# Issues Details by Project Component

*Project:* **HR Front End Maintenance**

*Total Report Issues:*    **10**

*Opened From:*  14-Oct-01    *Thru:*  26-Jan-11

## Included in this report:

| Project Component | Priority | Status |
|---|---|---|
| 01 :: Initiate New Hire = 3 | Critical = 1 | QA Completed = 10 |
| 02 :: Separation = 0 | High = 1 | |
| 03 :: Position Creation and Maintenance = 1 | Low = 0 | |
| 04 :: Add a Job = 1 | Normal = 0 | |
| 05 :: Job End Date = 1 | Unassigned Priority = 8 | |
| 06 :: Employee Job Record Change = 0 | | |
| 07 :: Employee Data = 0 | | |
| 08 :: Historical Job Change = 0 | | |
| 09 :: Reappoint/Reactivate = 3 | | |
| 10 :: Labor Distributions = 1 | | |
| 11 :: Work Schedule Changes = 0 | | |
| 12 :: Employee Group Change = 0 | | |
| 13 :: Routing (& SendTo, ReqAcc, Return...) = 0 | | |
| 14 :: Security = 0 | | |
| 15 :: Security/Profile/Routing Administration = 0 | | |
| 16 :: User Preferences = 0 | | |
| 17 :: In/Out Boxes = 0 | | |
| 18 :: Employee Search = 0 | | |
| 19 :: Document Attachment = 0 | | |
| 20 :: Audit Trail = 0 | | |
| 21 :: Transaction History = 0 | | |
| 22 :: Timeline = 0 | | |
| 23 :: Graphic Interface = 0 | | |
| 24 :: Other = 0 | | |
| 25 :: Banner: Data/API/Gateway/Messaging = 0 | | |
| 26 :: Print Friendly View = 0 | | |
| 27 :: Default Earnings = 0 | | |
| 28 :: Dates and Contract Parameters = 0 | | |

| Assigned To | Category |
|---|---|
| QA - Debby Borg = 0 | Change Request = 0 |
| Analyst Review = 0 | Defect = 2 |
| DEV - Michael Astorina = | Unassigned Category = 8 |
| DEV - Jeff Heckel = 0 | |
| TAM - Dave Kittell = 0 | |
| Closed Issue = 0 | |
| DEV - Satya Kanda = 0 | |
| DEV - Nyle Bolliger = 0 | |
| Rejected Issues = 0 | |
| ESC - Alison Campbell = | |
| ESC - Cheri Gorrell = 10 | |

**Report Sort Order: Project Component, Issue Priority, Issue ID**

| ID# 8147 | U: ccarr/debrock: Accrue Leave should always default to "YES" for EH employees, but have to change this to "NO" in order to process the transaction which is incorrect |
|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 20-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | High | **Actual Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Defect | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

### Issue Detail

When trying to add an EH job, I kept getting an error message that said I had to choose an appropriate Accrue Leave code for EH. That should always default in as "yes" and it did, but it would only accept my job (as the initiator) when I changed the Accrue Leave to "no" (which is incorrect). Once the transaction was at Campus Apply, I was allowed to change it to "yes," hit Save, and it saved as "yes."

12/20/2010 - CLG
I was able to recreate this issue in ALPHA for a NH transaction. It appears that ADD transactions work as expected.

LCP: 12/20/10  Looks like maybe QA issue 7931 might be the problem here. It went in with 6.3. Anu is looking into, as she worked on that issue. See attached e-mail string. I think that it was mistakenly thought that the default for EH should be 'No', but that's not right. 7931 dealt with SEP transactions, but the fix might have been applied to more trans types. SEP seems to be working ok though, oddly enough. All trans types

### Steps to Reproduce

Initiate a new hire with an eclass of EH

When you are on the Job Data screen the Accrue Leave defaults in as "Yes" which is correct.

Select Route, receive error message:
- Select acceptable ACCRUE LEAVE value for E-Class = EH.

The only work around is to change this value to 'NO', which is incorrect. The application should not make the user change this value to "NO" as "YES" is the correct value for this eclass.

### Comments

12/20/2010 2:26:41 PM       QA - DebbyBorg       Assigned to Mike A., per HRFE Developer's meeting today.

### Resolution       Code Change - fixed

1/4/11 - amp - Followed steps and could not reproduce the problem. When Accrue Leave was "Y", route had no problem. Trans id 222006 in BANDEV.

