Effort Reporting System Management Group
Meeting Notes
April 13, 2005
Accepted May 11, 2005

In attendance were: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, Karen Rust, Don Larson, John Ellis, Jorge Ohy, Karl Heins, Margie Pryatel (for Eric Vermillion), Joyce Freedman, Ken Orgill, Adam Cohen, and Jon Good.

Discussion Topics:

Review and Acceptance of Meeting Notes: The notes for the meeting of March 9, 2005 meeting were accepted without revision.

Project Status Update:

Adam Cohen distributed the updated project schedule while Jon Good reported that heads-down programming work continues. Another programmer has been added to the team to focus strictly on programming. The team currently consists of Adam and three contractors working full time, and Pixie, part time. Adam mentioned that another contractor will be brought in within the next two months to deal with testing/quality assurance. Also planned is the hiring of a programmer, as an employee, to provide continuity of support through the end of the development phase and into the maintenance phase of the project.

In response to a question from Sue Abeles, Adam reported that the prototypes will not be updated as development of the system proceeds.

Functional Requirements Work Group

Jon reported that the Requirements Work Group last met on March 10, with the primary discussion focused on combination of 9/12 and 11/12 appointments. The group had settled on a approach that uses factors to properly equalize percent time across different reporting periods The group also discussed the White Paper, with the group encouraged to provide comments via email as had been instructed at the time the White Paper was distributed. On the agenda for the April 14 meeting of the Requirements Group are: finalization of approach for 9/12 and 11/12 combination appointments, and exploration of the details of notifications and reporting.

Technical Advisory Group

Adam reported that the Technical Advisory Group had reviewed a web design guidelines document that articulates minimum standards at its March meeting. This document describes the web page design techniques that will be used for ERS and the browser requirements that these features dictate. Campuses will be reviewing the browser requirements to assess impact to the installed base.

The agenda for the next TAG meeting includes a review of the web application specification, which is a document of the "presentation view" of the web application including the content and format of each web page in the ERS system.

In response to a question from Mike Allred, Jon stated that the new ERS is a server-based system and does not require download/installation of any client-side component software.

Project Financial Status

Jon reported that all FY 2004-2005 funding transfers had been completed.

Jon handed out a worksheet showing funding and expenses projected over five fiscal years from the start of development, and highlighted the fact that the spend rate for the development phase is projected to be roughly 60% of the January 2004 project estimates. The lower than originally projected costs is a function of the scope control that the Management Group has maintained over the project. Sponsor shares for system development and maintenance are now projected to be approximately $80,000 for FY2005-2006 and FY 2006-2007, and $50,000 for FY 2007-2007 and 2008-2009.

Sue commented that the Irvine and Riverside campuses have expressed an interest in implementing the new ERS. Each non-sponsor campus electing to implement ERS will be required to pay an appropriate share of the development costs and ongoing maintenance support. Each campus buy-in would result in a rebate to campuses that are already bought in.

Discussion then turned to what work would take place once the development phase was completed and the maintenance phase begins. Jon reiterated that the model for ERS is similar to the Payroll/Personnel System (PPS) in that a "base" system would be maintained with releases distributed to campuses. However, while PPS has 50-80 releases each year, the volume of change anticipated for ERS is far less, but still not quantifiable. Jon commented that the project budget plan includes a higher level of staffing for the first 16 months following release of the system in February 2006 for the purpose of addressing fixes and in-scope changes that are inevitable following initial start-up of the system. Jon asked the group to think about what factors beyond technology currency and reaction to initial implementation that might necessitate system changes or enhancements. Margie Pryatel commented that the Management Group should continue its role into the maintenance phase to review proposed system modifications for purposes of scope and cost control. **It was agreed that the topic of continued oversight should be examined.** Sue suggested that the maintenance portion of the budget should include some margin for future enhancements. Jon commented that review of budget and costs is ongoing and that at this time next year, experience with the ERS in production will inform projections for FY 2006-2007 and beyond.

Feedback on White Paper Review

Sue reported that she has received very few comments on the white paper via the email address that was published and that most of the comments received to date were more editorial in nature

rather than substantive. Sue distributed a summary of the few substantive comments received on the white paper (to date). These comments include the following : (1) a request to make it explicit that each campus should develop and issue a cost sharing policy; (2) a question about whether third party cost share commitments should be handled in the system; (3) a request that the white paper cite specific title codes of those required to sign their own effort reports and address contingencies when the individual who must sign is not available; (4) a recommendation that reports be run 45 days after close of the reporting period instead of the 25-30 days stated in the white paper to allow sufficient time for a full month of payroll adjustments; and (5) a question about whether there should be a policy that addresses the allowability of incurring direct salary charges less than budget and making up the difference in the effort commitment on the effort report.   After some discussion, it was determined that the white paper could be amended to recommend that campuses proactively address cost sharing policy issues without being prescriptive on what the local policy should include. It was also determined that it would not be appropriate to handle third party cost shared effort in the ERS since it is not institutional effort. With regard to the request for more specific title code information about those who must sign their own effort reports, the Management Work Group determined that this should be left to the campuses since the campuses use different title codes. It was also agreed that how each campus deals with situations when the individual who must sign an effort report is not available is a local issue. Several campuses noted that they require the department chair to sign in the absence of the PI. There was agreement that the timeframe for running the effort reports may be influenced by the timing of local payroll cycles. It was agreed that the suggested window for running the reports ought to be "within 45 days" of the close of the reporting period. There was considerable discussion about the practice of charging less direct salary than budgeted and making up the difference in cost shared effort. From the discussion, this appears to be a common practice given re-budgeting permissions that the Federal government has extended to grantees. There was agreement that the cost shared effort would be considered committed cost sharing since the proposal budget committed the PI to certain effort %'s and should be captured in the ERS. Mike Allred mentioned that at Davis they would want their departments to amend the cost sharing commitment in their cost sharing system when this re-budgeting occurs so that this is captured and fed to the ERS.

