<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Statement:</th>
<th>Automate accounting JV by using Banner approval routing and imaging software (Nolij) for backups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program:</td>
<td>Banner Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created and submitted by:</td>
<td>Sharon Colman &amp; Mike Ulrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Owners:</td>
<td>Mike Ulrich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created:</td>
<td>9/16/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Modified:</td>
<td>9/28/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version:</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Current Situation

The current procedures for processing accounting journal vouchers are highly manual, affecting all business units across campus, and materially increasing the non-value-added tasks performed by Accounting Services (AS). There are internal controls in place, but the lack of automated approvals means that these controls do not always sufficiently prevent the possibility of fraud and waste. As well, paper records do not lend themselves to the campus need for “transparency”, making subsequent queries by business units and auditors difficult.

Here is an overview of how accounting JVs are submitted and keyed into Banner:

- **Campus**: A departmental user keys the details (transaction date, accounting strings, amount, etc) of a JV request into an Excel template supplied by AS. After keying, this document is printed and signed by a budget authority. They must also copy/print any supporting documents which justify this JV. Both the hard-copy JV and its supporting documents are then mailed via interoffice mail to AS.

- **Accounting Services**: When the packet arrives, they confirm it has the signature of a budget authority who is valid for the accounting strings on the JV. They also confirm it is accompanied by the appropriate supporting documents. When AS has verified both, they use the printed Excel spreadsheet to key the JV into Banner.

Problems with the current method of processing accounting JVs:

- Duplication of effort
- Potential for invalid FOAPAL segments on the paper JV submitted by departments
- Potential for keying errors by AS, when they key off the paper JV
- Potentials for oversight in internal controls
- Delays in processing
- Excessive use of paper
- Difficulty in later retrieving/viewing paper JV and backup (will be filed in AS area, or may need to be retrieved from archives)

2) Business Processes To Be Reviewed

- Processing of Accounting JVs
- Approval/authorization of Accounting JVs
- Submission of supporting documentation for Accounting JVs
- JV uploads processed via the Banner FWPJVUP process, to determine whether any of these documents should be switched over to submission via JV approvals
3) Functional Areas That Will Be Impacted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Business Services</th>
<th>Capital, FM, Safety &amp; Parking</th>
<th>Enrollment &amp; Student Services</th>
<th>Financial Services &amp; Payroll</th>
<th>Human Resources &amp; Payroll</th>
<th>Information Technology</th>
<th>Internal Audit</th>
<th>Internal Control</th>
<th>Legal &amp; Policies</th>
<th>Outside Consultant</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Budgeting</th>
<th>University Advancement</th>
<th>University Relations</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Required</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Identify Stakeholders

- Mike Ulrich, Accounting Services
- Diane Fuller, Accounting Services
- Sheryl Sparling, Accounting Services
- Nicole Goodman, BFA
- Ichi Pencil, Provosts Office
- Janet McLeod, Enrollment and Student Services
- Donna Chieppo, Payroll
- Kim Herrenkohl, Internal Audit
- Steve Weinberg, ADMCS

5) Identify Team Members

Note: All team members are proposal only. Proposed team members will be contacted after approval of this paper.

- Mike Ulrich, Accounting Services – Project Lead
- Sharon Colman, Financial Systems – Co-Lead
- Diane Fuller, Accounting Services – Advisor
- Steve Weinberg, ADMCS – Technical Lead
- Ichi Pencil – User Consultant – Provost’s Office
- Nicole Goodman – User Consultant - BFA
- Angela Andreason – User consultant – College of Business & Economic
- Debra Short – User consultant – Enrollment & Student Services
- Kim Herrenkohl - Advisor – Internal Audit
6) Relationship to Banner Initiatives Objectives

- **Simplify and automate business processes by implementing best-in-class practice**
  - Avoid human errors
  - Improve data integrity
  - Reduce process cycle time and unnecessary paperwork and handling
  - Increase productivity and improve accuracy
  - Integrate systems and reduce/eliminate redundancy and shadow systems

Accounting JV approvals will:

