

Baker Engineering Assignment **BUSA 323¹**

Context: Baker Engineering operates a single manufacturing facility in which it produces two products: A and B. Demand for product A is booming; Baker is considering increasing production in order to satisfy the surge in demand. Product B seems to be a dud; it is not moving, despite what appear to be give-away prices. Baker's management is puzzled about this turn of events.

Baker's manufacturing operations require three service departments [computer services, personnel, and janitorial services] and two production departments [foundry and assembly]. The computer services department provides data processing support to personnel [think payroll] and foundry and assembly [production scheduling, programming and tech support for computer-controlled machinery, etc.]. The personnel folks handle hiring and related personnel matters. The janitorial services department keeps the place clean. In the foundry [think hot, dirty, dangerous], molten metal is poured into molds to create castings, which are then machined to appropriate tolerances. Foundry operations are complex and require substantial capital assets and skilled workers. In the assembly department, various components [some from casting, others purchased from vendors] are assembled. Assembly operations are labor intensive, but require little skill and require simple tools that can be purchased at a hardware store.

Numerical data [costs, labor and material requirements, etc.] are included in the attached printouts from my Excel model.

Purpose: The Baker Engineering assignment provides the foundation for the entire topic of cost allocation and cost accounting systems. In other words, the material covered here is central to much of what we will do this semester. I have taught this material for over 25 years. By far the most common problem students experience with this material that they shortchange the time they spend on this relatively simple illustration. It will be tempting to look over the Excel printouts attached and assume that you "know" how to do the allocations. However, I believe it is essential that you set up the Excel model yourself and develop the formulas necessary to reproduce the numbers I have given you [*yes, every single cell*].

Having done that, you should be able to tell me [or someone else] precisely what each cell represents? An allocation ratio or rate? An allocated cost? The results of an allocation? You need to be able to explain why the results you get are different with different allocation assumptions. [Something like "the cost changed because the allocations changed" is true, but begs the question. WHY do the cost change? What is going on? What is happening to assumptions about resource consumption?]

Some of you may argue that this is stupid. "We have the numbers. Why waste time rebuilding the model?" Answer: Because reading about it and looking at it is not the same as doing it. When students have trouble with this material, I invariably ask "Have you set up Baker Engineering?" The responses vary, but can diplomatically be summarized as "Well, sort of." The consequences

¹ Copyright © 2009 by Gerald M. Myers. All rights reserved. Please do not reproduce without the written permission of the author.

[always negative] are predictable with a probability of 100%. The procedure is not difficult, but it does require developing a systematic understanding of the steps in process, where the numbers come from and what they mean.

What is attached: The attached pages are direct printouts of my Excel model for this problem. Note that there are nine pages attached. The pages are numbered and I have included worksheet names at the top of the respective pages:

Page 1: This is my data worksheet. ALL the “raw data” are entered here. There are **no data values** entered anywhere else in the entire Excel model. Even here, any dependent values [e.g., column and row totals] are derived with cell formulas.

Page 2: This is the data worksheet, color coded so that you can see where the VALUES are entered. EVERY other calculated cell in the entire model is cell referenced to these or to other cell formulas.

Page 3: This is the model for the direct allocation.

Page 4: This is the model for the step-down allocation.

Page 5, 6, and 7: This worksheet replicates the product cost calculations under the various assumptions of labor and overhead costing. These are printouts of the SAME worksheet. Page 5 is the costs under the plantwide rate. Page 6 uses the direct allocation, and page 7 uses the step allocation. Note the importance of using cell B2 as a driver for the =IF() functions in the worksheet. DO NOT create three separate worksheets. Use the =IF() function to test the alternative models.

Page 8: Page 8 calculates the net income under the various product costing assumptions. Note that the net income is always the same, but that the relative profitability of the products changes as the allocations change. Note that cell B2 [formatted to span B2:D2] is cell referenced to the “model number” cell in the “costs” worksheet. Note that I have included the income worksheet for ***just the plantwide rate assumptions***. As with the product cost worksheet, DO NOT create separate worksheets. Use =IF() functions.

Page 9: This is what I call the “proof” worksheet. Remember that product costing is a “wash.” All the costs that we start with have to wind up somewhere, either in inventory or in cost of goods sold. The total at the end has to be the same as the total at the beginning. If the totals are different [except for small rounding errors], something is wrong somewhere. Note also that as long as there is no inventory to worry about [with consequent issues like FIFO and LIFO], changing from one cost accounting model to another will have not have an impact on **total** cost of goods sold or **total** net income. The relative profitability of products will change, however. Remember that we’re just rearranging those beans under the coconut shells.

[Note that we are dealing exclusively with absorption costing here. A change from absorption to variable costing [or vice versa] WILL have an impact on profitability IF there are changes in inventory.]

