft trainers only visit the regional offices once a year. If a region decides to begin using PeopleSoft for a specific function (such as the previous example of inputting employee training information), this decision may not correspond with the yearly visit by HQ trainers. As well, the availability of training for new or transferred employees is not well serviced by yearly visits as employees may not receive training soon enough to assist them, or may receive training well before they are prepared to take on specific data entry duties. Advanced training techniques such as automated tutorials, teleconferencing, or video-conferencing for the regions have not been tried. We will discuss regional training requirements further in the section “Special Regional Requirements.”

In general, there has been a high staff turnover in the Department of Justice and this affects data integrity because it takes a few months for new staff to learn the system. At HQ, some HR employees left and came back several months later and had forgotten how to use PeopleSoft. Training new departmental staff in the leave system module when they are first hired is not useful because they usually only look at the module when they are ready to take leave, which could be many months later. Some training was given when the system was first implemented, but initially data output was poor and the system was not used—staff forgot what they had learned.

The administration of effective training requires information on training already given. Some information on PeopleSoft training history was prepared in answer to our request, but there is no regular or systematic record keeping on PeopleSoft training that has been given across the Department, such as courses scheduled, courses cancelled, and course attendance. Training should be improved and supplemented with automatic tutorials and proactive tips addressing difficulties being regularly encountered. Better references and a more intuitive system will decrease the need for in-person training. Self-service modules require better communication on how users are expected to learn them.

The system was implemented in 1996 and users are not yet sufficiently trained. Training requires a new strategy and its planning should determine the resources required.

Recommendations and Management Response

5. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

- **a) responsibilities for PeopleSoft training are reviewed and clearly assigned;**
- **b) training includes a useful overview of PeopleSoft for all those trained, that handouts are given for employees to follow the training sessions, and that staff are made aware of the training available (follow-up and one-on-one);**
- **c) increased training is given to the sector administrators to allow them to use PeopleSoft to carry out their functions;**

d) as training becomes available users are required to take it before they are given access to the system;

e) training is given in data entry of employee training data and that it be provided shortly before the regional offices begin doing entry of this information;

f) alternative training methods, such as issuing tips by e-mail, are considered;

g) advanced training techniques are considered;

h) statistics on training offered and given are regularly and systematically prepared and analyzed;

i) a strategy and plans are prepared and implemented for training;

j) training aids for self-service modules are monitored and improved as required. Communications and PeopleSoft itself should also be improved as required.

Since this audit, the HR Systems Team has initiated a completed review of training and has commenced work on the development of a Training Strategy referenced in the audit report and will be shared with all HR Directors to seek their support and commitment. It is recognized that a different approach for training of regional staff is required. As such, the training strategy will include the use of alternative training methods such as web based learning, online tutorials, etc. However, these new training approaches will require funding and as such, will be subject to securing funding as appropriate which may be difficult in the current departmental fiscal situation.

In addition, a new procedure has been implemented in the NCR whereby access to the PeopleSoft system is not provided until the HR user has been fully trained. The training strategy will be looking to the identification of power users in the regions who in turn would ensure that appropriate training is provided in-house or through the PeopleSoft team for new staff.

We agree with all of the above recommendations however the implementation of these training recommendations will be subject to the availability of the appropriate resources.

The DG, Human Resources will also seek managerial support for training and the appropriate time be given to staff to attend new and refresher training sessions.

As the HRD is now looking at “web casting” technology which will be used for the first time for the pay interface demo with the regions in March 2003. An assessment on its effectiveness will be undertaken and if appropriate, again subject to funding, considered for broader use in the future.

Help Desk

The PeopleSoft Help Desk provides good and prompt service. A few HR clients are unaware of the PeopleSoft Help Desk services or simply do not consult it. Also, HR clients are unsure of the range of services provided by the Help Desk and unsure where to send system change requests. It should be noted that IMB has a separate Help Desk for other systems and IT services.

Recommendations are made in the section “Communications.”

Onsite Support

Onsite support is good at HQ. The Data Integrity Unit is collocated with HR users and its staff are able to visit sector administrators experiencing problems. Data Integrity Unit staff function as “power users” who correct errors, prepare organization charts, provide advice, and give one-on-one training to staff on how to use the system. The full activities of the unit are discussed in more detail in the section “Data Integrity Activities.” Onsite support for regional offices is discussed in the section “Special Regional Requirements.”

2.4 Communications

Most users, in particular the regional offices and sector administrators, do not feel informed and consulted about the changes to PeopleSoft. Many are not receiving notices. Very few PeopleSoft-related notices have been sent by e-mail since October 2000. These went to a distribution list and not to all users. Notices were only about upgrades and not about plans and issues. The notices were not intended to seek input on plans and priorities. One notice did not explain what was fixed by an upgrade. However, each notice gave a phone number for inquiries. There have been no e-mails sent out with tips explaining how to do difficult tasks.

There was better awareness of HR staff of PeopleSoft status and issues when there was a departmental PeopleSoft Working Group that had regular teleconferences. The Working Group stopped meeting in 2001 and the last Working Group minutes were sent to HR staff (minutes were not intended for sector administrators) in May 2001. Regional representatives did not attend all Working Group meetings and those who attended did not necessarily inform other users of what was discussed.

There is no PeopleSoft Intranet site to provide a point of reference for all users. Such a site would provide easy access to manuals, plans, tips, and other notices. One regional HR director mentioned that she would like access to the status of technical problems to be aware of problems found by other users. This could be included in the PeopleSoft Intranet site as could a function for collection of user suggestions.

Users mentioned that the contacts at HQ for PeopleSoft problems are unclear. Now there are multiple points of contact with the Help Desk, service for ad hoc reporting requests, Data Integrity Unit, and others. Sector administrators at HQ said they did not always know who to phone for HR questions.

Recommendations and Management Response

6. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) A PeopleSoft Intranet site is implemented including, but not limited to, such information as:

- **plans,**
- **contacts,**
- **tips,**
- **manuals,**
- **a list of problems found and resolution status,**
- **frequently asked questions,**
- **a list of change/enhancement requests and status,**
- **a function for collecting user suggestions.**

Since this audit, the HR Systems Team has been actively working with the Strategic Initiatives Unit on the creation of a HR Systems intranet site within the HR & You. Content is now being defined but will include and not limited to, procedures, the current and upcoming plans, the PeopleSoft Helpline contact (email & telephone number), tips, frequently asked questions, etc. The date for the launch of this website will be communicated to all regions once known.

b) A communications strategy is developed and implemented targeting the different audiences such as daily users, administrative officers, and others.

It is correct that there has been infrequent communications related to the HR System. This is a recognized shortfall however to a large extent is due to the limited resources within the PeopleSoft Team given the realignment of functions which took place in the Fall of 2001 and which resulted in a reduction of the number of staff dedicated to the Psoft function. Several HR System Communiques have been sent to the different audiences over the past few months and more of a focus is being placed on ensuring that the subject area experts or HR clients (corporate) communicate new functionality and reporting requirements to all HR staff (e.g. labour relations module). The HR Systems group prepares communiques when changes have been made to the system such as changes emanating from hot line requests, the addition or enhancement of on-line reports, etc. However, focus over the course of the next few months will be on the development of a communications strategy which will include the creation of a website for easy access to all HR System information.

7. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that all upgrade notices include an explanation of what is being changed and the impact on users.

It has been the standard procedure for the HR Systems team to communicate all system upgrade or enhancements to the system to all the appropriate target audiences. However given this recommendation HR systems will re-look at its communication approach to ensure that communications are clear and targeted to the different audiences.

2.5 Procedures and Manuals

We found that there are insufficient or inappropriate written procedures for use of PeopleSoft. Some staff have prepared notes or screen printouts with handwritten notes for their own use. Also, there are no procedures on how to control data quality as part of regular data entry. These procedures are necessary as a basic reference and to decrease the amount of training required. There is regular staff turnover and new staff need access to written references. We found that staff who do not know how to complete a particular PeopleSoft function, and who do not phone the Help Desk, discuss how to use the system with colleagues and take a chance that the data is correctly entered.

Manuals that explain how the computer system works were developed by the PeopleSoft supplier but these are not tailored to the needs of the Department, are out of date by two software versions and do not include the customized changes made by the Department. These manuals are not used by the staff we interviewed and do not help them to understand and make effective use of the system. The one exception is that documentation for input of leave data exists in the form of a fairly good manual available in printed form and online from the Help menu in the PeopleSoft leave applet. We found that some staff were unaware of the Leave Manual and that it could be viewed online.

Users are unaware of all reports currently available from PeopleSoft. A report catalogue exists in printed form but it needs improvement. Those we interviewed did not have it or did not use it.

Our interviews and assessment of the Online Help indicated that it is too technical and not used (except for input of leave data). For example, there is no contextual help (help that automatically displays explanations about the screen being used). We are of the view that improving the content and functions of Online Help could increase and improve use of the system.

The responsibility for preparing written procedures is unclear. The PeopleSoft Team intended to prepare handouts for use in training sessions but there was no target date for completing this task. In the last year, the Data Integrity Unit prepared five procedure documents dealing with specific tasks, but the staff we interviewed had not seen these procedures. A coordinated approach is required for the preparation of procedures.

