

Effort Reporting System Management Group
Meeting Notes
March 9, 2005
Accepted April 13, 2005

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

Discussion Topics:

Review and Acceptance of Meeting Notes: The notes for the meeting of February 17, 2005 meeting were accepted without revision.

Project Status Update:

Adam Cohen distributed the updated project schedule while Jon Good reported that the majority of design work has wrapped up, with Technical Advisory Group input, and that heads-down programming work is moving along. Another programmer will be added to the team to focus strictly on programming from the design specifications the team has developed.

Functional Requirements Work Group

Jon reported that the Requirements Work Group had not met since before the February 17 ERS Management Group meeting, but would be meeting the next day (March 10). On the agenda for the Requirements Group are discussion of handling 9/12 and 11/12 combination appointments, and review of the white paper.

Technical Advisory Group

Adam reported that the Technical Advisory Group will be meeting March 15 and will be examining development conventions: browser compatibility, coding and data exchange conventions, etc.

Project Funds Transfers

Jon reminded the group of the January 14, 2005 email requesting transfer of funds from sponsor campuses. UCLA had already transferred funds, UCSF is in the process of transferring funds, and the UCOP share is being arranged. Mike Allred, Don Larson, and John Ellis indicated that they had requested funds be transferred from their campuses (Davis, San Diego, Berkeley, respectively) and that should have been taken care of by now. Jon will ask administrative folks handling receipt of funds to double check on the status of these transfers and will provide follow-up on status individually.

John Ellis inquired about progress on getting information about UCOP hosting ERS for campuses. **Jon responded that UCOP is developing a refined cost model for hosting and will discuss costs for UCOP hosting at the next meeting.**

Feedback on Campus Work Group Meetings

Davis –Meetings with campus effort reporting group have taken place. These meetings included a walk-through of the prototype and discussion of the white paper. These meetings went well. Jon and Adam attended a recent campus Technology Infrastructure Forum meeting attended by technical representatives from Information Technology and campus departments...presentation was described as informative and worthwhile. Pixie will be on campus on 3/22 for meetings with the School of Medicine, which is working through issues related to Payroll data involving salary caps, and the School of Veterinary Medicine which does not direct-charge effort (doing lots of transfers of payroll expense which will cause havoc in the ERS context). A meeting with the Council of Deans is planned.

Mike stated that he would like to announce to the campus that Summer 2005 effort reporting will happen on the new system in the October/November 2005 timeframe. Sue suggested that complexity of Effort Reporting may be such that communication, training, and deployment at the campus may require more realistic representation of the final product other than the current prototypes. Mike will wait on May/June development status to assess whether this will be a realistic target or whether reporting via ERS should be pushed back to the Fall 2005 period (reporting in January/February 2006).

Mike reported that Davis has a cost sharing system ready to go, though it currently is awaiting cost sharing data.

Berkeley – John reported that only general discussions have taken place regarding the white paper and the topic of how to get faculty on board with the ERS. No walkthrough of the prototype has occurred yet.

Sue remarked that based on a UCLA walkthrough of the prototype, where Pixie was present, it would might be helpful to all to have project team members, who are familiar with the prototype presentation, attend campus work group meetings to provide a consistent presentation of the prototype. It was agreed that this would be helpful to the project overall and that travel for team members should be covered by project funds as this was an anticipated activity for team members.

Los Angeles – Sue reported that the UCLA campus work group met on 3/8, the first time in several months. There's "excitement" about the new system, but still a lot of questions from campus participants. The 3/8 session was 1-1/2 hours and that wasn't enough time to cover all the materials. There is a sense that a lot of hands-on training will be needed for department effort reporting coordinators as well as for principal investigators. The new ERS will involve a cultural change, and this may take more time to work through than actual technical implementation of the system. The work group has agreed to meet on a monthly basis through implementation.

San Diego – Don reported that campus work group meetings have not yet occurred.