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Baker Engineering Problem: Cost Allocation and Product costing							
2					Production Departments			
3		Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals	
4	Labor costs	\$95,000	\$60,000	\$22,000	\$468,000	\$580,000	\$1,225,000	
5	Material costs	12,000	5,000	1,000	169,600	109,600	\$297,200	
6	Overhead costs	40,000	10,000	3,000	172,000	50,000	\$275,000	
7	Total overhead	\$147,000	\$75,000	\$26,000	\$172,000	\$50,000	\$470,000	
8	Total costs	\$147,000	\$75,000	\$26,000	\$809,600	\$739,600	\$1,797,200	
9	Computer hours budgeted	1,500	100	0	1,800	100	3,500	
10	Number of employees	6	9	3	15	21	54	
11	Square feet occupied	1,000	2,000	500	10,000	5,000	18,500	
12	Direct labor hours budgeted	8,320	14,560	6,240	31,200	58,000	118,320	
13	Product A material				\$ 80.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 100.00	
14	Product A production				1,000	1,000		
15	Product A DLH				20	2		
16	Product A Total DLH				20,000	2,000		
17	Product B material				\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 80.00	
18	Product B produciton				2,240	2,240		
19	Product B DLH				5	25		
20	Product B Total DLH				11,200	56,000		
21	Wage rate/DLH				\$ 15.00	\$ 10.00		
22	Total DLH required				31,200	58,000	89,200	
23		Product A	Product B					
24	Sales price	\$ 670.00	\$ 625.00					go to plantwide rate direct allocation step down allocation product cost calculations income statements proof
25	Non-Manufacturing costs	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.00					
26	Color coding >>>	Overhead Costs	Allocation Bases for the production departments					
27		Product A data	Propduct B data					
28								
29	Plantwide rate							
30	Total overhead	\$470,000			All the decimals in cell B34 are merely to show that this does NOT come out even.			
31	Total production DLH	89,200						
32	Overhead rate/DLH	\$5.26905830						

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	Baker Engineering Problem							
2	Cost Allocation and Product Costing							
3		Service Departments			Production Departments			
4		Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals	
5	Labor costs	\$95,000	\$60,000	\$22,000	\$468,000	\$580,000	\$1,225,000	
6	Material costs	12,000	5,000	1,000	169,600	109,600	\$297,200	
7	Overhead costs	40,000	10,000	3,000	172,000	50,000	\$275,000	
8	Total overhead	\$147,000	\$75,000	\$26,000	\$172,000	\$50,000	\$470,000	
9	Total costs	\$147,000	\$75,000	\$26,000	\$809,600	\$739,600	\$1,797,200	
10	Computer hours budgeted	1,500	100	0	1,800	100	3,500	
11	Number of employees	6	9	3	15	21	54	
12	Square feet occupied	1,000	2,000	500	10,000	5,000	18,500	
13	Direct labor hours budgeted	8,320	14,560	6,240	31,200	58,000	118,320	
14	Product A material				\$ 80.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 100.00	
15	Product A production				1,000	1,000		
16	Product A DLH				20	2		
17	Product A Total DLH				20,000	2,000		
18	Product B material				\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 80.00	
19	Product B production				2,240	2,240		
20	Product B DLH				5	25		
21	Product B Total DLH				11,200	56,000		
22	Wage rate/DLH				\$ 15.00	\$ 10.00		
23	Total DLH required				31,200	58,000	89,200	
24		Product A	Product B					
25	Sales price	\$ 670.00	\$ 625.00					
26	Non-Manufacturing costs	\$ 20.00	\$ 25.00					
27								
28	This sheet is included so you can see where I have used values in the original data worksheet.							
29	All of the cells shaded in blue are entered as values. All other cells are cell formulas based on cell references.							