- **Automate business processes** by that are currently performed manually: JVs will be keyed directly into Banner; supporting documents will be scanned rather than printed and mailed; approvals will be on-line rather than hard-copy signature.
- **Avoid human errors** by removing the possibility that departments can key invalid accounting strings or a closed fiscal period into Excel.
- **Improve data integrity**, ensuring that approvers for all affected departments “sign off” on a JV, rather than just the budget authority for one department. This will ensure that the responsible budget authority/managers are aware of the charges being put into their funds since they will be on the approval route.
- **Reduce processing time** by eliminating duplicate data-entry and mailing of paperwork
- **Reduce unnecessary paperwork and handling** by eliminating Excel JV as JVs will now be entered directly into Banner; supporting documents will be scanned into Nolij Connect (or Nolij Web, if Nolij Connect is not ready).
- **Improve accuracy** by removing the possibility that Accounting Services will miss key off the paper JV, entering the wrong description, accounting string, or amount into Banner.
- **Eliminate redundancy and increase productivity** by removing the duplication of effort that occurs when JVs are keyed manually into Excel and then again into Banner.

- **Improve services to campus and boost customer satisfaction**
  Approvals will improve services to campus by making JV details and images of the supporting documentation viewable to originators and approvers both during and after approval. Currently this information is no longer viewable once it has been mailed to Accounting Services.

- **Improve reporting capabilities on:**
  - **Management reports**
  - **State and federal reporting requirements**
  Approvals will improve reporting by increasing the timeliness of reports: with automation and online approvals, JVs can be entered, scanned, approved, and posted more quickly.

- **Deliver effective training program to all identified end-users across different departments prior to “go-live”**
  - This project will include delivery of hands-on classroom training to both originators (keyers) and approvers, prior to go-live
  - This project will provide dedicated web pages with documentation, flowcharts, and training material, both during and after implementation

- **Provide efficient post implementation support to end-users**
7) Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient communication with campus</td>
<td>● Resistance to keying JVs</td>
<td>Hold communication sessions to announce project, explain benefit, and answer questions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Assumption that Accounting Services is foisting their work onto campus</td>
<td>● departmental meetings, e.g. Dean’s Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● BMAC (Budget Management Advisory Council) meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● HR/Finance Focus Group meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient training</td>
<td>● Banner JVs are incorrectly keyed by departments</td>
<td>Hold classroom training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● JVs continue to be submitted on paper for Accounting Services to key</td>
<td>Create captivate video on keying JVs and post to “Approvals” webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● JVs are submitted as uploads</td>
<td>Create Captivate video on approving documents and post to “Approvals” webpage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue structure not understood (because campus expects them to match the Budget Authority setup exactly)</td>
<td>Delays in getting approval</td>
<td>In communication sessions, include intent to construct queues based on department (Organization codes), rather than trying to match the complex Budget Authority approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email Organization Managers directly, clarifying the orgs they will approve for, asking them to nominate backup approver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue structure does not provide proper authorization for internal controls</td>
<td>Poor internal control</td>
<td>Review and seek advice on queue structure with Internal Auditor before finalizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of ADMCS support</td>
<td>ADMCS resources may be strained due to competing resources (other projects)</td>
<td>Delay rollout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek consulting help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) Research

Research on the BFINANCE listserv and the SunGard Commons shows that Banner on-line approvals functionality is well-established. Approvals are in use by many schools, including the following:

- Oregon University System
- Villanova University
- Virginia Tech
- University of Illinois
- University of Dallas
- Indiana State University
- University of Arkansas
- Ventura County CCD
- Salk Institute for Biological Studies
- Alamo Colleges
- Lake Michigan College
- Aims Community College
- McGill University
- Norwich University
- Seattle Pacific University
- University of Puget Sound

Note that these schools may be using approvals for other document types, i.e. they may have turned approvals on for one or more of Requisitions, Pos, Invoices, or JVs. Approvals setup and processing works the same way, regardless of document type.

See Appendix A for a selection of comments from the listserv and Commons. See Appendix B for the text of the SunGard Innovation Webinar “Finance Approvals – Best Practices”, broadcast Sept.2/10, conducted by consultant Gary Houck.