Recommendations and Management Response

8. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) the responsibility for developing procedures is clarified;
b) written procedures matching the logical order of paperwork to the data entry to PeopleSoft are prepared, which include procedural tasks on how to control data quality as part of regular data entry;
c) manuals explaining how the PeopleSoft computer system works are prepared and made available to users, possibly in the recommended Intranet site;
d) the report catalogue is updated and includes a list of existing reports, samples, and guidance on how they can be obtained be prepared and made available to users, possibly on the recommended Intranet site;
e) the PeopleSoft Online Help function is reviewed and revised to improve its functionality and use.

We agree with the above recommendations and since this audit, the HR Systems team has amalgamated all procedures regarding HR process in a central location on the HRD common network shared drive. These procedures are identified by discipline and include the specific related HR processes pertinent to the respective discipline. These procedures will be communicated to all HR staff in the short term and will eventually form part of the new HR systems website for easy reference.

Also, the HR Systems team are researching further tools for the dissemination of procedures such as online tutorials, online help, online manuals, etc. in particular with the implementation of the new PeopleSoft GOC HRMS version 8.

Recommendation 6 should assist in making users aware of existing PeopleSoft references.

2.6 Access Control

There are different access rights for different types of users. Access is segregated by system function and type of access such as data entry, corrections data entry, and view only. Currently, about 4,500 departmental staff have access to leave self-service and the personal applet. About 400 users (HR staff, sector administrators, and PeopleSoft administrators) have access to various other functions of PeopleSoft including a different and more complete access to leave functions.

There are some controls to grant access to new users. Supervisors complete written requests (for their staff) or make requests by phone to the access administrator on the PeopleSoft Team. However, there is no standardized form for supervisors to specify the type of access required. The access administrator analyzes the type of work the person is likely to perform and decides what access to grant.

It is our opinion that too many staff have access to make changes to PeopleSoft data. HR staff in any location can enter and change data for other locations. While we did not find this to be a current concern, for reasons of security such access should be controlled. It might be useful for HR staff to have view access to information in other locations, but there is no need for all to have data entry rights. Only HQ staff working with exclusions should have data entry access to special exclusions (other than for lawyers), but PeopleSoft allows other HR staff to enter or change special exclusion codes. On the other hand some good restrictions are in place. Data entry access to pay and related information is restricted to pay advisors. Data entry and view access to performance review and employee assessment (PREA) data, employment equity, and conflict of interest data are restricted to a few HR staff members. At HQ only the Data Integrity Unit can correct certain HQ errors. PeopleSoft Team members have access to change all data, except their own personal data.

There is no effective method to find out which employees no longer need access. The access administrator is not usually told when staff depart or change jobs. Also, access accounts are not regularly reviewed nor are rights changed or inactive users deleted. No report is produced to identify inactive accounts. In addition, there are no other compensatory controls, such as yearly certification by users or managers, for access rights. In a quick review we found several employees with access whose access rights should be removed, including one regular employee having the full rights reserved for the PeopleSoft Team.

Access rights are managed by using access profiles. There are about 34 of these profiles. Users are assigned to one or more profiles. The access profiles assigned to users have evolved over several years and need reviewing since they are not logically organized, named, and are not described.

A limited audit trail (system tracking of user activity) exists but not all key users are aware of its capabilities. The PeopleSoft Team and key users need to know what audit trail is available for them to enquire about staff activity in PeopleSoft.

We found that some staff need more access but do not ask for it. Regional offices told us that more staff need view access to employment equity information to answer queries from managers. Now, only one person has the access in each regional office. However, most HR staff in all locations have access to employment equity paper records. Sector administrators indicated the need for more access to such data as the status of staffing actions.

Recommendations and Management Response

9. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

- **a) access to PeopleSoft is granted based on written requests from supervisors;**
- **b) an electronic access request form is created for supervisors to use;**
- **c) access is limited so that staff cannot enter data or make changes for organizations or functions that they are not responsible for;**
- **d) access to PeopleSoft is regularly reviewed so that access rights are removed or revised for staff who depart or who transfer;**
- **e) access profiles are revised;**
- **f) key HR staff are identified and informed of audit trail analysis capabilities;**
- **g) a notice is sent to PeopleSoft users to make them aware that they can request more access if justified and authorized;**

h) a procedure is prepared and issued outlining responsibilities and tasks to keep the PeopleSoft accounts and their access rights up to date.

We agree with the above recommendations and since this audit, the HR Systems team has initiated a complete PeopleSoft security review including the review of access approval processes, the review of existing security access profiles, etc. The results of this review as well as new procedures related to security administration will be finalized and communicated in the near future.

3. PEOPLESOFT USE IN THE DEPARTMENT

There is a strong link between the quality of the data and the degree of use of PeopleSoft as a reference for queries and for reports. PeopleSoft is not always used as the primary source of HR data. The under-use of PeopleSoft reduces the incentive to keep data accurate.

Apart from the use of PeopleSoft to support daily human resource activities the system is required for strategic planning. The rapid increase in departmental staff requires an increased focus on human resources planning and demographic information for planning and forecasting purposes. This information is critical to decision making and it therefore needs to be accurate.

3.1 Use of PeopleSoft Functions

In general, we found that PeopleSoft is under-used. Many users treat the system as their secondary reference, and as a result, the quality and integrity of PeopleSoft data suffers. The following details our findings about departmental use of PeopleSoft functions.

- At HQ, all functions are used by HR: classification, recruitment (staffing), linguistic status, exclusion status, designations, personal, and pay information.
- Regional offices do not use PeopleSoft's recruitment function. This function is used to control and record the hiring process. The regions prefer to rely on paper or other records. Regional offices need more training on this function as it is successfully used at HQ. A departmental policy is required for the regions to use PeopleSoft to provide required data. PeopleSoft improvements recommended in this report and proper support will be required to ensure effective and efficient use of the system. since most regional users are pleased with their current manner of capturing recruitment information. They claim that it takes a lot work to enter data and that they are short of staff. A benefit that could be used to promote this change would be that the PeopleSoft recruitment function will enable quicker responses to questions, a task which currently requires a more time-consuming search of paper files. Also, the lack of recruitment data for the whole Department has an impact on corporate reporting.

- The leave applet is used by most staff to do their own data entry for leave requests. Staff not using the leave applet submit leave data on paper forms, which is entered by HR staff. Also, HR staff must enter leave for functions not handled by the leave applet such as secondments, leave without pay, and interchange Canada (private industry staff exchange). At present, 12 departmental legal service units are not connected to the departmental local area network (LAN) and they cannot use leave online. Connection to the departmental legal service units requires the installation of new IT infrastructure services which is in progress.
- At HQ, the personal applet is little known and used. Neither the regional offices nor the legal service units use it. The applet allows employees to update their own personal information such as home address and telephone number. Otherwise, HR pay advisors update address and phone numbers of employees when asked.
- Sector administrators and regional offices make little use of PeopleSoft as a primary source. Rather, they use it as a second reference, after consulting their own records (see the section “Systems with Duplicate Data”).
- The PeopleSoft Web Charter is a separate program acquired by the Department. Overnight, PeopleSoft data is extracted to separate files used by Web Charter. Web Charter is complex to use and its organization charts are inaccurate if the reporting relationships and other data appearing in PeopleSoft are incorrect. The overnight update causes delays. Sector administrators have been using Web Charter since the summer of 2002 when the information was corrected by the Data Integrity Unit. They doubt that the information will be kept accurate (see the section “Data Integrity Unit”). Regional offices use another third party software to produce charts rather than PeopleSoft Web Charter.
- Data entry for employee training is centralized. Employees or administrators complete a form that they send to the Professional Development Directorate at HQ for data entry. The training information is rarely used because it is late and incomplete. The costs contained in the form are estimates. Actual costs are known only after the course has been taken and these actual costs are not entered into PeopleSoft. There is no process to ensure that forms are sent and received. A few sectors do not send any training forms. Only the information on the form is entered; any missing information is not requested. If the course taken by the employees does not have a course number, then the course does not show on reports. The Edmonton regional office has requested to do its own data entry for employee training. Sector and section administrators need accurate employee training data to advise their managers on how the corporate target of five days training per employee per year is being met.

Discussion and recommendations contributing to better use of ad hoc reports are made in the section “Reporting and Management Information.”

Recommendations and Management Response

10. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) **A strategy is developed and implemented so that PeopleSoft is used as a primary reference so that there is more incentive to maintain accurate data. This should include the issuing of a policy requiring that PeopleSoft be used for human resources data and that other systems and records be phased out.**

   It is agreed that Corporate HR policy will communicate the importance of maintaining the relevant modules to respond to both departmental and central agency reporting requirements and in order to effectively assess policy application, effectiveness, etc. As such, more emphasis will be placed on communication. A memorandum will be sent to the regional HR directors as well as Regional Senior General Counsels on the impacts of certain modules not being utilized or maintained and to enlist their support.

b) **PeopleSoft Web Charter is enhanced so that it can use PeopleSoft data online (avoiding the overnight delay) to increase Web Charter's use. Training is required for the regional offices to use Web Charter.**

   HR Web Charter is a third party application developed by the company HRSoft and not PeopleSoft. HR Web Charter derives the information for the organizational information contained in the Manage Positions module and employee info from Administer Workforce module. The product was enhanced over the past year to meet user requirements. It is now web-based and accessible to all and the information is "refreshed" on a nightly basis as per product specifications. Should information need to be refreshed immediately, the HR staff member can advise the HR Systems Unit through the hot line service and it will be actioned immediately. This service will be communicated again to all regional staff however formed part of a recent communiqué related to HR Web Charter.

