This meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Don Larson, Bobbi McCracken, Jorge Ohy, Adam Cohen, Pixie Ogren, Jane Meyer, Steve Hunter, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

**Introductions**

Sue Abeles introduced Bobbi McCracken as the Riverside representative to the ERS Management Group.

Jon Good reported that with Joyce Freedman retiring, the Management Group will be losing a representative from the Research area. Joyce has made a couple of recommendations for possible successors. Only one of those two recommendations comes from a participating campus: Bruce Morgan of Riverside. No discussion has taken place with Bruce. Bobbi indicated that Riverside’s Office of Research is very serious about moving forward with ERS, and she will talk with Bruce about his joining the Management Group.

**Review of 10/10/2007 Meeting Notes**

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

**Project Status**

Steve Hunter reported on recent and upcoming releases:

- Release 8.2 was issued on October 16th.
- Release 9.0 is still planned for December 2007.

**Requirements Committee Update**

Jon reported that the Requirements Committee met via conference call on October 11th. Several enhancement requests were reviewed and approved. No issue requiring Management Group attention was raised on the conference call.

The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, November 15th.
Technical Advisory Group Update

Adam Cohen reported that the Technical Advisory Group did not meet since the last Management Group meeting.

Adam mentioned that there was an informal check-in with technical representatives during the November 7th Users Group meeting and this will be as much coordination as is needed for the next few months.

Project Finances

Jon reviewed the cost projections for 2007-2008 and the not-yet-final campus contribution amounts. The total of contributions for 2007-2008 from all campuses is projected to be approximately $223,000. The prorated amounts for each participating campus, which now includes Riverside and Santa Barbara campuses has been calculated based on Total Direct Cost (TDC) numbers which have not yet been finalized. Jorge Ohy indicated that the numbers should be finalized this week.

The group agreed that once the TDC numbers are finalized, it is okay to proceed with transfer of funds to UCOP. Jon will forward the final prorated numbers along with individualized requests for transfers of funds when the TDC numbers are finalized.

User Group Meeting

Sue asked about the User Group meeting in San Diego on November 7th.

Adam reported that the Users Group meeting was useful. Whereas last year’s meeting was mostly UCOP talking about ERS, this year’s meeting was truly a sharing of campus implementation experiences. Everyone was satisfied with the day and the participants are looking forward to another meeting next year.

Mike offered to host next year’s Users Group at Davis next year if folks are willing to travel to Davis.

Actions When Effort Is Not Certified

Sue Abeles reported that she has drafted a letter to Larry Coleman and Anne Broome to thank them for their support of the policy recommendations, to convey the consequences statement as a proposed revision to policy, and to ask for coordinated review among the Vice Chancellors for Research, Controllers, and the Academic Council. The letter will go out today.
Non-sponsor Campuses - Status

Jon reported that there was no news.

Campus Status Reports

Davis – Mike Allred reported that Davis campus folks are really happy with the help that Steve Hunter has provided in working through numerous issues. [Steve credits the Davis folks for designing and checking numerous test cases that helped to reveal many of the Late Pay issues.] Late Pay problems have been resolved, causing certification completion to drop from 97% to 90%. Currently working on bringing certification levels up.

Data is being loaded now for the next reporting cycle, covering 1/2007-9/2007. Of some 450 ERS coordinators total; about half are signed up for forums to review the effort reporting process. Effort reports for the next reporting cycle should be available to certifiers in a couple of weeks.

San Diego– Don Larson reported that San Diego is into the second phase pilot (covering 40% of effort reports). The first phase (covering 20% of effort reports) is now at the 80% completion level. The third phase, covering July-September quarter, will get underway in December (covering 80% of effort reports). Plan to be fully operational by March. The implementation team has taken a department by department approach providing onsite training and hand-holding. Departments are taking ERS and effort reporting seriously and there have been fewer faculty problems than anticipated.

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley will start the first pilot on November 15th with 5-6 departments. Communications have been issued, and town hall meetings have occurred. The plan is to deploy to the rest of the campus in February.

Los Angeles – Sue Abeles reported that Los Angeles is still trying to get to 100% compliance (from 80-82%) on previous quarters. The campus is getting ready to roll out Release 8.1 next week for spring and summer 2007 cycles. The Vice Chancellor for Research will likely be engaged to help bring compliance levels up.

Riverside – Bobbi McCracken – Data sets have been all set up to begin testing. However, there’s been an issue regarding the proposed costs for the UCOP ERS Hosting SLA. Riverside is ready to go as soon as the SLA is signed.
Santa Barbara – No report

San Francisco – No report

Other Topics

Don Larson inquired whether other campuses were feeling that the time constraints for certification called out in policy should be revisited. [Current policy calls for issuing effort reports 45 days after the close of a reporting period, and completing certification of the effort reports 30 days after they are generated. Current policy language is in the Accounting Manual – Section III.A.3 http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/policies/acctman/p-196-13.pdf] There are concerns about the short time to both prepare the effort reports, particularly dealing with Payroll adjustments, and the short time allowed to certify once the effort reports are generated. Don suggested that NSF would accept 120 days after the end of a reporting period for certification.

Mike Allred suggested that the policy be revised to a “reasonability” standard. Jorge reminded the group that the original thinking behind the current policy statement was to be explicit about the amount of time allowed for certification. Pixie suggested a “reasonability” statement could cite 30 days as an example of a limit on the time allowed for certifying an effort report.

Don explained that if the effort report was incorrect when initially issued, the requirement to certify within 30 days after issuance was problematic because there was not enough time for corrections to be processed and an effort report to be reissued within 30 days, given the timing of payroll cycles and the need to rerun the effort reports. Departmental staff are concerned about asking people to certify when the effort reports are not completely accurate. Pixie then pointed out that it was never the intent to reissue incorrect effort reports before certification. Rather, the system was designed and built to allow necessary corrections to be made to the effort report by the reviewer or certifier and then certified. The adjusted and certified report would then have a status of “certified – adjustment required”. After payroll adjustments have been processed and the late pay process run, the status changes to “certified” without the “adjustment required”.

It was agreed that this would be discussed further at the next meeting/conference call.

Next Meeting

It was agreed to cancel the December 2007 meeting and to convene via conference call in January 2008. Moving forward, the group will decide a month in advance whether to convene or cancel the following month’s meeting.

2008 Meeting Dates (all are Wednesday’s; meeting time is 1-3pm):

January 9  
February 13
March 12
April 9
May 7
June 11
July 9
August 13
September 10
October 8
November 12
December (no meeting)

The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call for **Wednesday, January 9, 2008, from 1:00pm-3:00pm.**
<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>Davis</td>
<td>July-December 2006</td>
<td>March 2007</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>In Production March 2007</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 Francisco</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Production 4/16/2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using UCLA ERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using 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>Riverside</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Q1 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working out UCOP Hosting SLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Q1 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Working out UCOP Hosting SLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using Davis ERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>