Participants included:

Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Don Larson, Jorge Ohy, Eric Vermillion (by phone), Adam Cohen, and Jon Good.

Discussion Topics:

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

The meeting notes of July 12, 2006, were accepted without revision.

Project Status Update:

Schedule

Adam handed out the maintenance schedule and pointed out that Base ERS Release 7 would be issued on November 1. This release will address a number of enhancements and issues resulting from testing and actual production. With Los Angeles running ERS in production, and Davis, Berkeley, San Diego, and San Francisco engaged in a lot of testing in preparation for rollout, there have been more items to address. A subsequent release, to be scheduled, will include compliance monitoring reporting and more enhancements.

Requirements Committee Update

Jon Good reported that the Requirements Committee met via conference call in July, August, and September, focusing primarily on compliance monitoring reporting requirements. No issues have come up in the Requirements Committee needing escalation to the Management Group for resolution. The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, October 12, 2006, and will continue discussion on compliance monitoring reporting requirements and address a small number of enhancement requests.

Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam reported that the Technical Advisory Group continues to meet via conference call, primarily for question and answer sessions as well as second tier technical support. No issues have come up in that group for the Management Group. In the next Technical Advisory Group
conference call there will be discussion of authentication, particularly integration of Berkeley’s CalNet and UC Trust (initially for San Diego, but for all campuses as UC Trust is implemented).

Base ERS Budget 2006-2007

Jon distributed an updated “cash flow” spreadsheet, current through the end of August, and a spreadsheet showing projections for the proration method of calculating participant contributions to Base ERS support. On the latter, Jon pointed out that the proration is based on total direct cost (TDC) dollars reported in FY 2004-2005, as those are the most recent numbers available.

It was pointed out that TDC numbers for 2005-2006 should be available, even if the 2005-2006 financial report has not been finalized. Jon will follow-up with Jorge.

After some discussion of what constitutes the ERS “development” phase and when the proration method of Base ERS support contributions should begin, it was agreed that June 30, 2006, would be the end of the development phase for financial purposes and that the proration method of assessing Base ERS support costs would begin July 1, 2006.

Jon will revise the cash flow spreadsheets accordingly and distribute to the Management Group as soon as possible.

Annual Certifications for Professorial and Professional Staff

Mike Allred introduced this topic by distributing to the group a draft COGR document, “Compensation, Effort Commitments, and Certification: Policies and Practices”, and pointing out that the reason for examining annual certification specifically is to address the issue of summer researchers reporting 100% salary for summer though they’re not putting in 100% effort during the period.

Davis is actively looking at folding summer activity into fall period reporting and certification. This would be for all faculty and professional staff. The precise definition of this population is in the process of being defined, though right now that definition is focusing on individuals with career status (an unending appointment).

Davis is in the process of testing annual and 6-month certifications. If implemented, annual certifications would take place in August for the prior fiscal year. If annual certification turns out to be unworkable, Davis will fall back to 6-month cycles. Analysis and associated testing is expected to be completed by October 20.

Jorge Ohy noted that A-21 doesn’t prohibit annual reporting when using the “plan confirmation” method of effort reporting. UC has used the “after-the-fact activity reporting” method. However, it should be compliant with A-21 to have annual reporting for professorial and professional staff as long as more frequent certification occurs for everyone else. Whether annual reporting would
be the “best practice” or if UC should seek prior approval from the federal government are issues that need consideration.

Jorge also expressed his concern regarding the potential masking of a compliance issue through annual reporting (summary salary paid for work not performed in the summer).

Adam Cohen reported that annual certification was being discussed with UCSD and that research is being done on a potential ERS issue involving the effort calculation when academic year pay is combined with summer research pay. Combining these payments in an annual effort report could produce an incorrect effort calculation. Adam is working with Pixie Ogren to define the problem and work on possible solutions.

John Ellis noted that if annual certification is implemented at Davis, faculty at other campuses will want to report annually rather than more frequently, which will lead to serious pressure at the other campuses to adopt annual reporting. The Management Group will need to be comfortable with the approach.

