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

Discussion Topics:

Review of 1/9/2008 Meeting Notes

Mike Allred noted that the Davis Status Report incorrectly cited the current reporting cycle as March 1 through December 31, 2007. The reporting period is actually January 1, 2007, through September 30, 2007.

With this change, the January 9, 2008, meeting notes were accepted.

Project Status

Steve Hunter reported that Release 9.0 is just about ready for release in a few days, and includes improvements to compliance monitoring reporting which will make the reports easier for everyone to use as well as cleaning up numerous bugs.

Requirements Committee Update

Jon reported that the Requirements Committee met via conference call on January 10th. There was some discussion about the time limits for generating and certifying effort reports, which will be covered later in this agenda.

The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, February 14th.

Technical Advisory Group Update

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

Project Finances

Jane Meyer reported that expenditures are on target with projections for the current fiscal year. Funds transfers for 2007-2008 Base ERS support status:
Actions When Effort Is Not Certified
Time Limits for Generating/Certifying Effort Reports

Sue Abeles reported that Jorge Ohy had received feedback from just a few people on the proposed changes to the “Timeliness of Effort Reporting Certification” document that was sent out right after the last conference call.

Jorge remarked that the proposal calls for an absolute time limit of 120 days past the close of a reporting period for certification to be completed. It would be left to each campus to identify local milestones within the 120 days for the generation of effort reports, certification, and corrective actions. After 120 days certification must be signed off by the Vice Chancellor for Research. Sue commented that ERS does not have a mechanism for tracking such sign-off and suggested that this exceptional sign-off be noted as in the effort report comments to provide an audit trail of the action.

Jorge asked the group whether 120 days is realistic. This question had been posed to the Requirements Committee where there was general response that this would be sufficient time, but the reason for wanting more time was the fact that payroll transfers aren’t being done online or in a timely manner at all locations. Pixie Ogren noted that online expense transfer in the Payroll System was stated as a “requirement” very early on in the ERS project.

John Ellis commented that Berkeley has the ability to do online transfers through OPTRS, but feedback has been that there aren’t enough pay cycles to handle all of the expense transfer work, particularly given that there may be conflicting administrative priorities in the departments at various times during the year. Pixie Ogren mentioned that in any reporting period there are at least three monthly pay periods to effect the expense transfers, and campuses aren’t saying that they need to wait to do the transfers. Pixie added that all of the issues impacting certification timing needed to be examined and not just the final deadlines.

Pixie asked which campuses are processing transfers of payroll expense online in departments; Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Riverside, indicated that they are doing so; Santa Barbara expects to be doing so this summer, and San Diego has an unfunded project in the queue to do so. Jim Corkill noted that Santa Barbara is going to be implementing a front-end to PPS to more appropriately validate FAU on transfers of expense, which apparently PPS does not do. Don stated that San Diego had the same issue. John Ellis mentioned that he’d heard something similar at Berkeley. Bobbi McCracken indicated that Riverside has been using OPTRS for several years and is not aware of FAU validation problems. Sue mentioned that Los Angeles has also been using OPTRS for years and that she wasn’t aware of any FAU validation problems. Jim will forward to the group an analysis done at Santa Barbara of the apparently lacking PPS FAU edits on expense transfers.
Pixie remarked that the Requirements Committee did not give the impression of widespread use of PPS OPTRS for online expense transfers, and she will ask about this again on the February 14th conference call.

Sue will send to the group the latest version of the timeliness proposal for further review.

Jorge mentioned that the review of the previous “consequences” statement with Vice Chancellors for Research had fallen through the cracks and that Pat Schlesinger will take the “Timeliness of Certification” document to the next meeting of that group in March.

Non-sponsor Campuses - Status

There was no news to report.

Campus Status Reports

Berkeley – John Ellis reported that Berkeley is in the pilot phase with 6 departments, and have reached 85% certification. Berkeley will roll out ERS campus-wide in a couple of weeks. Meetings with faculty are continuing.

Davis – Mike Allred reported that Davis is now into the January 1, 2007 - September 30, 2007, cycle (about 7,000 reports); about 88% of those reports have been certified.

San Diego – Don Larson reported that San Diego is approaching the 90% certification level on the first phase, and the second phase is at about 30% certification. There’s a little bit of anxiety about needing greater participation and higher certification levels among participants in the first two phases before rolling out ERS further. San Diego is at the point of talking to department chairs and even the VCR to get the unresponsive folks on board. The third phase, which will see ERS deployed to about 80% of the campus, will be starting soon. Overall, there does seem to be a good deal of acceptance of ERS on the campus.

Los Angeles – Sue Abeles reported that Los Angeles has six reporting periods open at the moment. In most cases completion percentages are in the 80s and 90s. Los Angeles has observed a lower than anticipated rate of compliance among staff and a higher than anticipated compliance with 9/12 faculty. This suggests that PIs may not be certifying for others at the level that was anticipated, and this is being investigated. Problems with the School of Medicine are in the process of being resolved. Los Angeles is getting ready to run the Fall 2007 cycle, with release of reports planned for March.
Riverside – Bobbi McCracken reported that Riverside is working on getting the necessary funding.

Santa Barbara – Jim Corkill reported that Santa Barbara has just received funding approval for ERS and will be getting started shortly.

San Francisco – (as reported in the January 10, 2008, Requirements Committee conference call notes) – “Wendy Hom reported that San Francisco is moving along reasonably well. Fall 2006 is at 97% certification, Winter 2007 at 96%, Spring 2007 at 92%, and Summer 2007 at 77%.”

Other Topics

Adam Cohen inquired as to who was on point for the analysis on the issue of recertifying lines on effort reports rather than recertifying the entire effort report. This issue has come up on the Berkeley campus. Jon noted that on the January 9, 2008, conference call the Management Group agreed that more experience (through June 2008) with ERS was appropriate before starting on this analysis. Though the task belongs with the Requirements Committee, someone from the ERS Team will likely lead the analysis activity.

Sue announced that Jonathan Shockley was no longer with the University and that agendas and other correspondence with the Management Group would be coming from Phebe Arlen.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call for Wednesday, March 12, 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></td>
<td>In Production March 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Spring quarter 2006</td>
<td>Mid-August 2006</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Production September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Production 4/16/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using UCLA ERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using UCLA ERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Q1 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working out UCOP Hosting SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Q1 2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working out UCOP Hosting SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using Davis ERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>