   Since this audit, as part of the regional visits by the Data Integrity unit and the need for sign off from each area on the integrity of the data, organizational charts are produced using Web Charter and training or refresher training as well as simplified procedures provided to regional staff. Unfortunately not all regions are using Web Charter and this will be the subject of a future communication to the regions.

c) **The Human Resources Directorate works in partnership with the Professional Development Directorate to produce accurate training reports.**

The Administer Training module is outside the mandate of the Human Resources Directorate. The HRD will however communicate the results of this audit to the Professional Development Directorate so that necessary follow-up can be undertaken.

3.2 System Interfaces

No other systems provide electronic data to automatically update PeopleSoft, but PeopleSoft provides information to other systems and, in some cases, HR receives error reports on PeopleSoft data. The section "Other Measures to Ensure Data Accuracy" provides recommendations resulting from system interface issues.

As discussed in the section "Planning," there are plans for implementing a computer interface between the Online Pay System and PeopleSoft. Now, there is duplicate data entry of the same information in both systems and a manual pay card is updated and used as a key reference. After the two systems interface, it is expected that there will be single data entry for at least:

- notes of staff movements,
- leave without pay,
- maternity,
- acting appointments,
- promotions,
- status changes,
- notes on secondment,
- salary,
- collator codes,
- hours of work,
- date of birth,
- name,
- address,
- management date,
- pension number,
- effective date of continuous service.

This should reduce errors in these data elements.

Monthly, data is provided to PWGSC where a program is run to validate certain data fields and an error report is returned to the HR Directorate. There may be software problems with the data matching, as discussed in the section "Other Measures to Ensure Data Accuracy."

The Department's Information Services Directorate produces reports from the Caseview and Time Keeping systems. For these reports they need to obtain information from PeopleSoft such as employee group and level, personal record identifiers (PRI), full employee names, collator codes, and responsibility centre codes (this information is not recorded by the Caseview or Time Keeping systems). While matching names to the PeopleSoft data, errors or missing data are found in PeopleSoft and reported to HR.

There is a semi-annual TBS self-identification reconciliation process which applies to all government departments and allows each department to ensure that its self-identification information is accurate. In particular, it relates to deployments, transfers, and promotions through competitive processes where the successful candidate is from another government department. As part of this process, HQ sends employment equity data to TBS twice a year. TBS maintains its own database and matches its data to that submitted by the Department. Discrepancy reports are received by HR, investigated and, where necessary, corrections made (not all discrepancies are data errors).

Changes to excluded union positions and incumbents are entered by HR staff in both PeopleSoft and the Position Exclusion System Department Module (PESDM). The Department e-mails monthly updates of the PESDM database to TBS and TBS sends back updates for the Department's database. Questions and possible errors are handled by phone between TBS and the responsible person in HR at HQ.

3.3 Systems with Duplicate Data

Considerable amounts of data are kept on local records, duplicating information in PeopleSoft. This reduces motivation to maintain accurate PeopleSoft data. One HR section at HQ, all regional office HR sections, and all HQ clients keep separate systems (Excel, Microsoft Access, Microsoft Word, paper files). We were told that the main reason why duplicate records are kept is the lack of confidence that PeopleSoft data is correct and up-to-date.

The following are examples of duplicate HR information we found at HQ.

- There is duplicate data entry into Online Pay and PeopleSoft, but this issue may be resolved. See the section on "Planning." As well, paper pay cards are used to record pay information, which is also on the Online Pay System and in PeopleSoft.
- One section used PeopleSoft, spreadsheets, and Microsoft (MS) Word to track staffing and classification actions.

- Excel is used for tracking special exclusion actions that need approval. A manual log is used to control data entry to PeopleSoft, paper files, and PESDM. In addition to the PeopleSoft records, other records of excluded positions and changes of incumbents are kept.

PeopleSoft does not track grievances. Therefore, grievances (all four levels) were tracked using MS Word and Excel. The Department provides grievance information to TBS. It should be noted that TBS has a system for grievances and that the Department can request information from it.

Excel is used to record the National Occupation Classification (NOC) codes. Departmental data is provided to TBS.

The following are examples of duplicate information we found at regional offices and with HR clients at HQ.

- Regional offices and HR clients at HQ use third party software to create organization charts.
- MS Word is used to maintain office telephone lists.
- MS Word is used to maintain home address and telephone lists.
- Spreadsheets are used to track ongoing staffing actions.
- Spreadsheets are used to track security upgrades in progress and expiry dates of security clearances (the latter data element is unavailable in PeopleSoft).
- The Salary Management System (SMS) duplicates some PeopleSoft information and SMS reports are used for salary cost forecasting (PeopleSoft cannot provide forecasting functions or corresponding reports) and to reconcile to the Integrated Financial Management System.
- A spreadsheet is used to record the staff complement at one regional office.
- In one region, paper records are kept for employees' linguistic profiles and positions.
- A leave calendar of employees' summer vacations are tracked in MS Word.
- PREAs completion and ratings are tracked using spreadsheets.
- One region uses spreadsheets to list employee names and PRIs for salary reconciliation.
- Sector administrators have paper files for positions, employees, position action request forms (PARFs), employee training forms, letters of offer, PREAs, work descriptions, and resumes.

At HQ, there is some duplicate data entry into Workopolis (a Public Service Commission job advertising Internet site) and PeopleSoft. Workopolis is used for Internet Recruitment. PeopleSoft has a recruitment module but not for Internet recruitment.
HQ sector administrators and regional offices keep spreadsheets of employee training. This duplicates the Professional Development Directorate's entry of data into PeopleSoft. Besides

being more up-to-date (see the section “Use of PeopleSoft Functions”), the spreadsheets contain the actual training costs, which are not entered into PeopleSoft.

Recommendations and Management Response

11. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that measures are taken to decrease duplicate records and duplicate data entry.**

    We agree with the recommendation and measures are gradually being put in place to ensure the elimination of duplicate records and duplicate data entry. HR Corporate Policy will communicate that the PeopleSoft system is the authoritative corporate source for human resources information and that they will be seeking the support of senior management to ensure that the necessary steps are taken to eliminate standalone systems in the short term.

    The Data Integrity Team has traveled to the regional offices (with the exception of the Quebec Regional Office) and has tried to reinforce the elimination of the duplicate standalone systems by showing and explaining the capabilities of the PeopleSoft application.

12. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate discuss with the Director, Security Division the use of the PeopleSoft module to improve the process related to security clearances, thereby reducing duplication.**

    A preliminary meeting has been held with Security Services, HR Operations and the HR Systems to discuss the implementation of the PeopleSoft GOC Security module. Further discussion and meetings will be held in this regard.

Also, see Recommendation 10.a.

3.4 Reporting and Management Information

Reports generated by PeopleSoft are difficult to access and print and some are unclear. As already mentioned, a report catalogue exists, but is not widely disseminated (see Recommendation 8.d.). There are standard reports and ad hoc reports. Different standard reports require printing in various ways and this is difficult for users. Some reports have to be transferred to Excel or MS Word before they can be printed. Also, not all reports on the menu work correctly. Some cannot be accessed or printed. As well, the reports that are accessible cannot be displayed before printing them, which deters users. At present, most of the other systems used by departmental staff allow reports to be displayed before printing, in order to assess if the report is useful. In addition, some reports have the same or similar headings with different meanings. Finally, although users can generate some standard reports, there is no report generator directly available to the users to generate ad hoc reports. Users must request ad hoc reports from the PeopleSoft Team.

Regional offices have no access to all standard reports and have to request them from HQ, which causes delays. We were informed that this was due to IT infrastructure issues that were being addressed. Regional offices are not providing access to section administrators for standard reports because of concerns about data accuracy. We noted that one region started providing access to a section administrator when we were visiting it. Ad hoc reports are prepared by the PeopleSoft Team, which offers good and fast service. Unfortunately, regional office users do not know how to formulate precise requests and do not often obtain the information they seek. Sometimes regional offices receive information in a format that they do not know how to use, and they do not ask for help.

Several management reports are issued by the HR Planning and Employment Equity Section including:

- an annual departmental demographic and organization health profile report,
- reports for Central Agencies and the Deputy Minister.

These are produced by extracting data from PeopleSoft, reviewing it, correcting found errors and reformatting the reports for issue. With the current inaccuracies on PeopleSoft data, the degree of accuracy of these reports is not well established.

There are no regular reports on data status, backlogs, and errors encountered. For example, trends of the errors found by the Data Integrity Unit, employment equity data matching by TBS, and other error information is not formally documented and analyzed.

PREA information is important in that related management decisions are made based on accurate information to meet targets. The preparation of PREA reporting requires considerable work. Various people are involved and the data has to be frozen as of March 31. Information produced by PeopleSoft is manually verified to exclude secondments, retirements, and terminations. Late data entry and corrections of related PeopleSoft data have an impact on the PREA reports.

Regional offices mentioned that, in their reports, they have been unable to exclude staff data from other regions. However the Data Integrity Unit informed us that regional staff probably need training since it is possible to obtain reports by regions.

It should be noted that the Department of Justice must comply with employment equity targets provided by TBS. Departmental employees provide employment equity information (captured in PeopleSoft) based on voluntary self-identification. However, voluntary self-identification results in lower figures than the actual number of visible minorities and disabled employees. The reporting of accurate employment equity information is a concern for the whole government.

