

Effort Reporting System Management Group
Meeting Notes
November 9, 2006
Accepted December 13, 2006

The meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included: Sue Abeles, Kathy Hass for Mike Allred, John Ellis, Joyce Freedman, Don Larson, Jorge Ohy, Eric Vermillion, Pixie Ogren, Adam Cohen, and Jon Good.

Discussion Topics:

Review and Acceptance of October 11, 2006, Meeting Notes:

The meeting notes of October 11, 2006, were accepted without revision.

ERS Users Group

Don Larson reported that turnout was good and it appears that most of the participants got a lot out of the session: meeting one another, sharing implementation experiences, discussions of accountability and controls, etc.

Joyce Freedman asked about the population of participants. Don responded that participants were from project, functional and department business officers, and technical areas. The breakout sessions followed management, functional, and technical lines. Good discussions all around. Don hopes that as we learn more about what we are doing and not doing with the ERS implementations, the users group coming together will be helpful to the dialogue of practical solutions.

Sue commented that there were about fifty people present, including some from Riverside, which is a non-sponsor campus looking to implement ERS in the near future. All of the sponsor campuses were present. This was a good opportunity for UCLA to share initial implementation experiences and some of the issues that hadn't been anticipated through the development and implementation processes.

There were discussions about differences in the way things are done at each of the campuses. Overall, the Users Group felt that it would be useful to reconvene in the Spring after some of the other rollouts happen and discuss issues resulting from those rollouts.

Don noted that UCSD had a lot of department business officers attend the session and it was helpful to have a business officer from UCLA speak to their implementation.

Eric Vermillion mentioned that UCSF has concerns about the currency of the Base ERS training materials, which do not reflect some significant changes to the Base ERS since the initial release

in February. Jon Good noted that this comment had been raised and that Adam and he have been discussing how to bring the training materials current with in-house resources.

Sue asked whether we need to look at long-term maintenance of the training materials. UCLA would like to use web-based training on an ongoing basis.

Kathy Hass mentioned that Davis has consolidated many of the modules into one, responding to faculty feedback about “too many modules”. Davis will be providing their own audio.

After some discussion, it was agreed that the Base ERS training materials needed to be brought current and kept current for a while. Adam will arrange to bring the materials current, though audio will become a campus responsibility. Adam will also provide the Powerpoint sources, which will include appropriate animations of screen displays.

Project Status Update:

Schedule

Adam reported that Release 7 will be released on Monday, November 13. This release catches the Base ERS up with all approved enhancement requests and bug fixes. Among the significant enhancements are: better browser compatibility and navigation changes allowing users to move directly from one effort report display to another from among a list of effort reports. The project team will be helping campuses through November and December with the installation and implementation of Release 7.

Requirements Committee Update

Jon Good reported that the Requirements Committee met via conference call in October, continuing discussion 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, November 9, 2006, and will address a small number of enhancement requests.

Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam reported that the Technical Advisory Group last talked in October, and decided that individual implementation meetings with each campus would take the place of TAG conference calls through December. The TAG will next meet by conference call in January.

Base ERS Budget 2006-2007

Jon reported that he would distribute by Monday November 13, the budget information revised per the October Management Group meeting discussion.

Annual Certifications for Professorial and Professional Staff

Kathy Hass reported that meetings have been held with Davis faculty members on this topic. The feedback from faculty has been that the period October-September is the best for reporting effort. The campus is examining phasing in annual reporting by first reporting effort for a six-month period (7/2006-12/2006), then a nine-month period (1/2007-9/2007), and finally the first twelve-month period (10/2007-9/2008).

Kathy reported that Mike Allred wanted to know if Management Group had any concerns with this approach of one single annual reporting period. It had been reported earlier that 11/12 payment combined with summer payment presents a problem and that Pixie was going to do some research on the issue. Pixie noted that she had done some research into policy and calculations, and is not sure that there is a problem with the system as it is currently configured. Pixie then asked whether Kathy has inquired of other campuses about potential impact and suggested having an offline discussion with Kathy and Adam to see what, if any, issues remain. Kathy mentioned that split appointments with 9/12 and 11/12 pay plus summer compensation might be a problem.

Sue raised the question of whether an annual reporting cycle is really allowable since, in the “after the fact” certifications model that UC follows, effort reporting is supposed to occur not less frequently than twice a year.

Sue also pointed out that such a change in reporting would need cognizant agency approval.