1/4/11 - clg - I just recreated this in ALPHA which is production like.....trans #226096.

1/6/11 - amp - Added EH emp group to AccrueLeave_Y for NewHire.
BusinessRules.xml       Completed: At revision: 160416

Back ported change to v6.3.2.
BusinessRules.xml       Completed: At revision: 160415

1/11/11-KG -QA complete in Dev 6.4 b.43 #-232992
On hold waiting to test in Test

**ID# 8149    01 :: Initiate New Hire: Add a job: Not allowing users to use single filled positions when user knows the position #**

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Gorrell, QA - Kathi | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 24.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 20-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 24.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

- <span style="color:red">Errors in processing Job Detail accordion.</span>
- <span style="color:red">U12311-00: Another incumbent has been put into this position since you initiated this transaction. Please go back through the wizard and select a different position.</span>

Since 7109 has been deployed, we are now allowed to fill single filled positions if the user knows the position number.  We get the warning message on each route and apply but able to apply this already filled position.  If the position is filled with no end date or an end date outside of the 120 days by entering the position number in the I have a position number field.  If the position is filled with an end date within the 120 days, then the position should show in the available position list.  Please refer to 7109 for details. This was brought about back when 7109 was created because there are often times when positions are overlapped for awhile. HR had requested this change back then.  Usually, the person holding the position gives a notice that is longer than 120 days and they hire someone in the meantime who needs trained and who is taking the same position.

LCP: 1/6/11 - this happens on Add a Job as well, so is not strictly a New Hire issue
See Prod Trans 230228
Alpha Trans 226108

**Steps to Reproduce**

Open a BA employee in COA 9-699.
Choose Add a job.
Select U12311 for position number.
Use start date of 12/16/10.
Select to continue to use filled position.
Each route should show a warning message about position being filled including at the apply stop.  There should be no hard error on apply.

AND

Initiate New Hire
Enter fake data and search.
Continue to Demo screen.
Use COA 9, 699001, Urbana Campus, and Hire date of 12/16/10.
Fill out all other required fields.
Continue to Eclass screen.
Enter B, 12/12, 100%, $45,000.
Continue,
No, No.
continue to Position Selection screen.
Enter position number U12311.
continue through warning message about position being already filled.
Continue to ERV screen.
Route through Apply.  Should get warning about filled position on every route including apply.

**Comments**

**Resolution**   Code Change - fixed

1/7/11 - amp - Moved incumbents soft error to Translator_ERV. Removed hard error message introduced in issue 8023, per Mike A.

| | |
|---|---|
| Translator_ERV.java | Completed: At revision: 160588 |
| Translator_ErvJobDetail.java | Completed: At revision: 160589 |
| Translator_ErvPositionData.java | Completed: At revision: 160590 |
| BusinessErrors.xml | Completed: At revision: 160587 |

Back ported changes to v6.3.2.

| | |
|---|---|
| Translator_ERV.java | Completed: At revision: 160583 |
| Translator_ErvJobDetail.java | Completed: At revision: 160584 |
| Translator_ErvPositionData.java | Completed: At revision: 160585 |
| BusinessErrors.xml | Completed: At revision: 160586 |

1/10/10 -dlb- Per HRFE Developer's meeting today, returning this issue to Anu's queue until Cheri Gorrell receives verbal confirmation from all three campuses that this solution is acceptable - allowing the scenario of two transactions using the same position but displaying a soft error message instead of a hard error msg.

1/11/11 - CLG
Reviewed the following with the campuses today and they all agreed with the recommendation.
The issue is where user 1 initiates an ADD A JOB or NH transaction on employee #1 and utilizes position UA1234 (single, vacant position).  Now user 2 initiates a concurrent ADD A JOB or NH transaction and proposes to use the same single, vacant position (UA1234) on employee #2.  Since the transaction from user/employee 1 has not been applied at this time, the application is allowing both users to utilize position UA1234 due to the fact that we query Banner for incumbents.

Whomever applies their transaction first will apply without any errors.  Currently, the user who applies their transaction second receives a hard error.  However, we are thinking that at the final apply for the second transaction to apply the user should receive the following warning message:

- **This position has an active incumbent; are you sure you want to proceed with this position selected?**

The change in the text and type of error is a result of the new code that allows two incumbents to, at times, co-exist in the same position even if there are no End Dates on either job.