The regional offices reported that several requests for reports were not met and that, when this happens, they do not persist. The following documents some problems reported by regional offices.

- One regional office would like certain reports to include only active positions/employees.
- One regional office would like a report with details and total by type of leave. Although the report was requested, we were told that it was never received.
- Reports of term positions do not list individuals who are indeterminate but in a term position.
- Regular regional reports are required to assess the HR status such as staff retention, turnover, and progression but have not been requested.

Recommendations and Management Response

13. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) reports are easier to access, view, and print;
b) each region is able to produce all its own standard reports;
c) a degree of accuracy is estimated for management reports being issued to senior management;
d) reports on data status are produced including statistical information on backlogs and errors encountered;
e) PeopleSoft produces reports which closely meet the requirements for PREA reporting;
f) the ability of each regional office to print reports including only its data is reviewed, and that software changes are made if necessary or explanations given to the regional offices as to why such reporting is not possible.

DOJ is one of the few departments to have developed extensive reports and to have developed a Reports Library that is available to HR users, Administrators and Regional HR users and as such, has been identified as a leader in this regard and many of our reports are shared with the other cluster departments.

Of particular concern to HRD is the fact that there is no departmental guideline related to the desktop and printer configuration, which impacts significantly on the HRMS given the numerous HR reports available. The main issues surrounding reports relates to desktop and printer configurations. The HRD will request that Information Management Branch support a standardized desktop, which has been a departmental IT priority several years ago. It is our understanding that work is underway in this regard and that the department will be moving to Windows XP in the fall of 2003.

Since this audit, the HR Systems has undergone an extensive review of all reports included on the Reports Library. Reports have been reviewed to include further sorting parameters to enable user with more choice when producing the reports, redundant or duplicate reports have been removed for the Reports Library, etc.

4. PEOPLESOFT SOFTWARE

4.1 Testing of Upgrades and Data Conversion

As discussed, PeopleSoft is a large and complex system that requires time to learn. Not unexpectedly, software changes require considerable staff time for testing. The Department must wait for the interdepartmental committee to agree and approve the changes to be made to the software provided by the supplier. The Department has implemented additional changes to correct certain errors and to meet particular departmental requirements. Every time the supplier issues a new system version the Department must make its customized changes to the new version and test them.

Departmental users in HR and other sectors commented that errors are usually introduced when there are system upgrades. However, the PeopleSoft Team explained that a few errors have occurred but there were cases where decisions were made in consultation with the departmental PeopleSoft Working Group (now inactive) and not all users were aware of them. Also, some perceived system bugs can be data errors. There needs to be better communication and management of users' expectations in order to increase system acceptance and encourage users to advise the PeopleSoft Team of perceived or actual errors encountered.

Several system bugs were reported to the audit team, but it remains unclear whether many of these bugs are actually data errors. See Appendix A for examples of reported system bugs. System bugs are usually related to the testing of the software. We did not conduct an in-depth review of software testing processes, but noted that an organization and methodology for testing are in place. Recommendations in the section on "Communications" suggest that using an Intranet site to collect error descriptions and display the status of corrections should decrease users' perceptions of system bugs.

4.2 Computer Edits and Calculations

A key control for accurate data is that the computer system edits data to reduce errors on entry. Normally, a computer system performs automated edits to ensure data is entered in mandatory fields or that data meets a criteria such as matching values on a table or cross referencing to other data. PeopleSoft lacks many edits. See Appendix B for examples of the kinds of edits that PeopleSoft does and does not perform. Enhanced edits are one element to improve data accuracy but other improvements recommended in this report are also required.

The system's main calculations are done on leave data and on the points regarding the classification level—adding points and checking that they correspond to a valid position. We found that computer calculations have practically no errors.

Because PeopleSoft is a shared system, it is difficult to improve its edits. The Department has developed software to report on missing data. This will be further discussed in "Other Measures to Ensure Data Accuracy".

<u>Recommendations and Management Response</u>

14. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that efforts are undertaken to improve the validity of data by requesting system modifications to increase PeopleSoft software edits and by expanding the programs that check the validity of the data.

It is recognized that the system lacks edits, however, edits are a major customizations and as such, impact significantly on upgrades, etc. As DOJ is a member of the PeopleSoft Shared Systems Initiative, edits and customizations are limited as this would then deviate from the GOC core application. However, DOJ intends to take the lead in recommending edits for the Cluster shared systems initiative that would assist all cluster departments with their common data integrity issues and which would lead to these edits being delivered in the GOC product rather than DOJ having to maintain these edits.

5. DATA ENTRY PROCESSES

There are delays in data entry, some beyond the control of the HR Directorate. Generally, there are delays in entering classification information since its approval requires information that is not always complete or correct (such as work descriptions). Also, delays in data entry of staffing information occur because the information is incomplete or because of delayed receipt of the signed letter of offer. There are longer delays (up to six months for interdepartmental transfers) when information has to be obtained from another department. After data entry of staffing information, pay office staff enter certain data for the incumbent. Here the priority is to enter the data in the Online Pay System so that the employee gets paid. Data entry into PeopleSoft is done later and may take weeks before it is entered. One example of a delay is when one HQ directorate was reorganized—a request was sent to HR to update all the files, yet the updates took six to eight months to input and some were never done. The impact of such a delay is that PeopleSoft information is incorrect. This becomes problematic when, for example, the system automatically notifies employee supervisors of leave requests, but the information on the supervisor is incorrect.

With few exceptions there is no immediate or systematic verification of data entry by a second person or monitoring of data entry by supervisors. Errors are corrected as they are noticed. However, following the processing sequence by different employees the staffing person looks at some classification data and the pay person looks at some staffing data. Some staff mentioned that they have no time to review data, but a few employees do print reports to review the entered data. The Online Pay System data entry is usually verified by a second person, but PeopleSoft data is not. It is our opinion that data should be verified shortly after it is entered.

There are no easy tools for checking the data after it has been entered. Multiple screens are used to enter data and there are no screens or reports that allow easy verification at a glance of entered data. PeopleSoft does not provide a consolidated list of entered data for verification. Instead data can be printed in various reports. Not all data is easily printed and there are no screens of consolidated data to allow the person who entered the data to easily check their own entries. The auditors received a suggestion that a screen showing information as it is now in the pay card would be useful for checking data. We agree that some data should be consolidated in a few screens. Also, several screens do not show the PRI, which is a key reference for HR.

Some people use PeopleSoft effectively but it is a difficult system. For example, the code choices for promotion and appointment for reclassification are sometimes unclear. The process to enter retroactive dates is also difficult (we were informed that difficulties occur when the date format of PCs' operating systems is changed to other than the departmental standard). To enter an increment for an employee on leave without pay the employee has to be made active, the increment applied, and then the employee made inactive.

Staff entering data use only a fraction of the data. They therefore lack incentive to ensure data is accurate.

HR clients at HQ do not always advise HR of changes. When HR does not receive the documentation, PeopleSoft is not updated and reports and query screens are incorrect.

The staff relations officer responsible for processing and inputting employee exclusions needs to know when an incumbent changes in an excluded position. A report could be produced from PeopleSoft but instead there is now a manual process where copies of forms, which could be delayed or lost, are sent to her. Staff relations data is not in the PARF and therefore a separate process is required for staff relations actions.

There is no clear definition of data sources nor a glossary defining the many data elements and whether they are mandatory. Paper files and paper forms are not organized to correspond to data entry and the screens are not organized to correspond to the workflow. Also, there are various formats used for dates, such as year/month/day and day/month/year.

Recommendations and Management Response

15. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) Work is reorganized or revised and supervised to decrease data entry delays.

All HR staff will be made aware of the importance of maintaining data on a timely basis and that the responsibility of the maintenance of the system and data ownership form part of the employees objectives in the performance review and employee appraisal process as well as the management accords for the HR management team.

b) **The format of paper files and paper documents are reviewed and revised to be in harmony with PeopleSoft data entry.**

The HR Directors and Chiefs will ensure that the format of paper files is kept up to date and in harmony with PeopleSoft data entry. The paper documents that are used by Human resources are in most Public Service Commission and/or Treasury Board legislative documents and thus cannot be modified to reflect the PeopleSoft data entry. However, for the purposes of the Recruitment module, all letters relating to staffing actions are presently being reviewed by the HR Corporate Staffing area and will be incorporated within the PeopleSoft GC Recruitment module.

c) **Methods are implemented and consistently used for the immediate or systematic verification of entered data.**

The HR Systems and the Data Integrity Unit will implement audit reports for the verification of user data entry.

d) **When possible, PeopleSoft is modified to provide reports or screens for easy verification of entered data.**

Included in the all PeopleSoft procedures are screens (panel shots) for the ease of use for data entry as well as the identification of all mandatory fields.

e) **Managers of the sectors and sections are formally informed when HR does not receive documents.**

The Director General, Human Resources as well as the HR Directors and Chiefs will advise their respective areas to ensure that managers of the sectors and sections are formally informed when the appropriate HR documents have not been received.

f) **If feasible, PeopleSoft is modified to generate a report of incumbent changes in excluded positions for the use of the relevant staff relations officer.**

A report is presently available on the Reports Library listing the excluded positions for the use of the relevant staff relations officers. The Labour Relations Module is being implemented to ensure that relevant information is available.

g) A glossary is developed defining the data elements and indicating those which are mandatory.

Mandatory fields are highlighted and will continue to be flagged in the training material as well as procedures.

