Finance Program Meeting Notes – Automated Workflow Working Group

Finance Program Phase Two – June 26th, 2017

In Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sandra Price</th>
<th>Lulu Bersamira</th>
<th>Sonia Dhillon</th>
<th>Leeann Liew</th>
<th>Lisa Rein</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Backe</td>
<td>Catherine Stoddard</td>
<td>Susanne Stockdill</td>
<td>Sabina Diaconescu</td>
<td>Kamal Dhiman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Geng</td>
<td>Jennifer Thibeault</td>
<td>Eugenie Ko</td>
<td>David Lee</td>
<td>Wendy Unger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Ataei</td>
<td>Elizabeth Janssen</td>
<td>Stéphanie Sauro</td>
<td>Lesley Dougans</td>
<td>Luciana Rad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jimmy Wong</th>
<th>Harjot Guram</th>
<th>Cal Smith</th>
<th>Teresa Nicolson</th>
<th>Kari Sampson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Chiu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda**

1. Introduction from Sandra
2. Demo from Jennifer (Requisitions)
3. Demo from Lesley (Professional Development Reimbursement)
4. Recap and Additional Information
5. Answers to Questions
6. Conclusion

**Discussion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Introduction from Sandra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The team is currently setting up three pilots, which will occur in real business situations with real transactions. Once they’ve gone live, they will remain on, and functionality will gradually be added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The first is for Professional Development (with Catherine’s Faculty Relations department), and the second is for Requisitions (which will be Lifelong Learning and two of Susanne Stockdill’s Faculty of Sciences departments). At present, the pilots are only going to pertain to Fund 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Demo from Jennifer (Requisitions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • In addition to automated approvals through workflow, the team was able to make the Requisitions page more user-friendly. There will now be a ‘Save For Later’ button and a ‘Save and
## Discussion

Submit’ button. When a user selects save for later, they will get a requisition number. When they select save and submit, it will be submitted, and the requisition status will change to ‘pending.’

- Once it’s submitted, it moves on the reviewer portion of the system. More than one reviewer will qualify, but only one of them needs to review it in order for the requisition to move forward.
- Reviewers will get a summary page with a list of all their outstanding requisitions. After the initial reviewer approves it, it will then automatically move on to a budget reviewer, and then on to procurement for fund compliance. Once it’s approved, it can be pulled into a PO for processing.

- Everyone in the workflow will have access to all the comments added to a particular requisition.

- All the blue buttons are searchable icons.

- Reviewers are only required to add a comment if they deny or put it on hold. Please note that ‘Deny’ should be used as a last resort. The ‘Oh Hold’ option will allow corrections to be made.

- The ‘View Approvals’ section will let users see where requisitions are in the approval process.

- User wondering if there will be a page that links the requisition to its purchase order number.
- Confirmation from Jennifer that once the requisition has been pulled into a purchase order, the purchase order icon will light up, and the requester can click on the purchase order from there.

- User question: For the reviewer, if you’re a lab manager and you have signing authority to order on behalf of your PI, does the PI still need to approve it, or can the lab manager be the requester and the reviewer?
  - Jennifer: Everything in Requisitions is pulled from SAM. There will be a self-service component, and reviewers will be optional. Requesters will be able to turn it on or off, or delegate someone specific as a reviewer. However, the requisition will still need the budget manager reviewer.

- Technically a user can be both the requester and the reviewer, but this might not be the case going forward. Right now, if a requester has signing authority, they can also sign the requisition, because there will still be segregation of duties (since the requisition is going to procurement); but there is currently ongoing discussion as to whether this practice will continue in the future.

- User question: If a PI is the requester, and if the grant also has provisional delegates, then who will the requisition go to?
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• Jennifer: This is a situation she is presently examining. She can confirm that if a requester enters a requisition and they’re also a reviewer, the system will skip them. She is currently examining who the system will pull if the requester is also an approver. She’s trying scenarios before the go-live.
• User: We want the account holder to be the one approving it, not the provisional delegate.
• Jennifer: She’s still becoming familiar with SAM, but from what she’s seen, the system will pull in the provisional delegates and the account holder if they’re all within that role.

| 3. Demo from Lesley (Professional Development Reimbursement) |

• Faculty Relations has only a couple of approvers and reviewers, so this should be a smooth transition. The goal is to allow the Faculty Relations department to remove their online form, and to use the form that is already available to everyone else (i.e. the current online expenses form).

• In accordance with what users already do, this form will be located in the SFU End User Work Center. The PD purpose is up in the corner, and the GL code will run off this purpose. After users enter all their expense receipts, they hit submit, and it will go to the reviewer through workflow.

• If a user has two screens, they can slide their receipts to the second screen for easier viewing.