9) Process Review Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flatbed scanner</td>
<td>Departmental scanner for direct scanning into Nolij Web (existing networked scanner does not have this capability). Required for testing Nolij scanning features, and for support of this functionality to campus.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Possible need for outside consulting, to assist with programming</td>
<td>$185/hr</td>
<td>20 hrs</td>
<td>$3,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $4,700
Appendix A
Comments from the BFINANCE Listserv and SunGard Commons

Use of the Queue Limit field on FTMAPPQ
by Traci Ellington on 03/07/2011 12:56 PM 4 comments, 79 views

I would like to know how other Universities are entering the Queue Limit in the header of FTMAPPQ when there is a Next Queue involved.

We are in the process of revising/cleaning how our approval queues route and are set up. The main purpose for this is to make maintenance and creation easier. The problem that we’ve run into is that some of the approvers in the next queues only want to see documents that have amounts over a certain amount. Since these approvers are now in a different queue we can’t use the Approval Limit field of the base queue.

I had thought we could set the Queue Limit of the base queue at the threshold amount, then the next queue approvers would only get the document if that amount was exceeded. However, this has not worked. Instead the document errors in the approval process saying there is no approval queue that meets the criteria (if the document is under the threshold amount). I believe this might be a defect. Before I submit a ticket I wanted other input on the matter.

# | by Mildred Major on March 08 2011, 02:27 PM
All of our approval queues are set to a specific dollar amount, say $50,000. They also have a Next Queue. Once a document goes over the limit of the queue it is sent to the Next Queue. We then have levels within the approval queue, say $1,000, $5,000 and $50,000. At each level is a different user. If an invoice or requisition comes in that is $1,000 or less only the first approver sees the document, no one else. If the invoice or requisition is $5,000 or less only the first two see the document and can approve the document. The document is approved at each level.

# | by Ron Town on March 09 2011, 12:39 PM
You may want to check and make sure that the users at some level within the queues have an approval limit equal to or greater than the queue limit.

# | by Gary Houck SGHE on March 10 2011, 06:38 AM
I would recommend that the final approver in each queue has maximum approval authority ($9,999,999,999.99) so that any document that exceeds the queue limit gets approved and is moved on to the 'next queue" or final approval and released for posting.

# | by Tom Harrington on March 11 2011, 10:44 AM
I would also suggest there be two people at the highest level of each queue (proxy) so things don’t get bogged down if someone is absent/vacation
Maintaining Approval Queues
by Mildred Major on 03/04/2011 02:49 PM
We are currently having a discussion about the process we are currently using concerning the maintenance of our Approval Queues. They are currently maintained primarily by our Purchasing area where it concerns requisitions and invoices. We also approve certain journal vouchers and they are maintained by the Controller’s office. Three questions. (1) Who maintains your approval queues and why? (2) Is there a problem with segregation of duties if the person giving security access is also giving approval access? When documents go into the catch all queue who determines how to investigate the item caught, is it done by document type? For instance, if it is a requisition, does Purchasing investigate and if it is a journal voucher, does the Controller investigate??

# | by Wendell Vest on March 06 2011, 12:38 PM
At Virginia Tech, the approval queues are maintained by our General Accounting group in the Controller's Office. They handle all security functions and we placed approval queue maintenance in that group also. If an item goes to the catch all approval queue, our General Accounting group would investigate and follow up with the appropriate group.

# | by Cara Piperni on March 07 2011, 07:51 AM
At McGill, we have a separate 'Security & Infrastructure' group which is segregated from the day-to-day finance operations. This group does not perform approvals, but rather maintains queues independently of purchasing and the central fund administrators who approve transactions. If anything hits the Catch-All queue, this group investigates why, identifies the proper approver and obtains their written approval in order to release it.

# | by Andrea Noe on March 07 2011, 09:01 AM
At Liberty, the Financial Planning & Budgeting office maintains approval queues and Fund/Orgn security. We do this because the Budgeting office maintains the information regarding departmental reporting structure. All documents created by end users go through a department approval queue and then to the necessary Finance office for approval/processing. Documents submitted by our Finance team are routed through approvals by document type/rule group. The investigation of documents in the Catch all queue is also done by Budgeting.