Margie Pryatel indicated that the Budget Officers had discussed the white paper and will be sending their comments shortly; however, their concerns are that the white paper may be too detailed and may impede the flexibility of the campuses. She did note that in her re-reading of the white paper in preparation for this meeting that the white paper does a good job of explaining the "why" of effort reporting requirements and that she acknowledged that the white paper did, in many cases, leave specific decisions to local campus discretion. However, she urged the group to consider whether the white paper recommendations that are now more prescriptive could be viewed as a set of basic principles or guidelines versus strict policy requirements. There was a discussion about the fact that the Federal government continues to view effort reporting as a serious compliance issue and is actively auditing effort reporting compliance in their reviews. There was also an acknowledgement that the Federal government views the University of California as one system for purposes of the A-133 audit and that there has been a precedent for the Federal government to ask if issues that they find at one campus are also common practices at the other campuses.

Joyce Freedman indicated that she has not received any feedback from the Research Administration community but that they have a systemwide meeting scheduled the week of April 25 and she will ask for feedback.

Jon will provide Sue with feedback from the March 10 Requirements Group meeting.

Sue recommended that the Work Group wait until we receive final comments from the Budget Officers and Research Administrators prior to doing any editing of the white paper. Jon confirmed that the discussion of the policy issues and finalization of the white paper are not impeding the development of the system.

Feedback on Campus Work Group Meetings

Sue asked for reports on campus meetings about ERS.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that two meetings with departments have been held to discuss the new ERS and show the prototype, which was well received. The question came up regarding how principal investigators will be influenced to certify effort reports. Mike commented that Davis is making a policy that certification is required.

Davis –Mike reported that Pixie Ogren had come to Davis for meetings with the School of Veterinary Medicine as well as the School of Medicine, and that both meetings went well.

San Francisco – Ken Orgill reported that San Francisco's Program Management Office is coordinating campus communications on the ERS as well as system rollout and has scheduled a meeting for April 25th.

San Diego – Don reported that while in-person campus work group meetings have not yet occurred he has been sharing information, such as the prototypes and white paper, with his work group via email.

Los Angeles – Sue reported that the UCLA campus work group had two meetings recently and has settled into a monthly meeting schedule. The meetings have focused on sharing the prototype and use cases and discussion of the white paper.

Development of Strategic Plan for Communications and Training

Communications/Training Resource

A follow-up from the March 9th Management Group meeting was to find a communications/training resource to develop communications to the various constituent audiences (see "Audiences/Messages Grid", below) and to help develop a core training curriculum.

Sue reported that one lead she'd been following for a staff resource to help with communication and training was not promising.

Jon reported that he'd recently made inquiries at two campuses where he knew the potential might exist to find an appropriate staff resource, and he is waiting to hear back. At the same time, he's found a contractor who would fit the task(s) and is coming off assignment at one of the campuses. By end of April someone should be in place for this role. **It was agreed that whomever was selected to do the communications work should attend the next Management Group meeting where a work plan will be discussed.**

Audiences/Messages Grid

(Refer to the revised audiences/messages grid at the end of these notes).

Jorge suggested that the Campus Work Groups, Management Services Officers, and Grant Administrators should receive some of the background communications such as "What is Effort Reporting?". **It was also suggested that an additional message, "what is cost sharing?" be added. Joyce Freedman suggested, and the group agreed, that three messages should be communicated to all audiences: "What is Effort Reporting?", "What is Cost Sharing?", and "What is the Effort Reporting System (ERS)?".**

For the next meeting, the group agreed to give thought to the messages to be communicated in preparation for discussion of a communications plan.

UCOP Hosting of ERS

Following up on a request from the February meeting, Jon handed out a worksheet showing the estimated costs for UCOP to host an ERS implementation for a campus. The costs are approximately $100,000 for initial set up of the "base" ERS for campus use (includes hardware, software, labor, etc.) and approximately $100,000/year for operational support, including installation of "base" system updates provided by UCOP as well as technology currency. Neither of these cost quotes includes campus-specific customization at any level. Sue pointed out that the estimate didn't include any help desk support for system users. Jon remarked that, in this model, help desk support for end users is a campus responsibility.

Jon also noted that there might be a variance in the hosting costs of about $5,000, depending on campus data volumes.

Meeting Schedules

Jon commented that meetings of the Management, Requirements, and Technical Advisory Groups were scheduled only through June and suggested that scheduling of monthly Management Group meetings for the remainder of the development phase should get underway soon. All agreed that the Management Group should continue to meet monthly (2nd Wednesday

1-3pm) as should the other groups. Jon suggested that the work of the Requirements Group is winding down, but that the group can be scheduled for monthly meetings that can be converted to conference calls or cancelled if no meeting is necessary. Sue indicated that her office would coordinate the meeting room locations with personnel at OP and send out a confirming email.

<u>Next Meeting</u>
The next meeting is scheduled for May 11, 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 (revised 4/13/2005)

Message	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 cost sharing?	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
What is the Effort Reporting System?	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
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?															✔