

**Effort Reporting System Management Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**February 17, 2005**  
**Accepted March 9, 2005**

In attendance were: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, Karen Rust, Don Larson, Pixie Ogren, John Ellis, Jorge Ohy, Eric Vermillion, Karl Heins, Adam Cohen, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

Review and Acceptance of Meeting Notes: The notes for the meeting of January 12, 2005 meeting were accepted without revision.

Project Status Update:

Adam Cohen distributed the updated project schedule and pointed out that a pilot of the ERS had been added to the schedule for the September/October timeframe. In response to whether this would be a “production” pilot, Jon Good responded that is what is intended, though that might have to change depending on the outcome of development work that will go on through the summer.

Jorge Ohy mentioned that he’d heard of an interest by campus auditors wanting to provide input on the ERS. Karl Heins clarified that this was a local implementation issue rather than a systems development issue. Jon asked if an ERS project overview presentation to campus auditors might be of value. **Karl responded that he would check with Pat Reed about including ERS on the agenda of one of the quarterly Audit Directors meetings, suggesting that a project overview, brief demonstration of the system, and a review of internal controls would be good topics.**

Don Larson expressed interest in UCOP hosting of the ERS. Jon noted that UCOP hosting was an option that had been discussed as cost estimates for campus implementation were being prepared a year ago and that a fresh look at the estimate for UCOP hosting is in order now that more details of the system design are known. **Jon will prepare a new estimate for UCOP hosting of ERS within two months.**

Functional Requirements Work Group

Jon reported that the Requirements Work Group had successfully worked through a number of case scenarios and refinement of the mock-ups over the course of its past two meetings. In response to a question from Mike Allred, Jon commented that the mock-up ERS web pages had been well received by the Requirements Work Group.

Pixie mentioned that the Requirements Work Group had found that the roll up of detail for a given sponsored project would vary by campus because of the different Financial Accounting Unit (FAU) structures in use. Roll-up is necessary to avoid showing multiple lines of smaller effort percent for a single sponsored project. One example when an individual is paid through two different departments for work on a single sponsored research project, different account

numbers are used in conjunction with a common fund number. Another example is the use of account/cost center at some of the campuses. Because of variations among the campuses in the structure of the FAU, some guidance is needed in determining how roll-ups will occur. **Pixie asked the group to think philosophically about this issue and bring ideas to the next Management Group meeting for discussion.**

### Technical Advisory Group

Adam reported that database design review had been completed. The review of the PPS data interface had been completed earlier and that campus test files are being provided at this time. Financial System interface files will be coming into UCOP in the next week or two.

### User Interface Prototype and Use Cases

Adam distributed a handout of the use cases and walked the group through each of the cases.

Karl commented that the format of the worksheet detail was useful and asked whether the format will be preserved in the ERS. Adam responded that the detail will be available in drill-down form in the ERS.

In response to a question, Adam noted that the system design will allow for campuses to define separate effort reporting schedules for staff titles and academic titles.

Sue Abeles commented that UCLA will need to distinguish Merced employees from UCLA employees, and that an offline discussion is needed about how this might be handled in ERS so UCLA can avoid having to run a separate ERS instance for Merced.

Adam walked the group through the ERS web page mock-ups. The general consensus of the group was that the mock-ups looked great.

Mike asked if the mock-ups and the case scenarios were available on the ERS project web site. **Adam responded that the mock-up was available and that the case scenarios would publish links to these materials soon after the meeting concluded. (The following are those links).**

The on-line version of the prototype presented today is at:  
[http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/proto/proto\\_v4/](http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/proto/proto_v4/)

The case scenarios Excel workbook is at:  
[http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/ers\\_req\\_phase.html](http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/ers_req_phase.html)

### White Paper

Sue suggested that that this would be last review of the white paper and that distribution for wider review would be the next step.

Various minor changes to the text were noted and the group agreed that the paper was ready for wider review.

Sue will send the revised version of the paper to the group for wider distribution, which will be forwarded by the group members to their corresponding constituent groups:

- Eric Vermillion to Planning and Budget Officers
- Joyce Freedman to Research Administrators
- Sue Abeles to Controllers
- Karl Heins to Auditors
- Jon Good to ERS Functional Requirements Group

Eric suggested that a simple paragraph introducing the intent of the white paper be drafted as part of the cover for the wider distribution so as to properly set the stage for the scope of feedback desired. **Sue will distribute a paragraph that can be used for distribution of the white paper.**

#### Communications and Education Strategy

Sue remarked that the group needed to work out a strategy for communicating with and educating those who will be using the new ERS. With little time remaining in the meeting for this discussion, it was proposed that this topic be the main agenda item for the next meeting. The central issues for discussion are:

- what channels should information be communicated through? (explore common channels as well local campus channels)
- what materials should be prepared to facilitate communication?

On this latter point, Eric suggest that each campus bring examples of local campus communication and training efforts for discuss at the next meeting.

#### Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2005 from 1:00 to 3:00 at UCOP (Conference Room 10325 Franklin). This will be an in-person meeting.