Effort Reporting System Management Group
Meeting Notes
May 10, 2006
Accepted June 7, 2006

Participants included: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Joyce Freedman, Don Larson (by telephone), Eric Vermillion (by telephone), Jorge Ohy, Pixie Ogren, Adam Cohen, and Jon Good.

Discussion Topics:

Review and Acceptance of April 12, 2006, Meeting Notes:

Jorge Ohy pointed out that his name needed to be added to the list of participants. With this change, the meeting notes of April 12, 2006, were accepted without further revision.

Jon Good reported on a couple of follow-up items from the April 12, 2006, meeting:

- The ERS Project web site has been "locked down" in the sense that access to various materials (e.g., meeting notes) is only permitted from computers with a UC ip-address.

- Campuses interested in contracting with NIIT for customization of the training materials should contact Subroto Mukherjee at:

    Subroto Mukherjee
    NIIT (USA) Inc. - Knowledge Solutions Business
    1050 Crown Pointe Parkway, Floor 5
    Atlanta, GA 30338
    Tel: +1 (770) 290 6065 | Cell: +1 (404) 247 9490 | Fax: +1 (770) 551 9229
    Email: subrotom@niit.com | Websites:
    www.nitt.com/learning
    www.cognitivearts.com

- Printing of Training Materials – Macromedia Breeze does not handle printing of entire training modules. The equivalent material can be printed in its entirety from the PowerPoint source files that were imported into Breeze. NIIT has attempted to provide the final PowerPoint sources, but these have yet to be successfully downloaded from the NIIT server. Once this has been accomplished, the PowerPoint sources will be put on the ERS project web site.

Jon also mentioned that he meant to report at the April meeting that all ERS sponsor campuses have responded that there was no problem in adding the necessary fund table attributes to local financial systems. This was reported to the Requirements Committee at their April 13, meeting. This particular issue is closed.

Project Status Update:

Schedule

Adam Cohen distributed copies of the Maintenance Schedule and pointed out the following:

Release 3, the first batch of enhancements requested by the Requirements Committee, was shipped on April 28. Release 4, which will include distributed system administration only, is scheduled to be issued by the third week in May. Release 5 is planned for June and will include further enhancements as informed by the discussions and decisions of the Requirements Committee which meets tomorrow. Only a trickle of enhancement requests are coming in at this point in time. With Release 5, Base ERS should be caught up. After that, some technical changes will be implemented to help with serviceability of the Base ERS system. No Release 6 is planned yet. Pixie commented that some of the "deferred" items will be reviewed by the Requirements Committee as production experience with ERS occurs.

Pixie Ogren related findings on Payroll System (PPS) Salary Cap Fix (Release 1697) as reported by UCLA's Payroll Manager, Paula Farrington:

Three exception conditions are expected to be reported with respect to capped funds:

1. Pay in excess of the salary cap (obvious wrong)
2. When there is a By-Agreement payment on a capped fund
3. Rate adjustment on salary

In the first case, Payroll System logic is such that the exception condition is obviously wrong. In the second and third cases, however, the Payroll System cannot determine whether there is a cap violation, so someone needs to inspect the payments to make an appropriate determination of whether the cap has been violated.

The way the Payroll System reports these three different conditions, all of the above conditions are reported as they are encountered, in a format that is not very useful to reviewers. Instead, the exceptions should be grouped by the type of exception to facilitate review.

Pixie asked whether the way the report was being produced seemed less than helpful. The group agreed. There was brief discussion of campuses sorting the reported exception cases, but it was quickly agreed that there was no reason for all campuses to undertake this workaround. Sue Abeles asked whether the exception reporting followed the original requirements for the salary cap. Pixie responded in the negative. Sue and Paula Farrington will put in a request to Mike O'Neill to address this particular problem.

Requirements Committee Update

Jon reported that the Requirements Committee met in person on April 13 and continued reviewing enhancement requests. No issues requiring the Management Group's attention were raised during that session. Most of the remaining enhancement requests were reviewed. The Requirements Committee will again meet via conference call on Thursday, May 11, to review the remaining handful of enhancement requests.

Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam reported that the Technical Advisory Group is still meeting via conference call for question and answer sessions. No new issues have been raised by the TAG.

Non-sponsor Campus Status Update

Jon reported that an overview presentations have been scheduled with Santa Barbara on Monday, May 22, 2006, from 1-4 and Santa Cruz on Thursday, May 25, 2006, from 10:30-2:30.

Jon mentioned that he has not heard anything further from Irvine or Riverside about starting up the ERS. Sue asked whether there was a question of non-sponsor campuses buying in to ERS. Eric Vermillion responded that the Budget and Planning Officers from the sponsor campuses had agreed that none were expecting re-imbursement for the development work. It was suggested that the non-sponsor campuses may simply be waiting to see how sponsor campuses are doing with production ERS implementation.

UCOP Hosting Update

Jon reported the following from the UCOP IR&C team that is working on UCOP ERS Hosting:

- Berkeley – agreement on the service level agreement has been reached. The UCOP ERS Hosting Team has set up the QA environment and is in the process of installing the Base ERS System. Progress is being made on campus customizations (authentication and presentation). John Ellis mentioned that he had heard things are going well.

- San Diego – UCOP and San Diego will have a conference call on Friday, May 12, to discuss the service level agreement.

Campus Status Reports

Jon handed out a worksheet intended to provide "ERS go live plans" and status at a glance. Jon suggested that the three agenda topics ("Non-Sponsor Campus Status Update", "UCOP Hosting Update", and "Campus Status Reports") could be consolidated under the "Campus Status Reports" item and that the worksheet could be used to record a condensed status report in the meeting notes. The group agreed. (See the last page of these notes for current go-live status.)