1/12/11-KG-QA Complete DEV 6.4 B. 44  #233042/ #233040  [add a job]
 #233044  [New Hire]
 #233046-added job with end date farther than 120 days.


1/12/11 -dlb - DEV 6.4 Build 44
Case 1:  Add a Job - Selecting a position already being used
**PASSED** Trans ID # 233038 UIN # 678148472  Added Position U12311 & applied
**PASSED** Trans ID # 233041 UIN # 667725625 Added Position U12311, recv'd green warning msg (listed above) and applied transaction successfully

Case 2:  Create New Hire transaction and don't apply.  Then create another New Hire transaction w/same Position#.  Do not route until the first NH transaction has been applied (sucessfully), then route & apply the 2nd transaction.  Green warning msg should display at each route stop and transaction should still apply succesfully.
**PASSED** Trans ID # 233047 created NH UIN # 667508201  Added Position UA2788 (used by newly created NH UIN # 657261117).  Received appropriate warning messages in green and was able to apply the transaction.

1/12/11 -dlb- Need to verify in TEST when Patch v6.3.2 is deployed

1/13/11 -dlb-  NOTE Issue 8161 was created by Kathi, which will deal with the warning message displaying twice (or once for each incumbent) in the Add a Job & New Hire Wizards.  Mike A. fixed the msg so that it only displays once in ERV.

1/14/11-KG-QA Complete in TEST 6.3.2 Transactions #231986 ADD used new position and applied, 231987 started before previous trans was applied and on apply, got green warning message., 231990 (NH using position with end date >120 days) got green warning message.

### ID# 8151    U: lbarta: Memos are not saved when using Return To functionality

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Velazquez, ESC - Robyn | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 21-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

Memos are disappearing when doing a Return To after adding the memo.  Memos are automatically saved if you click on Route after adding a memo, but not when you click on Return To.

**Steps to Reproduce**

1. Initiate a transaction (this happens with any transaction type) such as JOBCHANGE
2. Make a change to the job
3. Save
4. Click the memo tab
5. Enter a new memo & click the Add button
6. Click Route
7. Take ownership
8. Enter another memo & click Add
9. Click RETURN TO
10. Highlight a stop & click either Person Return to Stop or Group Return to Stop (happens in both cases)
11. Select transaction from Group Inbox

**Comments**

**Resolution**    Code Change - fixed

MA 1/4/11
The transaction will now be saved when the RETURN TO button is clicked.
Ported back to 6.3.2.

KG-1/4/11-QA Complete in DEV 6.4 build 42 #222016
On hold waiting to test in TEST.60

**3  *Total Issues for Component*  *01 :: Initiate New Hire***

| ID#  8144 | U:mswright:226388:New Hire: backend data changes are causing Position can be updated once error if employee has two jobs with same position number |
|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Phillips, ESC - Lynn | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 16-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | Critical | **Actual Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

An employee has two jobs, with same position number, different Suffix.
A backend process occurs mid-transaction that updates some position data (say Salary Group/Table/Grade/Step).
The user is receiving an error when they route, stating that the "Position can be updated once". But the user hasn't even proposed any changes - it's the backend data change that is "registering" twice, under each job, and causing the problem.

The error should only be generated if the USER proposed muliple changes to the same position.

(I logged this under Position Creation and Maintenance since it's a position thing. It's more of a general transactional thing, or

**Steps to Reproduce**

679721890
Initiate an ERC
Change the Salary or something on the Job.
Select new Job Change Reason.
Save
Route
In Banner, access the position U80638 and make some change to it  (i.e. Select a new Salary Table?)
Take ownership of the transaction
Should see backend changes on both jobs in blue in the Position Data accordions
Route
Should get "Position can be updated once" error

**Comments**

**Resolution**   Code Change - fixed

MA 01/04/11
Application changed to ignore backend changes when checking if more than one position accordion was changed.

Note: It will still perform the backend changes - this will not change. So, it is possible that 2 position compnents with changed position data exists. But it will not be considered an error and should apply just fine.

Ported back to 6.3.2.