Other recommendations made in this report deal with issues in this section for which we give no recommendations here.

6. DATA INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES

6.1 Data Error Rates

The main reasons for PeopleSoft errors are late or lack of data entry, errors in data entry, and system or conversion errors.

Data elements are connected for positions and employees and the impact of an error affects the use of other data, leading users to distrust all the PeopleSoft information. Furthermore, PeopleSoft data has been perceived as being inaccurate since the system was implemented and it will take considerable improvement to dispel this perception.

Our tests and the error estimates we were given in interviews show that, generally, the basic data is good. Other current data shows a 30 percent error rate with certain exceptions, depending on the advisors/assistants entering and reviewing the data. Regional data is not as good as HQ data, as it is yet not being matched to pay cards. The error rate for historic data for positions and employees is higher than for the current PeopleSoft data. The results of our tests should not be used to predict the accuracy of all data since we did not use scientific sampling. The intent of our tests was to gain a general assessment of the accuracy of the data and a better understanding of possible measures to curtail errors.

Those who carefully check their data entry by printing reports to check the entered data estimated that their error rate was fewer than five percent.

During the 2001 labour strike errors were found in position exclusion codes, including some for important positions. Since it takes more than one year to have a union approve a position as excluded, these errors can be detrimental to the functioning of governmental essential services. Also, union fees are deducted from staff in all positions, except those which are excluded. In one case, an excluded position was incorrectly coded for two years. When the error was found, the union only returned the fees for the current year. The employee was not reimbursed for the previous year’s fees. Exclusion code errors encountered in 2001 were due in part to unclear processes and lack of training around data entry of exclusion codes.

We noted that PeopleSoft records indicate there are many vacant positions. System data shows that the Department has about 4,748 employees. Also we were informed that there are between 8,500 and 11,000 positions, which is excessive. A process is required for the regular deletion of positions no longer needed.

Recommendations and Management Response

16. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that a review is conducted of inactive positions and that those no longer needed are deleted from PeopleSoft.

A complete review of inactive and positions vacant for more than six months has been undertaken by Corporate Classification in consultation with the regions. Approximately 2000 positions were removed from the PeopleSoft application. This review will be an ongoing process for the Corporate Classification.

Recommendations made elsewhere in this report deal with issues in this section (e.g. training and procedures) for which we give no recommendations here.

6.2 Data Integrity Unit

Data integrity has been recognized as a major problem and a Data Integrity Unit was created at HQ in October 2001 and it was transferred to Corporate Policy and Planning in April 2002. An action plan was created for the unit which is being followed. The unit is intended to supplement data integrity efforts by all HR staff entering PeopleSoft data. It has made excellent progress. The unit is a temporary measure not reflected in job descriptions of its supervisor or the chief, HR Planning and Employment Equity. In our opinion, the Data Integrity Unit will be required for several years, possibly on a permanent basis, although its role may later change as data quality improves.

During the audit the unit was meeting with HQ sector administrators and correcting basic data (that is, data shown in the establishment report and organization charts). The unit also visited the regional office in Vancouver and plans to visit all regions. This is a good initiative and data is being corrected. This initiative is also providing some training, modifying certain reports to make them more useful, and improving the understanding of roles and working relationships of parties involved in data entry and information use. However, the follow-up work to maintain accurate data has not been defined and clients mentioned that errors are reappearing a few weeks after the review by the unit. A process needs to be established whereby errors found are analyzed and procedures put in place to prevent their recurrence. In addition, periodic reviews by the unit will further improve data accuracy. To manage expectations, clients need to be informed of what action will be taken to keep data accurate.

Reports were being prepared by the unit that document the result of reviews of each sector and region. As part of improving communications, these reports could be provided to the sector administrators and regional HR directors and their comments solicited. This would help avoid existing misunderstanding for actions to be taken and corrections to be made.

The functions of the two AS-3s of the unit, as described in their work descriptions, are not all being performed. Additional duties for data entry, reporting and help desk support are reducing their available time for data integrity duties. In addition, the unit intended to come up with a training methodology and have the sector administrators prepare certain reports. The latter functions overlap with the training and report preparation functions of the PeopleSoft Team. These unit positions should be able to identify causes of errors, formulate system requirements, and develop or revise procedures to avoid recurrence of data errors. Regular data entry now done by the unit should be assigned to other staff.

<u>Recommendations and Management Response</u>

17. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that the services provided by the Data Integrity Unit are available as long as needed.

The reporting structure for the data integrity unit changed in April 2002. At that time, it was transferred to Corporate Policy and Planning rather than with NCR regional operations and its mandate broadened in the later part of this past fiscal year to include regional offices. A detailed data integrity action plan was developed prior to the commencement of this audit and its implementation is nearing completion given the regional visits, etc. The focus for the next fiscal year will be on implementing ongoing audit and monitoring procedures. The data integrity unit will continue for an indefinite period as data integrity is a key priority for the Human Resources Directorate given the ever increasing focus on human resources planning and the need for good internal reporting capabilities related to demographics, to meet central agency reporting requirements, for forecasting purposes and to allow for further automation of transactional HR processes through the deployment of e-applications\solutions such as e-recruit, etc.

18. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) **The follow-up work to the initial error corrections made in visits to sectors and regions is defined, implemented, and communicated.**

   At the conclusion of the review of HR data contained in the HRMS, the data integrity unit obtains sign-off of the establishment report and where appropriate, the organizational charts (this was not done in the Ontario Regional Office as a separate software is used for org. charts which does not read from the HRMS and is maintained separately); this confirms that all changes have been actioned.

b) **The Data Integrity Unit's resulting reports from sector and regional reviews are distributed to the respective contacts in each sector or region.**

   A report on the results of each regional/portfolio visit documenting action items as well as issues is developed and shared with the business manager or regional HR director. The head of the Data Integrity Unit will ensure that all issues are discussed and resolved and the resolution communicated appropriately.

c) **The work of the AS-3 staff in the DIU is reviewed, described, and the positions are appropriately classified; that functions that overlap with the PeopleSoft Team are reduced; and that routine data entry is transferred to other staff in order to increase unit staff's technical data integrity functions.**

   The role of the Data Integrity Unit continues to evolve and as such, their work descriptions will be reviewed as deemed necessary. Overlap with the systems unit has been addressed.

See Recommendation 5.a, in the section on "Training and Support" for a recommendation on the assignment of training responsibilities.

6.3 Other Measures to Ensure Data Accuracy

This section reviews measures in place to ensure data accuracy, besides those at data entry time and by the Data Integrity Unit. Currently, measures are in place but are not enough to bring the data to acceptable accuracy levels.

No targets for data integrity, such as percentage of acceptable errors by types of data, have been established. We were told that all data is important. Regardless, targets could be used in tracking the status of data integrity and effectiveness of measures to improve data integrity; reporting on these elements should be included in the reports recommended in the section "Reporting and Management Information."

Once a year PeopleSoft's employment equity data is transferred to TBS where it is matched with TBS's data. HQ receives reports with matching differences, makes corrections for the whole Department and advises TBS of data that it is missing. Also, HR clients cannot verify the report on employment equity produced by HQ because they do not have the confidential information used to prepare the reports.

In December 2001, HQ decided to restrict its HR error correction access to the Data Integrity Unit. This new process is working well. Before, anyone with input access could correct data and in so doing often repeated the same errors. Proper data entry processes are now explained to those making errors. This provides an opportunity for the unit to notice where system or procedural changes are required.

As mentioned already, two regions have started or had plans to match PeopleSoft data to pay cards.

PWGSC produces reports from its Position Classification Information System (PCIS) system, which identify certain errors (grouped by type) in PeopleSoft data. The errors reported by PCIS relate only to the 36 data elements submitted to PWGSC, which is a portion of the total data. PCIS reports list fields with invalid or missing data. The unit is correcting six PCIS-identified error types for HQ and the regions. Some of the PCIS-identified errors are corrected by Official Languages in the HR Directorate. If an error type occurs more than 25 times, only the first 25 errors of that type are listed. A new report is issued every month, which includes a summary of the number of errors by type. The report dated August 3, 2002 showed 3,107 invalid fields and 108 blank mandatory fields. Some error types listed in the summary have no corresponding detailed listing in the first part of the report. Many errors were believed to result from a software error and there were misunderstandings on who was following up on this issue. We found that the PCIS report was not well understood. For the last 16 months nine PCIS reports were not received and there was no follow-up to obtain them.

The Department has developed software to produce data integrity reports showing some fields with missing data. The listed fields have changed over the last few months. The last report was issued in June 2002 to the regions (under 10 errors per region) and to HR at HQ (about 25 errors). This report listed missing appointment end dates, PRIs, dates of birth, incumbent, and official languages data. Corrections are made by the Data Integrity Unit for HQ and by the each regional office for its respective errors. This report is not intended to list all inaccurate data. It is unclear why this tool is not used to report errors for more fields. Also, the relationship between these reports and those of PCIS need to be analyzed and coordinated to avoid duplication.

Apart from the above noted procedures, errors may be noticed when data is used by HR and HR clients, and corrected on an ad hoc basis by the Data Integrity Unit in HQ and by staff in the regions.

Several HR sections at HQ and the regional offices correct errors but there is no coordination on error prevention measures and information on total errors.