------------
Subject: Re: Limited approvals for Invoices Script?
From: Josh Bergstrom <bergstrom@SALK.EDU>
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 11:57:42 -0700

Mark,
This is an easy setup within baseline Banner - no script necessary.

If all the invoices requiring approvals go to one set of approvers and all other invoices do not require approval, then you can setup two approval queues. You will want to set your approval level to 'Implicit' approvals on FOASYSC for invoices.

One queue will have the routing criteria on FOMAQRC for your funds requiring approval by document type, rule group and fund. The other queue will route by document type and rule group only (no FOAPAL routing).

Use FTMAPPQ to assign the approvers to each queue. The queue that does not require approvals will have all users
who process invoices in it at the highest $ amount (so these invoices will be implicitly approved by the user entering them and sent to posting). The queue requiring fund approval will have your fund approvers defined at the desired $ amounts (these will require manual approval assuming the user entering the invoice is not also an approver in this queue. If an approver enters an invoice, it will be implicitly approved by him/her.)

Joshua Bergstrom  
Salk Institute for Biological Studies  
Finance Dept.  
t.858.453.4100 x.1271  
f.858.558.9379  
bergstrom@salk.edu  www.salk.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: BANNER Finance Discussion List [mailto:BFINANCE@sungardhe.com] On Behalf Of Mark Hubbell  
Sent: Tuesday, March 23, 2010 10:42 AM  
To: BFINANCE@SUNGARDHE.COM  
Subject: Limited approvals for Invoices Script?

I am exploring ways to add approvals for invoices for only a few funds. It looks like invoice approvals are all or nothing. Does anyone have a script or workaround they use to force only certain invoices through approvals? It could be a script that moves the status to "A" for invoices if they do not fit the criteria of any approval routing codes?  
Mark Hubbell, CPA

==========

Subject: Re: Limited approvals for Invoices Script?
From: Brian Nolan <bnolan@AIMS.EDU>
Date: Tue, 23 Mar 2010 12:46:02 -0600

Hi Mark,
Why don't you set up an approval queue for each fund that you want to have direct approvals, with the approvers for those funds. Then set up another queue for all other funds with the AP data entry personnel as approvers. On FOASYSC set approvals for invoices to Implicit. Then invoices entered by the AP data entry personnel will flow through approvals with no intervention, while invoices for the few funds you want to go to approvals would go to the budget managers for those funds. Hope that helps . . .

--Brian

On 3/23/10 11:41 AM, Mark Hubbell wrote:
> I am exploring ways to add approvals for invoices for only a few funds. It looks like invoice approvals are all or nothing. Does anyone have a script or workaround they use to force only certain invoices through approvals?
>
> It could be a script that moves the status to "A" for invoices if they do
> not fit the criteria of any approval routing codes?
>
> Mark Hubbell, CPA

----------------------
Brian J. Nolan
Aims Community College
5401 W. 20th Street
Greeley CO 80632

============

Subject: Re: Centralize entry vs decentralized entry
From: "LEPAGE, ALBERT A" <alepage@MAIL.ACCD.EDU>
Date: Thu, 22 Jan 2009 08:36:14 -0600

Oscar,
My comments are inserted below and indicated by >>

Al LePage
Alamo Community College District
alepage@mail.accd.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: Oscar Barnes [mailto:OBarnes@ITS.MSSTATE.EDU]
Sent: Wednesday, January 21, 2009 1:24 PM
Subject: Centralize entry vs decentralized entry

Our departments key their own Requisitions and Invoices and everything
flows thru approvals. Our Internal Audit Department has a few questions
about this and we would like to know what other Banner Schools are
doing.

Questions are:
1. Are invoices/direct pays input centrally by Procurement/Accounts payable or by each department?
   >>Direct pays are input by end-users in all departments at our five colleges.
   >>Regular invoices (PO based) are input by our Central AP department

2. If invoices are input by the department, can one employee both input and approve or you require one employee
to input and another to approve?
   >>We have separate security classes for ”initiators” and ”approvers” that restrict the forms a user can access.
   Support staff are all granted initiator rights while departmental budget managers are granted approver rights.

