

**Effort Reporting System Management Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**October 12, 2005**  
**Accepted November 9, 2005**

In attendance were: Sue Abeles, John Ellis, Joyce Freedman, Don Larson, Jorge Ohy, Pixie Ogren, Eric Vermillion, Adam Cohen, Deb Nikkel, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

Review and Acceptance of September 7, 2005, Meeting Notes:

The meeting notes of September 7, 2005, were accepted without revision.

Project Status Update:

Adam distributed the project schedule and commented on the following:

- Work is in progress on System Administration by UC Davis staff.
- Testing is where all of the Project Team's energy is being spent, helping pilot campuses get set up for pilot tests, etc. A bug tracking mechanism is in place and already there are about 40 items on the list. Sue Abeles asked whether these items were coming up in QA testing. Adam responded that some had come from UCLA and UC Davis as preparations for the pilot are underway.

Jon reported that the second phase of NIH Salary Cap modifications to PPS is scheduled to be released by October 21, if not sooner.

Jon also mentioned that discussion of corporate "sponsorship" of the "Effort Reporting Indicator" data element was under way at UCOP.

Don Larson questioned why the schedule shows ERS group meetings ending at the end of 2005. Adam responded that the schedule did not have dates for group meetings past 2005 only because of when this portion of the project schedule was last updated. Jon added that the Management Group had agreed to keep meeting, and had recommended that the Requirements Group continue meeting through the first year after the initial base ERS release to work through issues resulting from production use of the ERS. Even though the project schedule doesn't show it, dates for meetings of all three groups have already been projected through June 2006. Don suggested that meetings may not need to continue on a monthly basis in the future.

Requirements Group Update

Jon reported that the Requirement Committee had met briefly via conference call on 9/8. The Committee heard reports on the 9/7 Management Group meeting, discussed the Pre-Quality

Assurance work plan, and confirmed previously discussed clarifications of requirements details. The one issue that arose in the discussion concerned “multi-campus appointments”, where an individual is paid from one campus but is working at another campus. This practice raised questions such as which campus the effort report should come from and the “office of record” for the certified effort report. It was pointed out that if an individual receives pay on federal funds from both campuses, they will get two effort reports. The individual would have to certify each report separately. If an individual is paid from their “home” campus but works at the visiting campus, it could appear that nothing is charged to the federal funds. The group felt that this issue could be dealt with as a policy matter or a training issue depending on the number of cases. Requirements Group members are surveying their campuses to evaluate how many instances of this situation may exist.

Don asked how Payroll handles the multi-campus appointments. Pixie responded that the home campus pays the employee for work done at the visiting campus and a journal is later done to transfer appropriate monies from the visiting campus to the home campus. The destination of the journal is typically a clearing account at the home campus. There is no trail of pay at the visiting campus.

Pixie stated that there is no way the ERS can address the multi-campus appointment problem, and that all that can be done is to provide guidance to the campuses in this matter.

#### Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam reported that the membership has been expanded to include more technical folks from Berkeley.

At the October 18 meeting, the TAG discussed integrating ERS with existing campus authorization systems.

#### ITLC Discussion on ERS Hosting

Jon reported on the September 20, 2005, IT Leadership Council (ITLC) discussion on consolidated ERS Hosting. The ITLC was generally very favorable to the idea of consolidated hosting, suggesting that an opportunity like ERS to demonstrate efficiencies through consolidated hosting might not come along again for some time. Non-sponsor campuses expressed interest in exploring the option and requested arranging for a more detailed overview of the ERS, its capabilities, and technology base. Jon will arrange these briefings. The ITLC also requested information on the composite cost for ERS (base buy-in and hosting costs). Pending discussion later in the meeting, Jon will provide this information to the ITLC.

#### Project Finances Review

Jon reported that expense projections for FY 2005-2006 had been revised at the end of the first fiscal quarter and that expenses for the first quarter were well under estimate. Expenses for third and fourth quarters essentially remain unchanged as there have been no revisions to the original “maintenance mode” estimates since January 2004. The overall change is that the sponsor share for FY 2005-2006 is now projected to be \$53,000, down from the July projection of \$79,000. Jon asked, and the Management Group agreed, to request transfers of funds from sponsors in the amount of \$53,000 based on this latest projection.