Pixie pointed out that there will be issues with accuracy of effort calculation for annual reporting with certain appointment combinations (9/12 with 9/9;) that need to be discussed and resolved and that system modifications will need to be made to accommodate annual reporting. The heart of the issue is folding summer research report into a single annual effort report. All campuses currently use off-quarter reporting to deal with summer salary. The issue of allowability of annual reporting needs to be resolved before system modifications are begun.

Jorge asked whether the annual reporting option would be a campus-by-campus option or would agreement be needed throughout the University? Sue responded that, from an A-133 audit perspective, UC is examined as a system, not individually by campus.

Don Larson expressed concern about too-frequent effort reporting inferring precision. He pointed out that documentation of practices across UC is needed.

Sue also pointed out that Payroll adjustments, to clean-up annual effort reports, could happen outside of a 120 day limit. Don suggested effort reporting should not be a payroll clean-up tool. Kathy mentioned that the Davis campus envisions having more frequent payroll reviews (enhanced controls) to further minimize the impact of payroll changes on annual effort reports.

Kathy mentioned that annual effort reporting is allowed when the “plan-confirmation” method of reporting is used. However, that’s different than the “after the fact” method currently used by UC, and may be an issue. Don commented that election of the “plan confirmation” or “after-the-fact” effort reporting methods is something that must be done on a UC-wide basis.

Pixie mentioned that, in the “plan confirmation” method, effort reports need to be produced not only annually, but anytime there is a change in the plan such as the addition of a new project or a change in pay distribution. In that scenario, effort reports could be produced multiple times, on an irregular schedule throughout the year.

When asked which agency would be the cognizant agency, Jorge responded that this would need to be researched. The last time UC sought endorsement of its effort reporting plans it was the HHS Inspector General, but that might not be the case now.

Next steps:

- 1. Jorge will research which agency needs to endorse the proposed change**
- 2. Controllers will discuss at their December meeting the proposal and strategy for getting endorsement**

Campus Status Reports

Los Angeles – Sue Abeles reported that Los Angeles is still implementing. Currently 20% of effort reports have been certified. The deadline for the first cycle has been extended because training and certifications still need to be done. Overall the implementation is going well. In response to a question from John, Sue noted that the low percentage of certifications was partly due to the new system and partly due to the learning curve in the departments. There is a lack of confidence in the calculations in the departments, based on the flawed effort calculation in the old A21/PAR system, so there is a lot of checking going on. Pixie added that this is also a busy time of year and folks aren’t paying as much attention to ERS.

Davis – Status covered in “Annual Certifications” topic, above.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley will come up in production February 2007. Currently, focus groups are looking at ERS.

San Francisco – Joyce Freedman reported that San Francisco is actively talking with faculty and departments. Production start is planned for February/March 2007.

San Diego – Don Larson reported that UCSD is on track.

Opportunities with Kual

Discussion awaits follow-up with Budget and Planning Officers (Eric) and Contracts and Grants Officers (Joyce) as discussed at the October meeting.

Other

Sue mentioned that meetings of the Management Group will be scheduled for through June 2007 while implementations are going on. In the May/June timeframe we will assess whether monthly meetings beyond June 2007 will be needed.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, December 13, 2006, from 1:00pm-3:00pm.** This meeting will be conducted via conference call.

**Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans
November 9, 2006**

Campus	Effort Reporting Period Start	Calendar Start	UCOP Hosting?	Notes	Status/Comments
Berkeley	Fall 2006	February 2007	Yes		
Davis	July-December 2006	February 2007	No		
Los Angeles	Spring quarter 2006	Mid-August 2006	No		In Production September 2006
San Diego	Summer Qtr 2007	August 2007	Yes	Will follow quarterly cycle awaiting annual cycle resolution	Pilot to begin with Summer 2006 reporting cycle.
San Francisco	Fall 2006	February/March 2007	Not Yet Determined		
Merced				Will use UCLA ERS	UCLA Overview presentation scheduled for 7/24/2006 at UC Merced
UCOP				Will use UCLA ERS	
Irvine	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005
Riverside	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Implementation planning about to get underway	ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005 – Overview presented to expanded campus audience 6/19/2006.
Santa Barbara	Unknown	2007	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 5/22/2006
Santa Cruz	Unknown	2008	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 5/25/2006
DANR				Will use Davis ERS	