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Direct method: resource usage						
2		Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals
3	Computer hours used	1,500	100	-	1,800	100	1,900
4	Number of employees	6	9	3	15	21	36
5	Square feet occupied	1,000	2,000	500	10,000	5,000	15,000
6	Direct labor hours budgeted	8,320	14,560	6,240	31,200	58,000	89,200
7	Direct method: ratios						
8		Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals
9	Computer hour ratios				94.74%	5.26%	1.00
10	Employee ratios				41.67%	58.33%	1.00
11	Square foot ratios				66.67%	33.33%	1.00
12	Direct method: allocation table						
13		Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals
14	Total costs	\$147,000	\$75,000	\$26,000	\$172,000	\$50,000	\$470,000
15	Computer services	(\$147,000)			139,263	7,737	147,000
16	Personnel		(\$75,000)		31,250	43,750	75,000
17	Janitorial services			(\$26,000)	17,333	8,667	26,000
18	Total costs	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$359,846	\$110,154	\$470,000
19	Direct labor hours				31,200	58,000	
20	Departmental rates				\$11.53354	\$1.89920	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Step-down method: resource usage						
2	Department	Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals
3	Computer hours	0	100	0	1,800	100	2,000
4	Employees	0	0	3	15	21	39
5	Square feet	0	0	0	10,000	5,000	15,000
6	Direct labor hours				31,200	58,000	89,200
7	Step-down method: ratios						
8	Computer hours	0.00%	5.00%	0.00%	90.00%	5.00%	100.00%
9	Employees	0.00%	0.00%	7.69%	38.46%	53.85%	100.00%
10	Square feet	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	66.67%	33.33%	100.00%
11	Direct labor hours	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	34.98%	65.02%	100.00%
12	Step-down method: cost allocation table						
13		Computer	Personnel	Janitor	Foundry	Assembly	Totals
14	Total costs	\$147,000	\$75,000	\$26,000	\$172,000	\$50,000	\$470,000
15	Allocate computer services	(147,000)	7,350	0	132,300	7,350	0
16	New total costs	0	82,350	26,000	304,300	57,350	470,000
17	Allocate personnel		(82,350)	6,335	31,673	44,342	0
18	New total costs	0	0	32,335	335,973	101,692	470,000
19	Allocate janitorial services			(32,335)	21,556	10,778	0
20	New total costs	0	0	0	357,529	112,471	470,000
21	Direct labor hours				31,200	58,000	89,200
22	Departmental rates				\$11.46	\$1.94	

Page 5; Baker Engineering: **Costs** worksheet; note that changing Cell B2 drives changes in the unit costs of the 2 products. Cells F9:H9 demonstrate the calculations needed to derive the value in B8.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	Product cost calculations								Go to Power Point show			
2	Cost model >>	1	Plantwide Rate									
3	Key:	1	Plant wide							<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> go to plantwide rate direct allocation step down allocation product cost calculations income statements proof </div>		
4		2	Direct									
5		3	Step down									
6	Overhead in Product A and B											
7		Foundry overhead	Assembly overhead	Total overhead		Calculation demonstrated						
8	Product A	\$ 105.38	\$ 10.54	\$ 115.92		Rate	Hours	Total ohd				
9	Product B	\$ 26.35	\$ 131.73	\$ 158.07	\$ 5.27	\$ 5.27	20	\$ 105.38				
10	Cost of Products A and B											
11			Catsting labor	Assembly labor	Total overhead	Total mfg. cost/unit	Units	Extension				
12	Product A	\$ 100.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 115.92	\$ 535.92	1,000	\$ 535,919.28	material is a lump sum (given)			
13	Product B	80.00	75.00	250.00	\$ 158.07	\$ 563.07	2,240	\$ 1,261,280.72	labor is wage rate * hours			
14							Total	\$ 1,797,200.00				
15	Profitability of A and B											
16		Sales price	Production cost	Gross profit/unit	Non-mfg cost/unit	Profit/unit	Return on sales	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> With the plantwide rates, product B is going gangbusters. </div>				
17	Product A	\$ 670.00	\$ 535.92	\$ 134.08	\$ 20.00	\$ 114.08	17.03%					
18	Product B	\$ 625.00	\$ 563.07	\$ 61.93	\$ 25.00	\$ 36.93	5.91%					
19	Note: The cells shaded in gray have =IF() functions which are driven by cell B2											

Page 6; Baker Engineering: **Costs** worksheet; note that changing Cell B2 drives changes in the unit costs of the 2 products. Cells F9:H9 demonstrate the calculations needed to derive the value in B8.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
1	Product cost calculations								Go to Power Point show			
2	Cost model >>	2	Direct Method									
3	Key:	1	Plant wide							<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> go to plantwide rate direct allocation step down allocation product cost calculations income statements proof </div>		
4		2	Direct									
5		3	Step down									
6	Overhead in Product A and B											
7		Foundry overhead	Assembly overhead	Total overhead		Calculation demonstrated						
8	Product A	\$ 230.67	\$ 3.80	\$ 234.47		Rate	Hours	Total ohd				
9	Product B	\$ 57.67	\$ 47.48	\$ 105.15	\$ 11.53	\$ 11.53	20	\$ 230.67				
10	Cost of Products A and B											
11			Casting labor	Assembly labor	Total overhead	Total mfg. cost/unit	Units	Extension				
12	Product A	\$ 100.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 234.47	\$ 654.47	1,000	\$ 654,469.22	material is a lump sum (given)			
13	Product B	80.00	75.00	250.00	\$ 105.15	\$ 510.15	2,240	\$ 1,142,730.78	labor is wage rate * hours			
14							Total	\$ 1,797,200.00				
15	Profitability of A and B											
16		Sales price	Production cost	Gross profit/unit	Non-mfg cost/unit	Profit/unit	Return on sales	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> However, with the departmental rates, we get a radically different picture. </div>				
17	Product A	\$ 670.00	\$ 654.47	\$ 15.53	\$ 20.00	\$ (4.47)	-0.67%					
18	Product B	\$ 625.00	\$ 510.15	\$ 114.85	\$ 25.00	\$ 89.85	14.38%					
19	Note: The cells shaded in gray have =IF() functions which are driven by cell B2											

