Stakeholder Survey Results

Purpose: To assist the project team understand where we are at from a project communication and organizational change standpoint.

Audience: FMC (Finance Management Committee)

- Survey date October 6, 2015
- 10 questions, mostly quantifiable questions with some space for comments
- 28 responses of 35 surveyed

Next Steps: In-person follow-up:
  - survey specific questions at more granular level
  - open Q&A session regarding overall project

On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate your level of awareness about the budget planning implementation.

- 39% No Awareness
- 21% 1
- 29% 2
- 11% 3

On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate your level of interest in the related budgeting changes.

- 82% High Interest
- 18% No Interest

- 1 -
... how big an impact you feel this implementation and related budgeting process change will have on your unit/faculty.

- No Impact:
  - 3%
  - 4%
  - 36%

- Large Impact:
  - 3%
  - 18%
  - 39%

... activities you and your team currently perform, and the frequency.

- Develop Annual Budgets:
  - 1
  - 2
  - 6
  - 15
  - 24

- Modify Existing Budgets:
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - 6
  - 17

- Monitor and Report on Performance Against Budget:
  - 1
  - 3
  - 6
  - 2
  - 5

... indicate your level of confidence in the success of this budgeting initiative.

- No Confidence:
  - 13%

- Total Confidence:
  - 58%
  - 29%

... how many people in your unit/faculty have an active role in your current budgeting process.

- 1-5:
  - 11%

- 5-10:
  - 25%

- 10-20:
  - 46%

- 20-30:
  - 18%

- 30+:
  - 1%
### Stakeholder Survey Results

Top ranked Pain Points by lowest (best) average ranking and number of times ranked in top 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
<th>Top 3 Rank Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forecasting and variance is difficult to perform on monthly basis</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reporting process requires data consolidation (manual process)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hard to compare salary paid against budgeted salaries (risk of unfunded staff)</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Challenging to track grants, donations and contributions within the operating fund</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Absence of budgeting across all funds</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Commitment tracking is often manual in nature</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Management of flex funds is difficult</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No consistent reporting format across all funds</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No ability to budget over multiple years</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budgeting only possible at department and program level (sometimes need is at a more granular level)</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Difficult to track and report on transfer funds</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of Reports

#### FSGLV12
- Never: 46%
- Annually: 11%
- Quarterly: 14%
- Monthly: 14%
- Weekly: 4%

#### FSFLEX
- Never: 36%
- Annually: 32%
- Quarterly: 14%
- Monthly: 14%
- Weekly: 4%

#### FSGLV65
- Never: 35%
- Annually: 46%
- Quarterly: 11%
- Monthly: 4%
- Weekly: 4%

#### Other Reports/Tools
- Never: 58%
- Annually: 19%
- Quarterly: 11%
- Monthly: 8%
- Weekly: 4%

*mostly Cognos and other PeopleSoft reports*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments, re: confidence in success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am confident that a good product will be delivered. However, the difficulty will be coming up with a budgeting tool that works for all faculties.</strong> There are a lot of competing ideas for what the budget model needs to look like but I know there will be a lot of effort dedicated to assessing the different requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am concerned about creating a budget system without fully knowing and understanding the budget model the University will use.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I have high confidence, but I do worry about the complexity of the project and the ability of the University to fund the project appropriately for success for the long term.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I don't have a good understanding of the scope (hands-on) yet, or the changes in all processes intended. I think a walk through the RFP would have been useful, but again, I am not sure what is in the RFP. We seem to go through a discovery process and then decide what we could and should do, rather than have specific goals in mind, or maybe I am not understanding the process.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not sure how will integrate into Peoplesoft financials—would like one stop shop for budgeting and producing monthly annual reports—peoplesoft would then be for details and GL extracts of transaction level,</strong> hurray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Implementation Issues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am confident that a good product will be delivered. However, the difficulty will be coming up with a budgeting tool that works for all faculties. There are a lot of competing ideas for what the budget model needs to look like but I know there will be a lot of effort dedicated to assessing the different requirements.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I'm new to the project and not knowing the level of business requirements that have been gathered. XXXX budget is very simple, but others who manage billable projects ie. Building renovations, IST Projects are more complex in the approach - rate driven vs actual driven, Labour Pools, etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not enough familiarity with it yet.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time it takes to get systems operational is very prolonged at UA and product delivered is usually less than robust as implied by the 1-11 ranking requested above. The requirements listed are all mission critical and many are inter-related or symptoms of current budgeting and reporting deficiencies. To recap a multi-year, multiple fund budgeting and reporting to a person and project granularity/full COA is required to manage our funds.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vagueness re: what the changes are being implemented</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>