• When reviewers log into their work center, they will have a ‘My Work’ option, and clicking on that will bring up a console with their work. It will start with the oldest and work down to the most recent, and the reports will light up once they’ve been there for a while and should be actioned.

• Once the reviewer has clicked okay, the form will move on to the approver, and drop from the reviewer’s list (if it’s a pooled approach, it will drop from all the reviewers’ consoles). The approver will have an option to click on ‘Pending Approvals’, where she can see who has reviewed it. At that point, the approver will be able to approve it or send it back (there will not be buttons to deny it, hold it, or save changes). After that, it will drop from the approver’s list and it goes to Payment Services. At this point, they’re able to hold it, send it back, or deny it, and any chances that need to happen will be sent back to the claimant. If Payment Services denies it, it cannot be resurrected.

• Receipts will be verified to make sure GST recording is being done correctly for rebate purposes.

• The claimant can always go into their work center and see the status of their claims.

• Catherine is going to provide training for her pilot. Users can sign up for workshops this summer (where they can bring their receipts and learn how to use this expense form), and there will be additional workshops over the course of the next year. These will be held at least once per month.
Discussion

• Wendy: If one of our staff does an expense claim, normally it’s signed off by their director before it comes to us. Could you walk us through how the workflow is going to work?
• Catherine: Then they would be the reviewer. If the director reviews it, then they would have given it the okay to come to Wendy for budget purposes.
• Wendy: But they’re supposed to be approving it. Normally the reviewer would be one of my staff, looking at it to make sure it’s complete. Normally, a staff member completes an expense claim, and they would give it to their director to approve it, and then it would come to the finance staff. Then it would be reviewed and submitted.
• Janet: Shouldn’t review happen before the approval?
• Wendy: So it’s going to change direction?
• Lesley: Yes. We’re going to change the business process.

| 4. Recap and Additional Information |

• Sandra: There has been discussion about having a working group to discuss current processes, and to identify best practices. If users are going to need to change their processes, it will be good to understand what the current situations are, so we know what changes will need to be made.

• Going forward, Lesley and Jennifer will be providing workshops at all three campuses.

• Once this goes live, users are advised to keep paper copies of everything until their claims have been approved. After that, they are welcome to either shred them or keep them for their own records. Finance staff will not be keeping paper copies, but there will be an electronic repository.

• Scanning guidelines will be provided re: expense claims receipts.

• Jennifer: We are going to be creating different training aids, in addition to UPK training. Everyone learns differently, and we want to provide effective resources to aid with adoption.

• For employees who are working in the field, the fact that signatures will no longer be required for expense claims will make it easier for employees to submit their claims.

| 5. Answers to Questions |

• Please see PowerPoint notes for full question details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slide 7</strong>: Discussion re: how long claims will be allowed to sit in pending. Different areas may need different timelines. Doing the pilots will provide more information around these timeframes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slide 8</strong>: User suggestion to bounce the claim back. Jennifer: Only administrators will be allowed to bounce it back, and we will be establishing criteria re: what allows them to send it back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the initiator didn’t get an action, they will be able to see who they need to contact to see why it hasn’t been approved. Similarly, users at the end will see how the transaction moved forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slide 9</strong>: On the requisition summary page, users will see the action, the requisition name, the date, the requester, and the person who entered it. Jennifer will provide an image of that screen to everyone. (The initial PowerPoint slide said that this was not possible, but that was incorrect).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slide 10</strong>: The team will test the system in real life situations to see what that looks like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slide 11</strong>: The team will run Research Accounting pilots once the Fund Compliance development is complete. At present, there isn’t a way to do fund compliance, but the team didn’t want to wait until that was aspect completed. The goal is to move forward and start the changes gradually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Conclusion

- The team is proposing two pilots, followed by a working group to bring the results to everyone. At that point, there can be some more discussion. The team will be asking Catherine and Lulu to help with that and to share those experiences, since the team wants the actual users to be able to bring feedback to the rest of the group, instead of the team just describing how things went. |

- Lulu has already entered some transactions. There were requestors in the morning, and approvers in the afternoon. Everyone was able to use the system without any issues. |

- Lost receipts will still be addressed the same way they are today (with a lost receipt form). |

- There will be a Financial Stakeholders meeting on July 6th. Invites have been sent for that. |

### Action

1. Jennifer will provide an image of the requisition summary screen. |
2. There will be a best practices meeting scheduled to discuss the processes that users are currently using, and to identify how practices may begin to change with the new systems.
3. The team will be getting in touch with pilot participants to provide further information.
4. Catherine will be providing workshops over the course of the next year.
5. Lesley and Jennifer will be providing workshops at all three campuses over the next year.
6. There will be a Financial Stakeholders meeting on July 6th (invites have been sent for that).