

**Effort Reporting System Management Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**February 7, 2007**  
**Accepted March 7, 2007**

Participants included: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Joyce Freedman, Don Larson, Jorge Ohy, Adam Cohen, Pixie Ogren, Steve Hunter, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

Review of 1/10/2007 Meeting Notes

The January 10, 2007 meeting notes were accepted as written.

Actions When Effort Is Not Certified

Sue Abeles led a discussion concerning consequences for failure to certify effort reports in a timely manner. Sue read her email note to the UCLA Office of Research Administration personnel about possible consequences of not certifying effort and each campus reported on discussions that had taken place on their respective campus. A general discussion followed the individual campus reports. The discussion focused on the advantages and disadvantages of various consequences which could be used to enforce compliance. Consequences discussed included: seeking the assistance of the Department Chair or Dean; not setting up awards; not submitting proposals; and moving salary charges off of sponsored projects to discretionary funds for uncertified charges. While each of these options could legitimately be employed, most have their own issues. For example: not setting up awards may not stop spending on the project with the result that charges will be recorded against one fund and later need to be moved; not submitting proposals would result in a loss of funding to the University; and moving charges to discretionary funds would mean using University funds which might be better used elsewhere. However, working with Department Chairs and Deans has no such resultant issues.

The group concluded that seeking the assistance of the Department Chair and or Dean would be the best first step. If compliance was not achieved after the intervention of the Chair or Dean, campuses could determine on a case by case basis which of the other methods it would employ. The group also recommended that a systemwide policy statement that outlines the possible escalation steps for non-compliance be developed. Sue volunteered to draft a policy statement. This policy might logically be contained in the Contract and Grant manual. Campuses could use an aging report of non-compliant reports to determine when and how to escalate when effort reports are not certified in a timely manner.

The group also concluded that it would be helpful to have a compendium of cases of audit issues or disallowances that could be provided to PI's to demonstrate the consequences of non-compliance.

## Annual Certifications for Professorial and Professional Titles

Mike Allred reported on UC Davis progress and stated that the campus is proceeding with annual certification using the plan confirmation method. Mike commented that Pixie had some questions about the plan confirmation process. Pixie Ogren clarified that her questions were not focused so much on process but rather on whether plan confirmation was in fact predicting future effort and if so, asked how using past payments could predict future effort.

The question of weighting percentages of time paid was raised in the context of annual reporting. Mike reported that a conference call had been held to discuss the issue. Pixie explained that the proposal was to expand the current weighting scheme to include all combination appointments and not only the combination of 9/12 and 11/12. Expanding to include 9/12 and 9/9 as a combination will allow campuses to combine all payments in an annual report.

## Multiple Principal Investigators

Jon reported that the next step is to develop specific requirements for handling multiple principal investigators in ERS. This topic is on the agenda for the 2/8/2007 Requirements Committee meeting

## Project Status

Steve Hunter reported that Release 8, which will deliver compliance monitoring reporting capabilities, is still on track for a March release. Although the focus has been the reporting, any bugs continue to be fixed as they are reported.

## Requirements Committee Update

Jon reported that the Requirements Committee had met via conference call on January 11<sup>th</sup>. No issues requiring the attention of the Management Group were raised in that session.

## Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam reported that the Technical Advisory Group did not meet in January, and that a touch-base call was being planned for February.

## Project Finances Review

Jon reported that project expenses were within \$3,000 of projections through the end of January. Project fund transfers for three campuses have already been received.

### University of Washington

Jon Good reported that Mike Anthony from the University of Washington had sent a letter expressing interest in exploring the option of partnering with UC to bring a fresh effort reporting solution to UW. Sue suggested, and it was agreed, to invite Mike Anthony and others from UW to participate in the March ERS Management Group meeting to discuss this further. Jon will make arrangements for UW to join in the call.

### Kuali

Mike mentioned that Kuali has already looked at ERS, referring to an analysis of differences between Indiana University's A21 and UC's ERS functionality that has already been done. Mike hoped we could discuss UC participation in Kuali Research Administration (KRA) with ERS. The group expressed interest in exploring KRA.

Jon reported that as part of a more detailed technical analysis, the Kuali Foundation had requested ERS source code. Jon has initiated getting a Non-Disclosure Agreement prepared by UCOP Office of Technology Transfer to facilitate this evaluation. Jon will circulate via email the draft NDA to the Management Group for comment/approval once the draft has been prepared.

### Campus Status Reports

Davis –Mike Allred reported that Davis has pushed back rollout from 2/15 to 2/22 to get Release 7.4 implemented and further minimize risk. Campus communications about the rollout are underway. Approximately 6,200 effort reports are expected, of those 600-700 are for Agriculture and Natural Resources. Currently, the biggest anticipated problem is trying to get faculty to understand that when they accepted grants they also made a commitment to certify effort.

San Diego – Don Larson reported that San Diego is about ready to begin its pilot. Six departments will commence certifications using ERS starting in April. For the time being, San Diego will certify effort quarterly. A decision on annual certifications has not yet been made. There is a chance that some of the departments (e.g., Dept. of Medicine) might drop out of this "pilot-in-production". The Supercomputer Center and Physics departments are included in this pilot. Training in all pilot departments has been completed. The pilot will proceed with 4/1, 7/1, and 10/1 reporting cycles. Go-live for the whole campus will occur with the summer cycle.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley has two new pilot departments, the School of Public Health, and another, smaller, unit. The fall semester pilot start has been pushed back into March.

If all goes well with the pilot, the entire campus will go live for the spring semester reporting cycle. Staff certify effort quarterly.

San Francisco – Joyce Freedman reported that San Francisco plans to go live March 5 for the entire campus. UCSF is going up w/out local cost sharing system and will rely on individuals filling in the information. Currently, UCOP and UCSF are working on an ERS Hosting performance issue, with UCSF preparing to drive some stress testing in the hosted environment.

Los Angeles – Sue Abeles reported that UCLA is wrapping up testing of Release 7.4 and preparing to run separate fall and winter quarter cycles simultaneously starting in March.

#### Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Wednesday, March 7, 2007, from 1:00pm-3:00pm**. This meeting will be conducted as a conference call.

**Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans  
February 7, 2007**

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Effort Reporting Period Start</b>	<b>Calendar Start</b>	<b>UCOP Hosting?</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Status/Comments</b>
<b>Berkeley</b>	Fall 2006	March 2007	Yes		
<b>Davis</b>	July-December 2006	February 2007	No		
<b>Los Angeles</b>	Spring quarter 2006	Mid-August 2006	No		In Production September 2006
<b>San Diego</b>	Summer Qtr 2007	August 2007	Yes	Will follow quarterly cycle awaiting annual cycle resolution	Pilot to begin with Summer 2006 reporting cycle.
<b>San Francisco</b>	Fall 2006	March 2007	Yes		
<b>Merced</b>				Will use UCLA ERS	UCLA Overview presentation scheduled for 7/24/2006 at UC Merced
<b>UCOP</b>				Will use UCLA ERS	
<b>Irvine</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005
<b>Riverside</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Implementation planning about to get underway	ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005 – Overview presented to expanded campus audience 6/19/2006.
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	Unknown	2007	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 5/22/2006
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	Unknown	2008	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 5/25/2006
<b>DANR</b>				Will use Davis ERS	