KG-1/11/11-Transaction 233006- Initiated Separation on person with two jobs with same position and different suffixes. After the first route, I went into banner and changed the Salary table.  Then picked up the transaction from the inbox. Routed and then got the error.
   * Errors in processing Position Data accordion.
   * U78096-00: A position can only be updated once within a transaction. Changes to position U78096 have already been proposed. Please revert the pending position changes back to their original values and enter them in component (ID) 505683.

MA 01/11/11
Typo fixed. Was checking for System changes instead of Backend changes.
Ported back to 6.3.2.
Will deploy to DEV tonight so it can be tested in the morning.

### 1  *Total Issues for Component  03 :: Position Creation and Maintenance*

| ID#  8153 | U: mswright: ADD: 231926: Position can be updated once - Bargaining Unit |
|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Burdette, ESC - Beth | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 05-Jan-11 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 16.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

Per Michael some similar issues have been reported, but this one is different enough so he requested that I create a new QA issue. The new logic that was added to prevent multiple changes to a position within the same transaction is causing some new issues. This particular issue occurs when two ADD JOBS are completed in the same transaction and the position is the same with different suffixes.  In looking at the audit trail for the transaction, it appears that the user changed the Bargaining Unit was changed on the Position Data screen for each of the components, but it actually was not changed by the user.

See attachment for screenshots of the error message and audit trail, as well as steps to recreate the error.

Work around:  Have the user delete one of the two Add Job components and apply the transaction.  Then complete a separate transaction for the second change ADD Job.

01/07/2011:ALHELM:R687811: User Jessica Mette received error when completing a New Hire and Add a Job in same transaction

**Steps to Reproduce**

See attached for steps.

**Comments**

**Resolution**   Code Change - fixed

1/8/11 - amp - Replaced getDescription() with getCode() for BargainingUnit.
Translator_Helper_PositionData_New.java      Completed: At revision: 160733

Ported changes back to v6.3.2.
Translator_Helper_PositionData_New.java      Completed: At revision: 160731

1/11/11-KG -QA Complete in DEV Vs.6.4   b.43  #232990
On hold waiting to test in TEST.

**1  *Total Issues for Component  04 :: Add a Job***

**ID# 8137** ERC: Job with End Date. When doing an ERC then a JED to move End Date earlier, the JED component does not display and JOB END date is not changed and the components are not listed correctly

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** Borg, QA - Debby | **Status:** QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** 0.00 |
| **Opened Date:** 10-Dec-10 | **Priority:** Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** 0.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** 03-Jan-11 | **Category:** Unassigned Category | **ETC:** 0.00 |
| | **Browser:** N/A | |

**Issue Detail**

This was discovered while verifying Issue 8077 in TEST v6.3.1 build 6

If a job has an End Date and the user does an ERC first, effective some date prior to the Job End Date, then does a JED to move the End Date earlier, the components are displayed incorrectly and the job end date didn't change. Even after applying the transaction, the job end date remains the same. The Change Type displays ERC for Job Change Reason "EJ001, End Job" and the Change Type displays END for Job Change Reason "RA001, Reappointment". **RA001 was never selected.**

See Document Links tab

**Note:** *I tried this scenario in ALPHA (Trans ID # 221316 same UIN # 658910759)*
*Was not able to change the JED to 03/15/2011, due to issue 8077 not being deployed to Alpha yet. But I did change the JED to 5/16/2011 and was able to route.*
*Noticed there was an END component, the job end date displayed 05/16/2011 and there was no Reappointment component. See*

**Steps to Reproduce**
Find a job with an End Date (i.e. a GA)
Use UIN 658910759
Initiate an ERC transaction type
Change the salary and Job Change Reason to SA010
Save
Click Add Change
Change the View Date to = current Job End Date (5/15/11). Click 'View'
Select Job End Date transaction type
Expand the Job Detail accordion
Change the Job End Date to a date earlier than 5/15/11 (i.e. 03/15/2011)
Tab
The folowing pop-up message displays

"New Job End Date 03/15/2011 after active record on 08/16/2010, refresh to 03/15/2011 date
required"
Click OK
Make sure the View Date now displays 03/15/2011
Enter a Job Change Reason & Job Comment
Continue routing to the apply stop
Click "Continue with Job End Date" when the pop up message displays
Apply

**Actual Results:**
There is an ERC component instead of an END component for Job Change Reason(EJ001, End Job) in the Proposed Changes section
There is an END component for Job Change Reason(RA001, Reappointment) even though I did not select RA001 as a job change reason.
The Job End date did not change from 5/15/2011 to 3/15/2011

**Expected Results:**
There is an END component for Job Change Reason EJ001, in the Proposed Changes section
The Job End date now displays 03/15/2011

**Comments**

See Document Links tab

**Comments**

**Resolution**   Code Change - fixed

MA 12/20/10
This defect will deal only with the defaulting of the Job Change Reason. Most of what I see is working fine, and maybe some of the anomolies are also documented in 8053. So, between the two of them, all issues should be resolved. If not, we'll create another defect…but lets see what falls out first.