Mike will distribute the Davis analysis to the management group for discussion at the November meeting.

Access to Comments on Effort Reports

Adam mentioned that on one of his visits to UCSF, Joyce Freedman had raised the question of whether it might be necessary to prevent comments on effort reports from being displayed to “outsiders” such as auditors. The Management Group agreed that everything in the ERS needs to be considered ‘public record’. The nature of the content of comments in effort reports needs to be addressed with training.

Campus Status Reports

Los Angeles – Sue Abeles reported that Los Angeles is in production and generated 9,600 effort reports for the spring 2006 reporting period. UCLA will certify quarterly. Not a lot of effort reports have been certified yet, but progress is being made. The general buzz from ERS users is good. Summer cycle reports probably will be released in November.

Don Larson asked how satisfied the technical staff are with ERS at Los Angeles. Sue responded that the primary person currently supporting ERS is relatively green but handling support well and is getting good support from the Base ERS Team. Triage of problem reports is being done by an individual in the central effort reporting function.

John Ellis asked about the kinds of questions being posed to the UCLA help desk. Sue responded that many of the questions are about access issues and are redirected to departmental security coordinators. Some questions are about potential enhancements desirable to end users. There have been issues of work-study folks inappropriately getting effort reports; this problem is being
investigated. A few issues related to: inability to access training modules; unable to generate blank reports; not being able to open a saved search list. There is an issue with system generating automatic notifications (feature not turned on at Los Angeles). There was a question of how to send saved reports to the PI. Some of the issues are training-related.

There was no specific training for PI’s. Some PI’s came to the information sessions. The Vice Chancellor for Research sent a letter to all PI’s about ERS and included a reference to online training. A lot of help has come from participants in the pilot, who are personally training PI’s in their departments.

Sue mentioned that San Diego is starting a users group, inviting folks from campuses to discuss implementation and rollout planning.

Davis – Mike Allred reported that Davis will have 30 minute training session for PI’s (in addition to mandatory online training). Davis will not be setting up new awards if PI’s don’t complete ERS training. Testing continues to encounter problems with data loads.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that go-live plans have changed from Summer 2006 to Fall 2006 certification.

San Francisco – Eric Vermillion reported that San Francisco is on track for going live in February for Fall semester certification.

San Diego – Don Larson reported that the team is testing now through next quarter. Departments have been engaged and are participating in the tests

Opportunities with Kuali

Mike Allred mentioned that Kuali board has expressed interest in UC joining the Kuali Research Administration (KRA) project. Kuali’s objective is to come up with a suite of applications that meet higher-education needs. UC is already a part of the Kuali Financial System (KFS), with $250,000 sponsorship from Anne Broome and the University contributing $750,000 of equivalent labor. KFS has post-award administration capabilities. MIT has contributed COEUS for pre-award administration (a couple of UC campuses still use COEUS).

The KRA will not be ready for at least 2-3 years. The question for consideration is whether UC would be willing to contribute ERS to Kuali as a component of KRA. Eric will bring up the question with the Budget and Planning Officers. Joyce Freedman will need to discuss with Contracts and Grants Officers.

The group agreed to continue discussion at the November meeting.
Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday November 9, 2006, from 10:00am to Noon. This meeting will be conducted via conference call.
## Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans
*October 11, 2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Effort Reporting Period Start</th>
<th>Calendar Start</th>
<th>UCOP Hosting?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Status/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
<td>Late October/Early November 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Spring quarter 2006</td>
<td>Mid-August 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In Production September 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Not Yet Determined</td>
<td>Not Yet Determined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pilot to begin with Summer 2006 reporting cycle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Not Yet Determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will use UCLA ERS</td>
<td>UCLA Overview presentation scheduled for 7/24/2006 at UC Merced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will use UCLA ERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>ERS Overview presented 5/22/2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will use Davis ERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>