Page 7: Baker Engineering: **Costs** worksheet; note that changing Cell B2 drives changes in the unit costs of the 2 products. Cells F9:H9 demonstrate the calculations needed to derive the value in B8.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L		
1	Product cost calculations								Go to Power Point show					
2	Cost model >>	3	Step Down Method											
3	Key:	1	Plant wide							go to plantwide rate direct allocation step down allocation product cost calculations income statements proof				
4		2	Direct											
5		3	Step down											
6	Overhead in Product A and B													
7		Foundry overhead	Assembly overhead	Total overhead		Calculation demonstrated								
8	Product A	\$ 229.19	\$ 3.88	\$ 233.06		Rate	Hours	Total ohd						
9	Product B	\$ 57.30	\$ 48.48	\$ 105.78	\$ 11.46	\$ 11.46	20	\$ 229.19						
10	Cost of Products A and B													
11			Catsting labor	Assembly labor	Total overhead	Total mfg. cost/unit	Units	Extension						
12	Product A	\$ 100.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 233.06	\$ 653.06	1,000	\$ 653,063.86	material is a lump sum (given)					
13	Product B	80.00	75.00	250.00	\$ 105.78	\$ 510.78	2,240	\$ 1,144,136.14	labor is wage rate * hours					
14							Total	\$ 1,797,200.00						
15	Profitability of A and B													
16		Sales price	Production cost	Gross profit/unit	Non-mfg cost/unit	Profit/unit	Return on sales	The differences between the direct and step down methods are insignificant. Why?						
17	Product A	\$ 670.00	\$ 653.06	\$ 16.94	\$ 20.00	\$ (3.06)	-0.46%							
18	Product B	\$ 625.00	\$ 510.78	\$ 114.22	\$ 25.00	\$ 89.22	14.28%							
19	Note: The cells shaded in gray have =IF() functions which are driven by cell B2													

Page 8; Baker Engineering: **Income** worksheet--Income statements under the various assumptions. Cell B2 is =costs!B2 so that linkage of the appropriate cost model is assured.

	A	B	C	D	E	F
1	Baker Engineering Income Statement					
2	Model > > > >	1				
3		Product A	Product B	Total	go to plantwide rate direct allocation step down allocation product cost calculations income statements proof	
4	Units	1,000	2,240			
5	Sales price	\$ 670.00	\$ 625.00			
6	Revenue	\$ 670,000	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 2,070,000		
7	Cost of goods sold	535,919	1,261,281	\$ 1,797,200		
8	Gross margin	\$ 134,081	\$ 138,719	\$ 272,800		
9	Non-mfg costs	20,000	56,000	\$ 76,000		
10	Net income	\$ 114,081	\$ 82,719	\$ 196,800		
11	Return on sales	17.03%	5.91%	9.51%		Go to Power Point s

Page 9; Baker Engineering: **Proof** worksheet; This shows that total costs are always the same as long as sales and production are the same under the various cost model assumptions.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1	Reconciliation of total overhead						
2		3		Direct		Stepdown	
3	Department	Foundry	Assembly	Foundry	Assembly	Foundry	Assembly
4	Overhead rate	\$ 5.27	\$ 5.27	\$ 11.53	\$ 1.90	\$ 11.46	\$ 1.94
5	Product A hours	20	2	20	2	20	2
6	Product B units	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
7	Total costs	\$ 105,381.17	\$ 10,538.12	\$ 230,670.83	\$ 3,798.40	\$ 229,185.57	\$ 3,878.29
8	Product totals		\$ 115,919.28		\$ 234,469.22		\$ 233,063.86
9	Product B hours	5	25	5	25	5	25
10	Product B units	2240	2240	2240	2240	2240	2240
11	Total costs	\$ 59,013.45	\$ 295,067.26	\$ 129,175.66	\$ 106,355.11	\$ 128,343.92	\$ 108,592.22
12	Product totals		\$ 354,080.72		\$ 235,530.78		\$ 236,936.14
13	Total allocated costs		\$ 470,000		\$ 470,000		\$ 470,000
14	Total costs to be allocated		\$ 470,000		\$ 470,000		\$ 470,000
15	Difference (sh/be zero)		0		0		0