MA 12/20/10
The Job Change Reason will now default correctly and will force the user to make a selection.
Ported back to 6.3.2.

12/20/10 -dlb-  **patch 6.3.2** has not been deployed to TEST yet

12/22/10 -dlb- <span style="color:red">**FAILED**</span> in DEV v6.4 build 40
According to hudson@urbbuild1.admin.uillinois.edu, the fix was deployed to DEV on 12/20/10
Trans ID # 221988  UIN # 670784299  U64489-00
Trans ID # 221993  UIN # 676151138  U210163-00

See Document Links tab.   The Proposed Changes section is correct but the Job End Date did not change.  Job End Date reverts back to original end date after clicking "Continue with Job End Date" pop-up message.

MA 12/22/10
This IS working as designed. If you do not know or understand how it is meant to work, see me.

1/3/11 -dlb-  This fix is working, will file a new defect if patch 6.3.2 does not fix the Job End Date of not updating.

On HOLD till patch 6.3.2 is deployed

1/14/11-KG-The job end date is not keeping the change after apply. I think the reason is because there is a 3rd proposed change that was a future dated automatic one that was created by HRFE.  It was an ERC and had the salary change that was done earlier. Since this date is after the new Job end date, I think it is overriding the job end date.

MA 01/18/11
Not related to any changes made here. Do not fail this defect. Create a new one if necessary…but please make sure it is a REAL issue.

**1  Total Issues for Component  05 :: Job End Date**

ID# 8122     U:llbarta:221278: REA: Date format error on Job End Date when no LPD on job

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Woodley, ESC - Teresa | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 02-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

LCP:  When doing a reappointment on a job that has no Last Paid Date yet, if the user enters a Job End Date, an error message appears and won't let the user continue with the reappointment.

WORKAROUND:  Wait for calc to run and the LPD to populate before doing the reappointment.

Please enter End Date in mm/dd/yyyy format.

## Notes from ticket:

Martha Green is processing a Grad Hourly reappointment. She attempted to add an end date. We both entered the date several different ways (011511, 01/15/2011, 01/15/11) and regardless of the format we used, we received the message Please enter End Date in mm/dd/yyyy format. I removed the end date, since I was unable to enter one in the wizard, and clicked continue. I was also unable to enter an end date in ERV. We completed the transaction and I entered the end date in Banner forms. Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thanks.
Laura

12/7/10  AC:  Laura Bleakney reported another issue with this error message on an End Date for a lump sum reappointment.  USD ticket R670275.  UIN 661306298

**Steps to Reproduce**

search for an employee who has a reappoint-able job with no Last Paid Date: Atul Anil Kulkarni
select the reappoint/reactivate job transaction
Select U85026/00.
Continue
Begin date - 12/18/10
End date - 1/15/11
Continue
 Get error message

**Comments**

**Resolution**  Code Change - fixed

MA 12/15/10
Application was not considering the LPD to be null.
Needs to be ported back to 6.3.2. Not done yet.

12/20/10 -dlb-  patch 6.3.2 has not been deployed to TEST or DEV yet.

12/22/10-KG-QA Complete in DEV 6.4 build 40 #221991.  UIN#652302057

On hold for deployment to TEST v6.3.2.

| ID#  8138    U:REAP:223777: Salary Group not editable on an Extra Help (EH) REAP |
|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Phillips, ESC - Lynn | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 10-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

User reappointed an old job.
2005 values defaulted into ERV for Salary Group and Hourly Rate.