3. Are requisitions input centrally by Procurement/Accounts payable or by each department?
   >>Requisitions, direct pays, and budget adjustments are all input at the departmental level. In addition, our library
   staff at the five colleges have the ability to input POs for a limited number of ACCT codes.
4. If requisitions are input by the department, can one employee both input and approve or you require one employee to input and another to approve?
   >>see answer to #2 above

5. How are Banner invoice approval limits set? by department head, dean, vice president, policy, or other (please specify).
   >>very straight-forward structure. Department manager can approve up to $5,000 and their supervisor can approve over $5,000.

Subject: Re: Approval queues
From: Brian Nolan <bnolan@AIMS.EDU>
Date: Thu, 8 Jan 2009 15:06:12 -0700

Jon,
Are you using implicit approvals (check on FOASYS)? If so, if the department approver is entering the documents, they will be automatically approved and forwarded to the next queue. Another thing you might check is to see if you have routing criteria on the buyer queue that might be causing it to bypass the department. Generally, queues that are used as next queues only shouldn't have any routing criteria.

HTH,
--Brian

Jon wrote:
Hi everyone, > I’m trying to troubleshoot an issue with our approval queues. Our setup > consists of one department approver queue, one buyer queue and one buyer > supervisor queue. The appropriate information is set up in FOMAQRC and the > correct buyer is in put in the next queue field in FTMAQQ. For some reason, > when a req. is submitted the department approver queue is skipped. The req > will go directly to the buyer queue and once approved, the buyer supervisor > queue. Does anyone know why this might be? > Thanks, > Jon Tyks > Financial Analyst > Bridgewater State College > Bridgewater MA > 508.531.1457

---------------------
Brian J. Nolan
Aims Community College
5401 W. 20th Street
Greeley CO 80632
Subject: Re: Approval Queues
From: Al LePage <alepage@MAIL.ACCD.EDU>
Date: Fri, 8 Feb 2008 12:19:53 -0600

On Thursday, 7 Feb 2008 David Court wrote (in part):
Montana State University is looking to implement Finance Approval Queues.
However there has been concern that this is just transferring the inefficiencies from a paper process to an electronic process.
1 - What Approval Queues have you implemented?
2 - How many Approval Queues (by type e.g. requisitions, Invoices etc)?
3 - How long did it take to do the initial set up?
4 - How many people did it take to set up the Approval Queues?
5 - Resource requirements for on-going maintenance of the Approval Queues?
6 - Which office is responsible for maintaining the Queues?
-------

David,
You should not just transfer inefficiencies from you paper process.

When Alamo CCD implemented Finance, we changed the authorization rules by eliminating a number of levels required by the old paper based system. This involved a Business Process Analysis calling together key administrators from all five of our colleges to streamline the requirements. In its simplest terms, this BPA authorized departmental budget managers to approve transactions up to $5,000. Above that level required one additional [NextQueue] approval. If a transaction uses specified technology ACCT codes an additional [NextQueue] is involved.

Answers to your specific questions are:
1 - we have distributed input to end users at all five of our colleges for requisitions, budget adjustments, and direct pay invoices. In addition, we developed local rule groups/classes that allow end user input of Interdepartmental Charges and Petty Cash Payouts as journal vouchers. All of these plus regular journal vouchers are controlled by approval queues.

2 - We have literally hundreds and hundreds of queues because we have five colleges plus the District. Some document types (like reqs and budget adjustments) are in the same queue for a given department because the same approval rules apply to both doc types.

3 - Initial set up during implementation was difficult because there were so many queues and all the FOAP component concepts were so new (and FOAP relationships were changing during implementation). If you are starting approvals after already being in live for a while this will eliminate a lot of the confusion. We developed the queue and approver structures in Excel
and uploaded them into the Banner tables.

4 - A lot of folks were involved in supplying the correct information for their FUNDS/ORGs, but just a couple folks at District worked part time on assembling the data for the upload.

5 - One person spends a portion of their time maintaining all Banner access rights, while a second person spends a portion of their time maintaining FOAPs and approvals. We have developed automated workflows that control all requests for Banner Access Rights and new or changed FOAPs. A component of one of these workflows captures information related to approval queues and approvers. Currently, the workflow does not capture all the data needed to make proper decisions on queues and approvers. Next week we are starting a re-design effort of the workflows to correct this shortcoming.