Recommendations and Management Response

19. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that:

a) **Targets for data integrity are established.**

   As stated above the Data Integrity Unit has established a data integrity action plan including target dates for data integrity initiatives.

b) **Responsibilities for resolving issues with the PCIS report are clearly assigned and the issues addressed include that;**
   - **the PCIS report is well understood and that listed errors corrected,**
   - **missing reports are requested when not received by the expected date,**
   - **a method is developed to obtain a complete list of errors when these are more than 25.**

c) **A strategy is developed and implemented for the effective use of the data integrity reports and the PCIS Reports.**

   b) & c) A review of the PCIS is being undertaken and a strategy is being developed by Corporate Classification to introduce an ongoing monitoring process with the regions and NCR to ensure that classification data is effectively maintained and that the error rate of the PCIS transmission is drastically reduced. It is our goal to return to the 95% accuracy rate achieved in 1999, which was the highest of all government departments. Communication has commenced with PWGSC regarding the transmission process and issues related to their use of outdated technology. This is a government wide concern (in other words, it has been flagged by the cluster group departments using the Psoft application). The PCIS report is reviewed on a monthly basis as it is received and all identified errors are reviewed and actioned.

d) The Data Integrity Unit is tasked with coordinating all HQ's error correction except errors with employee training data, which is the responsibility of the Professional Development Directorate.

The correction mode access has been removed for HR advisors/assistants and it is the responsibility of the Data Integrity Unit for the correction of PeopleSoft information.

See the section "Planning" and its recommendation on using planning to improve PeopleSoft data.

7. SPECIAL REGIONAL REQUIREMENTS

PeopleSoft is a complex system intended for large organizations that can set up proper support for it. In the Department of Justice, the regional offices are independent and do not receive the same support as HQ. Support by phone or through infrequent visits from HQ support staff is insufficient. Local “power users” need to be trained in each regional office to provide support and coordinate local system use and dealings with HQ. Their duties could be similar to those of the Data Integrity Unit at HQ, and could include provision of user support.

The current training approach is not working well for the regional offices. Multiple training methods are required. The current training is infrequent and trainers are not well aware of regional HR procedures. There are users at HQ who are using the system very effectively and they could be used to visit regions and supplement formal training sessions by showing how to use the system in harmony with local procedures. In addition, training documentation should be made available so that the power users can do local training to supplement the training given by HQ.

Regions do not provide PeopleSoft access to HR clients. The only exception was Edmonton, where HR clients are beginning to appoint business managers who will require the PeopleSoft information. As we discussed earlier, greater use of the data should result in higher data quality. It is our opinion that each of the larger regional offices should provide access to PeopleSoft to its HR clients. HR clients will need training, which could be given by HQ and supplemented with training given by the local power users; such initiatives will require adequate training material.

Recommendations and Management Response

20. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate together with the HR regional directors:

a) Ensure that regional "power users" are trained and appointed for PeopleSoft.

The DG, HR will be communicating with the regional HR directors and requesting the identification of power users. It is our intent to implement as part of our enhanced training strategy, a train the trainer approach for the PeopleSoft application, which would be one of the responsibilities of the power users. This of course would require regional buy in and support.

b) Organize visits by HQ users who are making effective use of PeopleSoft to assist the regional offices.

Since this audit, regional visits have been organized and actioned by the Data Integrity Unit. Ongoing visits to the regional office will continue by the HR Systems team as well as the Data Integrity Unit.

21. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that training assistance (such as training packages) is made available for regional offices to do local training.

Included in the HR System training strategy and plan for the upcoming PeopleSoft version 8 will be the availability of web based learning tools such as classroom procedures, manuals, online help, etc. These will be made available to the regional power users.

In the interim, all current procedures have been amalgamated in one central area and will be made available on the regional network servers.

8. CONCLUSION—POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF PEOPLESOFT

PeopleSoft can be a very valuable tool for corporate and HR management. At present the system is under-used. The main benefits have been derived from the leave module, which works well and is accurate.

Once the data is improved, users can expect to benefit from:

- easy access to comparative information—for example, when planning for a new position or reclassifying an existing one, staff can look at classification information in order to be in line with the rest of the Department;
- easy access to information—PeopleSoft tracks position and employment history and has data unavailable in other systems. This is easier than viewing paper files and records;
- an integrated system with information on most HR functions;
- information on excluded positions such us the number of employees by sector who are in legal strike position;
- solid corporate management information for the management of human resources;
- data is entered by all departmental staff, using the self-service function, time of HR staff can be redirected to assist clients and speed up other processes.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

1. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate revise employee work descriptions to define data owners and hold staff accountable for data errors in performance reviews, and that the importance of defining data owners is relayed to regional HR directors. Defining quantifiable objectives for data responsibilities for affected employees should be considered..10**

   It is recognized that employee objectives regarding the PeopleSoft HRMS must be clearly established, therefore the Director General as well as the Directors of the HR Directorate have established in the NCR quantifiable data integrity objectives relating to the ongoing accountability for the PeopleSoft HRMS. These objectives will be clearly stated in the HR employee's yearly performance review for the 2003-2004 process and ongoing.

   It is also recognized that the Director General of HR must ensure the establishment of the PeopleSoft data integrity objectives for regional staff given that the HRMS is a corporate application. As such, the DG, HR will write to all regional HR Directors referencing this requirement for the upcoming performance cycle and to seek their input into the development of monitoring and auditing reports for assessment purposes. A communication will also be sent from the DG, HR to the Regional Senior General Counsels given the need to ensure that accountability for data integrity forms part of the performance agreements for all regional HR directors.

2. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 11**

   a) Procedures are put in place on how supervisors are to verify leave data.

   Leave Self Service procedures have been clearly established for all areas on the e-application including the verification of employee leave data by supervisors. These Leave Self Service procedures are available online and in hard copy.

The Director General, HR Directorate will ensure the re-communication of the availability of these procedures to all Justice Leave Self Service employees.

b) Only direct and back-up supervisors are authorized to approve leave for each employee.

With reference to those that have authority to approve leave, the PeopleSoft system draws the information from the “reports to” field within the Manage Positions module. However, given that there are numerous actings and assignments situations within the department and that there is a time delay in getting this information into the system, the HR Systems group were asked to override this and allow the employee to change the manager so that there was no impact on leave authorizations and approvals; hence the employees can select from an extensive listing of managers. Therefore, the issue relates to the need for the information to be maintained correctly in the PeopleSoft system and on a timely basis so that this situation does not occur.

c) Supervisors are trained in how to check when leave for their staff is approved by another supervisor and in how to access leave history.

Leave Self Service procedures for the supervisor review of employee leave history are available online and in hard copy within the Leave Self Service application.

It is agreed that re-communication of these Leave Self Service procedures will be actioned by HR Systems.

d) Communication related to the certification of leave balances and the accuracy of personal information occur on a regular basis.

Prior to the implementation of the Leave Self Service, all employees received a hard copy statement at year-end for their review and approval. However, with the leave self service, it was confirmed by Treasury Board that there is no longer a requirement to provide the hard copy of the leave statement, as the employee can review their leave balances and transactions as needed. At year end, the leave system is shut down for a period of two weeks and all employees are advised that the leave year end process is underway and that they are to report any errors in relation to their leave utilization to their respective compensation advisor so that adjustments can be made as appropriate. This is currently done through an InfoPersonnel, which is distributed through JustInfo.

The DG Human Resources will ensure that communication related to the leave year-end process as well as the importance of the accuracy of personal information is communicated to departmental employees on a regular basis.

3. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate explore ways to ensure that all sector administrators are reporting errors to the HR Directorate for correction.12

During the last year, the Director General, HR has implemented a comprehensive data integrity initiative and has dedicated resources to this initiative. These resources have and continue to work closely with the HR employees, sector administrators, business managers and the HR Systems team to review all data relevant to the different regions, portfolios and branches in order to ensure that information is correct including organizational structure and reporting relationships given the impact on leave (see rec. 2-b). As a result of these meetings, Psoft data is very accurate and up-to-date.

The focus now will be placed on implementing ongoing auditing and monitoring functionality and reporting and working in collaboration with HR Directors both in the NCR and regions to agree on a process and timeframes for this ongoing requirement. In addition, as part of the ongoing process, there will be regular communication and a verification process implemented with clients (i.e. business managers) to ensure that HR staff is maintaining the data in a timely and accurate manner.

4. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that plans are prepared for improving the accuracy of the PeopleSoft information, and the importance of preparing PeopleSoft plans is relayed to regional HR directors..................................13

As stated above, the Director General, HR Directorate has implemented, during the last year, a PeopleSoft data integrity initiative. This data integrity initiative, which was launched prior to the commencement of this audit, will continue the audit & monitoring of the PeopleSoft information.

As well, regular communiqués and teleconference meetings are held with the regional HR directors keeping them informed of the ongoing plans of the HR Systems team.

5. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 15

a) responsibilities for PeopleSoft training are reviewed and clearly assigned;

b) training includes a useful overview of PeopleSoft for all those trained, that handouts are given for employees to follow the training sessions, and that staff are made aware of the training available (follow-up and one-on-one);

c) increased training is given to the sector administrators to allow them to use PeopleSoft to carry out their functions;

d) as training becomes available users are required to take it before they are given access to the system;

e) training is given in data entry of employee training data and that it be provided shortly before the regional offices begin doing entry of this information;

f) alternative training methods, such as issuing tips by e-mail, are considered;

g) advanced training techniques are considered;

h) statistics on training offered and given are regularly and systematically prepared and analyzed;

i) a strategy and plans are prepared and implemented for training;

j) training aids for self-service modules are monitored and improved as required. Communications and PeopleSoft itself should also be improved as required.