### Buy-in for Non-sponsoring Campuses

Jon introduced this topic as needing endorsement of the ERS Management Group so estimates of costs for buy-in could be distributed to non-sponsor campuses. The spreadsheets distributed with the meeting materials show a simple method of buy-in, where the next non-sponsor to buy-in essentially pays for their share of costs incurred to date. Those buy-in dollars would then be re-distributed to existing sponsors. Eric Vermillion suggested that the Controllers and the Budget and Planning Officers should consult with sponsor campus vice chancellors about the buy-in methodology. Eric cited the fact that smaller campuses do not necessarily have the ready money to buy-in on an equal share, and suggested that it might be advantageous to give non-sponsor campuses incentive to buy-in sooner rather than later in keeping with the goal of uniformity of effort reporting across UC. Don suggested that it would be helpful to find out if cost is truly an issue for the smaller (non-sponsor) campuses.

Eric mentioned that the next meeting of the Budget and Planning Officers will occur November 30, and that the topic should be raised with that group then.

Jon suggested using the buy-in amounts he had prepared as a “worst case” estimate for presentation to the ITLC. The group agreed.

### Issue: Faculty and Professional Staff Certifying Their Own Effort Reports

Pixie Ogren introduced this topic by referring to the ERS White Paper as recommending that faculty and professional staff must certify their own reports. Pixie asked: How strong is the commitment of the ERS Management Group to have ERS strictly enforce this policy? Sue commented that she never saw the system as the enforcer of such a policy. Don added that there is always a need for flexibility to accommodate exception cases, such as people who have left the University. Sue commented that the recommendation in the White Paper was more of a policy to have departmental administrators enforce to the best of their ability, not a system enforcement policy. The group agreed that the system doesn’t need to enforce this particular policy, though a system-generated report indicating which faculty and professional staff effort reports were actually certified by others would be useful.

Jorge Ohy asked whether reports have been defined for this kind of monitoring. Adam responded that very few “canned” reports had been called out in the requirements definition, and a report

for this kind of monitoring was not among those in the requirements definition. Sue suggested that the pilot participants be asked to provide input on the reports that are needed.

### Communications and Training: Product Status, Review and Pilot Feedback

Deb Nikkel reviewed an updated plan for development and delivery of ERS communications and training products. Communications materials for all phases except the final implementation phase were developed and posted on the ERS website on October 5, 2005. Feedback from project leads at the UCD and UCLA pilot campuses was received and incorporated into the source products. Deb walked through the Planning Phase communications packet and explained the different components and messages that were included.

Development is in process for training modules and scheduled to be delivered to pilot campuses by October 31, 2005.

### Breeze/Captivate Overview

Acknowledging the Management Group's desire to have ERS training modules delivered that were Macromedia Breeze compatible, Deb explained that Breeze is a training delivery mechanism and learning management system (LMS), not a development tool. She also noted that not all campuses have Breeze. Deb noted that after talking with a number of campuses it was determined that one of Macromedia's authoring tools – Captivate – would be used to develop the web-based training. The advantage of developing in Captivate is that output can then easily be published to Breeze, WebCT and other LMSs that campuses may have in operation. Output from Captivate has the additional advantage of being SCORM/AICC compliant. Don Larson asked that the chart Deb prepared as a resource in the discussion be posted to the ERS website.

### Feedback from Campus Work Group Meetings

Los Angeles – Sue reported that: Rick Valdivia in UCLA Extramural Funds is on point for the UCLA pilot. With Pixie's input, Rick has prepared a very detailed plan for the UCLA pilot. This plan has been shared with the campus work group. That work group has been expanded to include departments with significant PAR activity that hadn't previously been included. A list of pilot participants has been developed. A demo for these participants is scheduled for October 21. Sue and Pixie had given a demo for the School of Medicine a couple of weeks ago. The UCLA Vice Chancellor for Research has agreed to sign some of the communications directed to deans and PI's.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley is about to sit down with key faculty to demonstrate ERS and get feedback. The Berkeley campus work group is also being expanded to include some departments with the largest volume of effort reporting.

San Francisco – Joyce Freedman reported that UCSF has gathered a work group that meets mostly via email and is communicating on ERS regularly.

San Diego – Don reported that a focus group has just looked at the effort reporting process and the focus group is enthusiastic about the direction of the system.

Davis – no report.

### Scope of Work for Maintenance Mode

Jon introduced this topic as important to planning for the ERS “maintenance mode”, which is scheduled to begin after the initial base release planned for February. Jon asked whether the group could articulate what level of change could be expected to ERS once the system was widely deployed and issues pertaining to the initial deployment had been addressed. The group agreed that they could not make anything more than a wild guess as to what maintenance activities will need to be accommodated. Don suggested, and the group agreed, that without any clarity to what maintenance activities will be required, that cost projections for “maintenance mode” err on the side of higher cost to preserve staff resources with knowledge of the ERS.

### Next Meeting

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