6 - Fiscal Affairs
Setting up approvals in Banner can be an arduous task, but the benefits are worth the effort - especially if you can eliminate some of the clunky paper approval requirements as part of the process.

Al LePage
alepage@mail.accd.edu

============
Subject: Approvals/timing question follow-up
From: "Wills, Judy" <willsj@VT.EDU>
Date: Wed, 18 Apr 2007 08:14:40 -0400

Thanks to all of you who have responded regarding my question on approvals and the issue after month end of documents from the previous period not being approved. It sounds like everyone is doing some kind of script/program to handle these documents proactively at month end and that is likely what we will do as it seems the most efficient.

Judy Wills  AIS - Finance Team
Virginia Tech  1700 Pratt Drive - 0214
Blacksburg, VA 24061
Appendix B
Text of SunGard webinar “Finance Approvals – Best Practices” (Sept.2/10)

Finance Approvals –Best Practices
Presented by: Gary Houck
SunGard Higher Education

Introduction
• The presentation will review how to establish the approval queues in the Finance module and look at some recommended practices for naming conventions, routing of documents, number of queues and proxy authorities.
• After this presentation you should have a better understanding of how the approval process works and how it can best be maintained.
• “Best Practices” is what works best for your school. One practice does not fit all. These practices need to be evaluated in respect for your business policies and requirements.

Agenda
• Approval Process review
• Approval Queue set up
• Approval Queue Maintenance
• Approval Day to Day processing
• Month and Year end considerations
• Other considerations

Approval Process review
• Review your Approval process and policies
• Try to keep it simple
  — As few approvals as possible — Organization hierarchy
  — Consider raising approval limits — Pcard limits
  — How identify required approvals in the COA - Hierarchy
• Fund or fund type
• Account code
• Organization code
• Program code
• Special purchases — who approves first?
  — Dept vs. Special — e.g. IT purchases
Approval Queue set up
• How many queues?
  — Different documents may require different queues
• Budget adjustments vs. purchasing vs. invoices
• Special approvals — IT, Equipment, etc.
• A queue can handle different documents if the approval requirements are identical.

• Next Queue or Not?
  — Maintenance when people change
• Use Hierarchy in routing to reduce maintenance
  — New grants (funds) or organizations
• Use rule groups for separate routing of documents
  — Invoices — direct pay vs. regular
  — Journal vouchers — budget vs. transfers
• FOASYSC
  — Which documents
  — Type of approval — implicit vs. explicit
• Proxy approvers
  — Oracle IDs and passwords
  — Several levels or queues

Approval Queue Maintenance
• Use hierarchy in routing — no need to update routing when new funds or organizations are entered.
• New approvers — back date effective date
• Write clean up script to remove terminated approvers
  — Approval history detail stays — uses SPRIDEN record
  — Run it regularly
  — Can be done manually by changing the effective date
• Write script/report to query queues for a specified approver
  — Eases updating when people change.
• Have a good one — submit thru our open sourcing process to get it considered for baseline.

Approval Day to Day processing
• Include approval queue forms in your
  — Quick/workflow flow for new FOAPAL elements — Routing
  — Quick/workflow for new hires — especially administrators
• Approval authority — new and terminate
Month and Year end considerations
• Outstanding approvals at
  — Month end
• Script/program to change transaction date to new open fiscal month.
• Notify approvers to take action
  — Year end
• Script to change transaction date to new fiscal year
  — Update both fiscal period and fiscal year
• Notify approvers to take action

Other considerations
• Workflows vs. Approvals
  — Workflows if reserving funds is optional or end of process
  — Workflow can open/initiate a Banner document – Req or General Encumbrance
• Approvals can be done in Self Service
  — Disapproved documents cannot be updated and resubmitted in SSB – yet.
• Possible future enhancement thru our open source initiative

Summary
• Review approval policy and authorities
  — Try to keep it simple
• Chart hierarchy helps to reduce maintenance
• Add approvals to Quick/Workflow for new hires and promotions etc.
• Scripts for month/year end to move transaction date
• Scripts to delete terminated approvers

Gary Houck
Gary.houck@sungardhe.com
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