Since this audit, the HR Systems Team has initiated a completed review of training and has commenced work on the development of a Training Strategy referenced in the audit report and will be shared with all HR Directors to seek their support and commitment. It is recognized that a different approach for training of regional staff is required. As such, the training strategy will include the use of alternative training methods such as web based learning, online tutorials, etc. However, these new training approaches will require funding and as such, will be subject to securing funding as appropriate which may be difficult in the current departmental fiscal situation.

In addition, a new procedure has been implemented in the NCR whereby access to the PeopleSoft system is not provided until the HR user has been fully trained. The training strategy will be looking to the identification of power users in the regions who in turn would ensure that appropriate training is provided in-house or through the PeopleSoft team for new staff.

We agree with all of the above recommendations however the implementation of these training recommendations will be subject to the availability of the appropriate resources.

The DG, Human Resources will also seek managerial support for training and the appropriate time be given to staff to attend new and refresher training sessions.

As the HRD is now looking at "web casting" technology which will be used for the first time for the pay interface demo with the regions in March 2003. An assessment on its effectiveness will be undertaken and if appropriate, again subject to funding, considered for broader use in the future.

6. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 18

a) A PeopleSoft Intranet site is implemented including, but not limited to, such information as:

- **plans,**
- **contacts,**
- **tips,**
- **manuals,**
- **a list of problems found and resolution status,**
- **frequently asked questions,**
- **a list of change/enhancement requests and status,**
- **a function for collecting user suggestions.**

Since this audit, the HR Systems Team has been actively working with the Strategic Initiatives Unit on the creation of a HR Systems intranet site within the HR & You. Content is now being defined but will include and not limited to, procedures, the current and upcoming plans, the PeopleSoft Helpline contact (email & telephone number), tips, frequently asked questions, etc. The date for the launch of this website will be communicated to all regions once known.

b) A communications strategy is developed and implemented targeting the different audiences such as daily users, administrative officers, and others.

It is correct that there has been infrequent communications related to the HR System. This is a recognized shortfall however to a large extent is due to the limited resources within the PeopleSoft Team given the realignment of functions which took place in the Fall of 2001 and which resulted in a reduction of the number of staff dedicated to the Psoft function. Several HR System Communiques have been sent to the different audiences over the past few months and more of a focus is being placed on ensuring that the subject area experts or HR clients (corporate) communicate new functionality and reporting requirements to all HR staff (e.g. labour relations module). The HR Systems group prepares communiques when changes have been made to the system such as changes emanating from hot line requests, the addition or enhancement of on-line reports, etc. However, focus over the course of the next few months will be on the development of a communications strategy which will include the creation of a website for easy access to all HR System information.

7. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that all upgrade notices include an explanation of what is being changed and the impact on users. 19**

It has been the standard procedure for the HR Systems team to communicate all system upgrade or enhancements to the system to all the appropriate target audiences. However given this recommendation HR systems will re-look at its communication approach to ensure that communications are clear and targeted to the different audiences.

8. **It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 20**

   a) **the responsibility for developing procedures is clarified;**
   b) **written procedures matching the logical order of paperwork to the data entry to PeopleSoft are prepared, which include procedural tasks on how to control data quality as part of regular data entry;**
   c) **manuals explaining how the PeopleSoft computer system works are prepared and made available to users, possibly in the recommended Intranet site;**
   d) **the report catalogue is updated and includes a list of existing reports, samples, and guidance on how they can be obtained be prepared and made available to users, possibly on the recommended Intranet site;**
   e) **the PeopleSoft Online Help function is reviewed and revised to improve its functionality and use.**

We agree with the above recommendations and since this audit, the HR Systems team has amalgamated all procedures regarding HR process in a central location on the HRD common network shared drive. These procedures are identified by discipline and include the specific related HR processes pertinent to the respective discipline. These procedures will be communicated to all HR staff in the short term and will eventually form part of the new HR systems website for easy reference.

Also, the HR Systems team are researching further tools for the dissemination of procedures such as online tutorials, online help, online manuals, etc. in particular with the implementation of the new PeopleSoft GOC HRMS version 8.

9. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 22

a) access to PeopleSoft is granted based on written requests from supervisors;
b) an electronic access request form is created for supervisors to use;
c) access is limited so that staff cannot enter data or make changes for organizations or functions that they are not responsible for;
d) access to PeopleSoft is regularly reviewed so that access rights are removed or revised for staff who depart or who transfer;
e) access profiles are revised;
f) key HR staff are identified and informed of audit trail analysis capabilities;
g) a notice is sent to PeopleSoft users to make them aware that they can request more access if justified and authorized;
h) a procedure is prepared and issued outlining responsibilities and tasks to keep the PeopleSoft accounts and their access rights up to date.

We agree with the above recommendations and since this audit, the HR Systems team has initiated a complete PeopleSoft security review including the review of access approval processes, the review of existing security access profiles, etc. The results of this review as well as new procedures related to security administration will be finalized and communicated in the near future.

10. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 27

a) A strategy is developed and implemented so that PeopleSoft is used as a primary reference so that there is more incentive to maintain accurate data. This should include the issuing of a policy requiring that PeopleSoft be used for human resources data and that other systems and records be phased out.

It is agreed that Corporate HR policy will communicate the importance of maintaining the relevant modules to respond to both departmental and central agency reporting requirements and in order to effectively assess policy application, effectiveness, etc. As such, more emphasis will be placed on communication. A memorandum will be sent to the regional HR directors as well as Regional Senior General Counsels on the impacts of certain modules not being utilized or maintained and to enlist their support.

b) **PeopleSoft Web Charter is enhanced so that it can use PeopleSoft data online (avoiding the overnight delay) to increase Web Charter's use. Training is required for the regional offices to use Web Charter.**

HR Web Charter is a third party application developed by the company HRSoft and not PeopleSoft. HR Web Charter derives the information for the organizational information contained in the Manage Positions module and employee info from Administer Workforce module. The product was enhanced over the past year to meet user requirements. It is now web-based and accessible to all and the information is "refreshed" on a nightly basis as per product specifications. Should information need to be refreshed immediately, the HR staff member can advise the HR Systems Unit through the hot line service and it will be actioned immediately. This service will be communicated again to all regional staff however formed part of a recent communiqué related to HR Web Charter.

Since this audit, as part of the regional visits by the Data Integrity unit and the need for sign off from each area on the integrity of the data, organizational charts are produced using Web Charter and training or refresher training as well as simplified procedures provided to regional staff. Unfortunately not all regions are using Web Charter and this will be the subject of a future communication to the regions.

c) **The Human Resources Directorate works in partnership with the Professional Development Directorate to produce accurate training reports.**

The Administer Training module is outside the mandate of the Human Resources Directorate. The HRD will however communicate the results of this audit to the Professional Development Directorate so that necessary follow-up can be undertaken.

11. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that measures are taken to decrease duplicate records and duplicate data entry. 31

We agree with the recommendation and measures are gradually being put in place to ensure the elimination of duplicate records and duplicate data entry. HR Corporate Policy will communicate that the PeopleSoft system is the authoritative corporate source for human resources information and that they will be seeking the support of senior management to ensure that the necessary steps are taken to eliminate standalone systems in the short term.

The Data Integrity Team has traveled to the regional offices (with the exception of the Quebec Regional Office) and has tried to reinforce the elimination of the duplicate standalone systems by showing and explaining the capabilities of the PeopleSoft application.

12. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate discuss with the Director, Security Division the use of the PeopleSoft module to improve the process related to security clearances, thereby reducing duplication...31

A preliminary meeting has been held with Security Services, HR Operations and the HR Systems to discuss the implementation of the PeopleSoft GOC Security module. Further discussion and meetings will be held in this regard.

13. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 33

a) reports are easier to access, view, and print;
b) each region is able to produce all its own standard reports;
c) a degree of accuracy is estimated for management reports being issued to senior management;
d) reports on data status are produced including statistical information on backlogs and errors encountered;
e) PeopleSoft produces reports which closely meet the requirements for PREA reporting;
f) the ability of each regional office to print reports including only its data is reviewed, and that software changes are made if necessary or explanations given to the regional offices as to why such reporting is not possible.

DOJ is one of the few departments to have developed extensive reports and to have developed a Reports Library that is available to HR users, Administrators and Regional HR users and as such, has been identified as a leader in this regard and many of our reports are shared with the other cluster departments.

Of particular concern to HRD is the fact that there is no departmental guideline related to the desktop and printer configuration, which impacts significantly on the HRMS given the numerous HR reports available. The main issues surrounding reports relates to desktop and printer configurations. The HRD will request that Information Management Branch support a standardized desktop, which has been a departmental IT priority several years ago. It is our understanding that work is underway in this regard and that the department will be moving to Windows XP in the fall of 2003.

Since this audit, the HR Systems has undergone an extensive review of all reports included on the Reports Library. Reports have been reviewed to include further sorting parameters to enable user with more choice when producing the reports, redundant or duplicate reports have been removed for the Reports Library, etc.

14. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that efforts are undertaken to improve the validity of data by requesting system modifications to increase PeopleSoft software edits and by expanding the programs that check the validity of the data. 36

It is recognized that the system lacks edits, however, edits are a major customizations and as such, impact significantly on upgrades, etc. As DOJ is a member of the PeopleSoft Shared Systems Initiative, edits and customizations are limited as this would then deviate from the GOC core application. However, DOJ intends to take the lead in recommending edits for the Cluster shared systems initiative that would assist all cluster departments with their common data integrity issues and which would lead to these edits being delivered in the GOC product rather than DOJ having to maintain these edits.

15. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 38

a) Work is reorganized or revised and supervised to decrease data entry delays.

All HR staff will be made aware of the importance of maintaining data on a timely basis and that the responsibility of the maintenance of the system and data ownership form part of the employees objectives in the performance review and employee appraisal process as well as the management accords for the HR management team.

b) The format of paper files and paper documents are reviewed and revised to be in harmony with PeopleSoft data entry.

The HR Directors and Chiefs will ensure that the format of paper files is kept up to date and in harmony with PeopleSoft data entry. The paper documents that are used by Human resources are in most Public Service Commission and/or Treasury Board legislative documents and thus cannot be modified to reflect the PeopleSoft data entry. However, for the purposes of the Recruitment module, all letters relating to staffing actions are presently being reviewed by the HR Corporate Staffing area and will be incorporated within the PeopleSoft GC Recruitment module.

c) **Methods are implemented and consistently used for the immediate or systematic verification of entered data.**

The HR Systems and the Data Integrity Unit will implement audit reports for the verification of user data entry.

d) **When possible, PeopleSoft is modified to provide reports or screens for easy verification of entered data.**

Included in the all PeopleSoft procedures are screens (panel shots) for the ease of use for data entry as well as the identification of all mandatory fields.

e) **Managers of the sectors and sections are formally informed when HR does not receive documents.**

The Director General, Human Resources as well as the HR Directors and Chiefs will advise their respective areas to ensure that managers of the sectors and sections are formally informed when the appropriate HR documents have not been received.

f) **If feasible, PeopleSoft is modified to generate a report of incumbent changes in excluded positions for the use of the relevant staff relations officer.**

A report is presently available on the Reports Library listing the excluded positions for the use of the relevant staff relations officers. The Labour Relations Module is being implemented to ensure that relevant information is available.

g) **A glossary is developed defining the data elements and indicating those which are mandatory.**

Mandatory fields are highlighted and will continue to be flagged in the training material as well as procedures.

16. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that a review is conducted of inactive positions and that those no longer needed are deleted from PeopleSoft. 42

A complete review of inactive and positions vacant for more than six months has been undertaken by Corporate Classification in consultation with the regions. Approximately 2000 positions were removed from the PeopleSoft application. This review will be an ongoing process for the Corporate Classification.

17. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that the services provided by the Data Integrity Unit are available as long as needed. 43

The reporting structure for the data integrity unit changed in April 2002. At that time, it was transferred to Corporate Policy and Planning rather than with NCR regional operations and its mandate broadened in the later part of this past fiscal year to include regional offices. A detailed data integrity action plan was developed prior to the commencement of this audit and its implementation is nearing completion given the regional visits, etc. The focus for the next fiscal year will be on implementing ongoing audit and monitoring procedures. The data integrity unit will continue for an indefinite period as data integrity is a key priority for the Human Resources Directorate given the ever increasing focus on human resources planning and the need for good internal reporting capabilities related to demographics, to meet central agency reporting requirements, for forecasting purposes and to allow for further automation of transactional HR processes through the deployment of e-applications\solutions such as e-recruit, etc.

18. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 44

a) The follow-up work to the initial error corrections made in visits to sectors and regions is defined, implemented, and communicated.

At the conclusion of the review of HR data contained in the HRMS, the data integrity unit obtains sign-off of the establishment report and where appropriate, the organizational charts (this was not done in the Ontario Regional Office as a separate software is used for org. charts which does not read from the HRMS and is maintained separately); this confirms that all changes have been actioned.

b) **The Data Integrity Unit's resulting reports from sector and regional reviews are distributed to the respective contacts in each sector or region.**

A report on the results of each regional/portfolio visit documenting action items as well as issues is developed and shared with the business manager or regional HR director. The head of the Data Integrity Unit will ensure that all issues are discussed and resolved and the resolution communicated appropriately.

c) **The work of the AS-3 staff in the DIU is reviewed, described, and the positions are appropriately classified; that functions that overlap with the PeopleSoft Team are reduced; and that routine data entry is transferred to other staff in order to increase unit staff's technical data integrity functions.**

The role of the Data Integrity Unit continues to evolve and as such, their work descriptions will be reviewed as deemed necessary. Overlap with the systems unit has been addressed.

19. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that: 46

a) **Targets for data integrity are established.**

As stated above the Data Integrity Unit has established a data integrity action plan including target dates for data integrity initiatives.

b) **Responsibilities for resolving issues with the PCIS report are clearly assigned and the issues addressed include that;**
- **the PCIS report is well understood and that listed errors corrected,**
- **missing reports are requested when not received by the expected date,**
- **a method is developed to obtain a complete list of errors when these are more than 25.**

c) **A strategy is developed and implemented for the effective use of the data integrity reports and the PCIS Reports.**

b) & c) A review of the PCIS is being undertaken and a strategy is being developed by Corporate Classification to introduce an ongoing monitoring process with the regions and NCR to ensure that classification data is effectively maintained and that the error rate of the PCIS transmission is drastically reduced. It is our goal to return to the 95% accuracy rate achieved in 1999, which was the highest of all government departments.

Communication has commenced with PWGSC regarding the transmission process and issues related to their use of outdated technology. This is a government wide concern (in other words, it has been flagged by the cluster group departments using the Psoft application). The PCIS report is reviewed on a monthly basis as it is received and all identified errors are reviewed and actioned.

d) The Data Integrity Unit is tasked with coordinating all HQ's error correction except errors with employee training data, which is the responsibility of the Professional Development Directorate.

The correction mode access has been removed for HR advisors/assistants and it is the responsibility of the Data Integrity Unit for the correction of PeopleSoft information.

20. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate together with the HR regional directors:...50

a) Ensure that regional "power users" are trained and appointed for PeopleSoft.

The DG, HR will be communicating with the regional HR directors and requesting the identification of power users. It is our intent to implement as part of our enhanced training strategy, a train the trainer approach for the PeopleSoft application, which would be one of the responsibilities of the power users. This of course would require regional buy in and support.

b) Organize visits by HQ users who are making effective use of PeopleSoft to assist the regional offices.

Since this audit, regional visits have been organized and actioned by the Data Integrity Unit. Ongoing visits to the regional office will continue by the HR Systems team as well as the Data Integrity Unit.

21. It is recommended that the Director General, HR Directorate ensure that training assistance (such as training packages) is made available for regional offices to do local training..50

Included in the HR System training strategy and plan for the upcoming PeopleSoft version 8 will be the availability of web based learning tools such as classroom procedures, manuals, online help, etc. These will be made available to the regional power users.

In the interim, all current procedures have been amalgamated in one central area and will be made available on the regional network servers.

APPENDIX A—REPORTED PERCEIVED SYSTEM BUGS

The following are system bugs reported to the auditors. However, some of these may not be system bugs but may be data errors or issues requiring training. These are presented here to illustrate some of the difficulties faced by users of the system. For example:

- When the start and end dates are entered for indeterminate employees, PeopleSoft looks at, for example, the acting position and not at the substantive position. Therefore, the employee does not get proper leave credits.
- If there are changes to the position, the status of an employee may be affected and needs to be addressed.
- When a decision number is given it can be for multiple positions. Later, if one of the affected positions is changed and a new decision number is entered for this one position, it overwrites the number previously given to the other positions. The impact is that valid decision numbers cannot always be found in PeopleSoft. Also, if one of the positions in a decision is inactivated, all involved positions are inactivated.
- During the conversion process at time of implementaion, some of the information prior to 1995 is missing, as it was not available in the old system.

APPENDIX B—COMPUTER EDITS AND CALCULATIONS

The following presents the audit team's findings of examples of the kinds of edits that PeopleSoft does and does not perform.

Examples of edits performed by PeopleSoft are:

- checking that the "reporting to position" exists,
- preventing entry of certain data if pay data is not entered,
- preventing the entry of duplicate position numbers,
- preventing entries when some mandatory data is missing,
- checking some date sequences,
- preventing leave entries for leave on the same dates,
- validating if salaries are in a range based on position classification points (this does not apply to lawyers).

On the other hand, key computer edits are missing. Typically, system edits may reject certain entries or a system may issue a warning for the user to verify that indeed the entry is correct. After seeing the warning, users have the option to proceed with the data entry once they verify that the information is correct.

- PeopleSoft does not check dates to warn if acting and term appointments exceed four months.
- When an employee acting in a higher position goes back to his or her substantive position and staffing officers enter the change, the system issues no warning to also change the group and classification.
- The system allows entries with duplicate PRIs.
- The system contains data with no longer valid or invalid cost centres. When the cost centre table is changed, there is no effective process to assign correct cost centres to affected records.
- There is no limit for lawyer salaries; any figure could be entered.

- Some fields offer a range of valid codes for data entry but these codes are for all the government users and not just for the Department. For example, the data entry for a given field may provide a selection of 30 options while only five are used by the Department. This gives more opportunity for errors to occur.
- The system allows entries when required data is missing. For example, the appointment process code can be left blank. Also, the position information can be entered without identifying the language.