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that the campus is starting to get serious with their implementation activities. He inquired how other campuses are interacting with faculty, in particular faculty participation in training. Sue commented that some departments plan to sit down with the faculty and walk them through the training; styles vary depending on the department and the faculty involved. UCLA already has online systems in operation and a track record with faculty that will make implementation of ERS easier than if it were the first system the faculty were seeing.

Davis - Mike Allred reported that Davis expects to have clean payroll data starting July 1, which means that ERS production will begin with the summer reporting cycle. Functional user groups (academic administrative support) have gone through training and review of the system. Reaction to the training materials was mixed, but the implementation team is getting feedback on which training modules work best so that a smaller number of modules may be assembled for the training. Two meetings with faculty, graduate student researchers, etc. will take place next week and further reaction will be gauged then. Academic administrative support staff will help guide which training modules will be used for academics. Mike offered to share the feedback on the training with the Management Group.

Los Angeles - Sue Abeles reported that a meeting with the campus Administrative Group (Information Technology, Extramural Funds Management) was held on Monday to discuss the timeline for implementation and putting more detail into the campus implementation plan. Campus plans call for a go-live date in mid-August or early September for the Spring reporting cycle. It may be necessary to allow more than 30 days for certification to occur during the initial rollout. Pixie pointed out that in setting their schedules and planning for training, campuses should consider that various audiences may have a need to go through training modules significantly in advance of the planned system implementation. For example, department administrators will need to do some business process planning, as suggested in the training materials, and if distributed security is to be implemented, then additional preparation and set up of users must be done by the Security Administrators before implementation.

San Diego – Don Larson reported that the campus work group had not met since the last Management Group meeting.

San Francisco – Joyce Freedman reported that nothing has yet happened, but that work will begin soon.

Jorge asked how UCOP figured into the UCLA rollout, since UCLA handles UCOP payroll and business services. Sue remarked that UCOP should be listed on the "go-live" worksheet. She also mentioned that if UCLA does rollout ERS in August, effort reporting for UCOP will have to switch to ERS at that time. Mike asked about effort reporting for DANR, which is handled at Davis. It was noted that changes in federal funding requirements will require DANR to do effort reporting soon.

Base ERS Budget 2006-2007

Jon handed out an updated ERS Cash Flow worksheet with revised expense projections for FY 2006-07 through 2008-09. He pointed out that the numbers were based on 2 FTE supporting the Base ERS Maintenance on an ongoing basis. Additionally, for FY 2006-07, there is an additional amount for contractor time to deal with enhancements and modifications to the Base ERS based on feedback from campus rollouts. Jon mentioned that the very first ERS budget identified $380,000 for FY 2006-2007 and beyond, and that the revised numbers were well below that amount.

Mike requested a comparison of the original budget amounts to the latest revisions to get a sense of how far in time the original projections would go in light of actual expenses and the revised projections. Jon will provide that information by the next meeting.

Policy Update: Contracts and Grants Manual, Accounting Manual

Jorge reported he had received a couple of minor comments from the group to incorporate in the Q&A. Once that is done, the Q&A will be ready for distribution. Jorge will then ask UCOP Accounting and Contracts & Grants to issue the revisions to manuals. The Controllers will weigh in on the new time limits on certification for campuses not yet up on ERS.

Marketing and Licensing of ERS

Jon handed out the document "Effort Reporting System – Licensing/Marketing Options", which described five options and associated income and expense characteristics, and pros and cons of each. Three of the options have UC providing some form of direct marketing, licensing, and support. One option is to have a third-party handle marketing, licensing and support, with UC getting royalties in return. The remaining option is to pursue a community or open source arrangement.

Discussion yielded the following points:

- A better understanding of what's involved in the community/open source model is needed. Jon will follow up with folks close to Project Sakai (a community source Course Management System) and elaborate on the model.
- Any decision to market and license the ERS will need to involve Budget and Planning Officers, Controllers, and the IT Leadership Council.
- Action on marketing and licensing the ERS will need to wait until rollout of the system has been accomplished and appropriate feedback on the system has been received. In essence, next steps in marketing the ERS will not be taken until the fall of 2006 at the earliest.

- All materials related to the ERS need to display a copyright notice. This may be a simple notice at the beginning of the materials; the notice does not need to appear on every page. This includes the system itself, training materials, the project web site, etc. The Requirements Committee, the Technical Advisory Group, and the campuses need to be informed to place a copyright notice in front of any ERS materials made available on campus web servers or shared through other means.
- With the appropriate copyright notices in place, it is okay to share ERS materials such as powerpoint presentations, training modules, etc. with other institutions.

Scenarios for 9-month Appointments

Prior to the meeting, Mike had distributed the document, "Effort Commitment & Cost Share Questions related to 9-month Academic Year Appointments", to share scenarios that Davis has used to guide effort reporting on campus. The document generated a good amount of discussion. Mike invited the group to email him with thoughts and question about the document.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday June 7, 2006, from 1:00pm to 3:00pm**. Confirmation of an in-person meeting or conference call will be sent by end of day on Tuesday, May 30, 2006.

Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans
May 10, 2006

Campus	Effort Reporting Period Start	Calendar Start	UCOP Hosting?	Notes	Status/Comments
Berkeley	Summer 2006	Fall 2006	Yes		
Davis	Summer 2006	Fall 2006	No		
Los Angeles	Spring quarter 2006	August/September 2006	No		
San Diego	Not Yet Determined	Not Yet Determined	Yes		
San Francisco	Not Yet Determined	Not Yet Determined	Not Yet Determined		
Merced				Will use UCLA ERS	
UCOP				Will use UCLA ERS	
Irvine	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005
Riverside	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005
Santa Barbara	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview scheduled for 5/22/2006
Santa Cruz	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview scheduled for 5/25/2006