San Francisco – Ken Orgill reported that some meetings have occurred on the functional side, but he was not aware of whether prototype review had occurred. Adam reported that he had

recently provided background on the project to Deb Nikkel in the UCSF Project Management office, to help them get started with campus implementation planning.

Adam suggested, in general, that consideration should be given to parallel testing, particularly whether this is a reasonable thing to do or even whether it is feasible. **It was agreed that parallel testing could involve some significant work to compare results, and that the decision to parallel test would be left to the campuses.**

Development of Strategic Plan for Communications and Training

John Ellis handed out hardcopy of training materials that Johns Hopkins had prepared for their effort reporting implementation. There was consensus that these materials were good and could possibly be used as a template for ERS training materials.

The group discussed developing a common training package, perhaps by an outside consultant, that could be used as is or with local modification in campus training programs. Macromedia's Breeze was pointed out as a technology that could be used to convey the training materials.

It was agreed that separate training materials for faculty and staff would be needed. Further, it was agreed that all audiences at each of the campuses would need to be identified, and the associated message for each audience formulated, to facilitate the development of common training materials.

It was suggested that a training specialist be contracted to develop the training materials. There was agreement that knowledge of subject matter **and** training expertise would be needed to be successful. It was agreed that a group consisting of campus people and a dedicated training preparation specialist working on training materials would likely be the most practical and successful approach. Mike suggested and we all agreed that with savings on the overall project budget, we should be able to bring in such a training specialist. **Jon will prepare a profile (job description, responsibilities, schedule) for a training specialist and will explore availability of a UC resource from the Requirements Group or others from any of the campuses before seeking someone from outside of UC.**

Discussion turned to the variety of audiences and the messages to be communicated to those audiences. The following table shows the audiences and associated messages, along with the agreed upon timeframe for the preparation of associated communications and training materials.

| Timeframe | Audiences | Messages |
|--|--|---|
| March 9 – June 8, 2005 (ERS Management Group) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executive Vice Chancellors • Vice Chancellors of Research • Academic Council • Deans • Chairs • Academic Senate | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do we need to do effort reporting? • What is effort reporting? • What is the Effort Reporting System (ERS)? • What is the timeframe for beginning to use ERS? • What are the implications to workload for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty? ○ Department Staff? |
| March 9 – September 8, 2005 (who will do this is to be determined) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campus Work Groups • Management Services’ Officers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of the process • Use of the System • Policy Implications |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant Administrators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of the Process • Use of the system • Policy implications |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty – Principal Investigators • Faculty – Other • Key Academic Personnel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do we need to do effort reporting? • What is effort reporting? • What is the Effort Reporting System (ERS)? • What is the timeframe for beginning to use ERS? • What are the implications on workload for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty? ○ Department Staff? • Use of the System • Policy Implications |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Administration (Pre/Post Central Units) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View of system data & calculations |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payroll Office Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View of system data & calculations |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Security Administrators | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do I set up people? |

[The last page of these notes shows the same information in grid form.]

The group agreed that high-level communications need to be developed now, while more detailed communications and training materials can be completed on a longer timeframe, particularly as details of the developed system are settled.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for April 13, 2005 from 1:00 to 3:00 at UCOP (Conference Room 10325 Franklin). This will be an in-person meeting.

ERS Communications – Audiences and Messages Grid

| Message | Audience | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------|--------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Executive Vice Chancellors | Vice Chancellors of Research | Academic Council | Deans | Chairs | Academic Senate | Campus Work Groups | Management Services' Officers | Grant Administrators | Faculty – Principal Investigators | Faculty – Other | Key Academic Personnel | Research Administration (Pre/Post-Award) | Payroll Office Staff | Department Security Administrators |
| Why do we need to do effort reporting? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| What is effort reporting? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| What is the Effort Reporting System (ERS)? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| What is the timeframe for beginning to use ERS? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| What are the implications to workload for Faculty? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| What are the implications to workload for Department Staff? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Management of the effort reporting process | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Use of the ERS system | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Policy implications | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| View of system data & calculations | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| How do I set up people? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ✓ |