**Steps to Reproduce**

651589232
Reappoint on job U99541-00 effective 12/5/10

**Comments**

**Resolution**   Code Change - fixed

1/4/11 - amp - Made fields editable for REAPPT.
Translator_ErvJobDetail.java      Completed: At revision: 160169

Ported back changes to 6.3.2.
Translator_ErvJobDetail.java      Completed: At revision: 160168

1/11/11-KG-QA Complete in DEV 6.4 b. 43  #232997
On hold waiting to test in TEST.

| ID# 8140 | U: debrock: Leave Category needs to be editable at the campus apply stop |
|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 15-Dec-10 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 8.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Unassigned Category | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

While the campuses were testing the new LCAT (leave category) of Y8 out in the Alpha enviornment it was noticed that everything worked as expected except Reappointments.  The Accrue Leave is editable (Y/N) the leave category needs to be editable at the campus apply stop.

**Steps to Reproduce**

*****Need to make sure that the Y8 LCAT has been configured in BANNER *****

UIN - 659808209
Select REA
Position - U62695
Begin Date - 7/16/2011
End Date - 12/15/2011

Route to Apply

Should be able to update the Leave Category, however this field is not editable.

**Comments**

12/20/2010 2:27:19 PM        QA - DebbyBorg            Assigned to Mike A., per HRFE Developer's meeting today.

**Resolution**    Code Change - fixed

12/21/10 - amp - Does Leave category have to be made editable at Apply stop only for REAPPT or other type of components also?

1/4/2011 - We just need to address the REAPPT as ERC and ADD are working fine.  The following is the information from the campuses:

I can do an ERC and Add Job (still need to verify the data made the trip to BANUSER) but  for a reappointment while Accrue Leave is editable (Y/N) at campus apply the leave category is not available for edit.

1/5/11 - amp - Made LEAVE CATEGORY editable for REAPPT.
Translator_ErvJobDetail.java      Completed: At revision: 160288

Ported back changes to 6.3.2
Translator_ErvJobDetail.java      Completed: At revision: 160287
1/11/11-KG-QA Complete in DEV 6.4 b. 43  #232994
On Hold to test in TEST.


**3  *Total Issues for Component  09 :: Reappoint/Reactivate***

**ID# 8075** UAT-6.3; C: sabacan: LD and PLD - QA issue 7840 - when updating the index value (without selecting edit) by entering a lower case letter, it should convert to a capital letter as it does when you select Edit

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Assigned To:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Severity:** | Unassigned Severity | **Cycle:** | Patch 6.3.2 |
| **Opened By:** | Gorrell, ESC - Cheri | **Status:** | QA Completed | **Estimate Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **Opened Date:** | 11-Nov-10 | **Priority:** | Unassigned Priority | **Actual Hours:** | 0.00 |
| **ClosedDate:** | | **Category:** | Defect | **ETC:** | 0.00 |
| | | **Browser:** | N/A | | |

**Issue Detail**

Users were testing QA issue **7840 - LD: Convert index character to capital letter to be consistant with rest of application**

It works fine when you select edit, however when you do not select edit and enter an index that begins with a lower case letter the

**Steps to Reproduce**

UIN 671121103

Select ERC or LD

Expand either/both the job/position LD

Enter 'e53152' in the index field and nothing else prepopulates.

However if you enter 'E53152' the other fields are then populated.

**Comments**

**Resolution**   Code Change - fixed

MA 12/16/10
Index value in LD cells will now be converted to uppercase when value changed.
Ported back to 6.3.2

12/20/10 -dlb-  patch 6.3.2 has not been deployed to TEST or DEV yet.

12/22/10-KG-Failed in DEV 6.4 build 40 #221990-ERC transaction. # 221987 (LD trans).
It looks like it is converting to a capital letter but it is not working like an index. This only happens when you enter the index in the field without selecting the edit first.  If you select edit and then enter it, you will see the fields all defaulting correctly. It's just not working when entering the index directly which is what this issue is about.   It is not changing the other cells in the LD accordingly.  See screen print in Doc links which shows the what the other cells should be and shows how it's not changing them in ERV.

MA 12/22/10
When I try it, it seems to do the right thing. However, I used a different index because the index mentioned here is not valid. I don't know where you got your screenshot of the database from, or what database you're using for that matter, but that index is not valid. And if it is not valid, there is nothing to display.

Try using a different index for starters and see if it works. Then we'll take it from there.

KG-1/4/11-QA Complete in DEV 6.4 build 42.  Used indexes e53152 and e45501. Trans#222014.
On hold waiting to test in TEST.

**1  *Total Issues for Component  10 :: Labor Distributions***