**Effort Reporting System Management Group**
**Meeting Notes**
**August 12, 2009**
*Accepted September 9, 2009*

This meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Bruce Flynn (for Eric Vermillion), Cecilia Hamilton, Bruce Morgan, Jorge Ohy, Rachelle Jeppson, Carrie Gatlin, Steve Hunter, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

Review of 6/10/2009 Meeting Notes

The June 10, 2009, meeting notes were accepted as written.


ERS Compliance and Audit Review

Rachelle Jeppson reported on the July presentation to President's Compliance Committee (PCC) and follow-up recommendations. Sue Abeles and Mike Allred had presented background on how effort reporting has moved from PARS to ERS. The recommendations put forward to the PCC were those in the fact-finding report:

- Invite Academic Senate to recommend PI/Faculty Users for participation in all aspects of the effort reporting process, including governance

- Continue to improve system usability, functionality and exception reporting  (Rachelle noted that Sue and Mike indicated in their presentation that this was being addressed through the ongoing governance structure of ERS, which provides a vehicle for resolving bugs and making enhancements to the system.  She pointed to the exception report for faculty reporting 100% to federal grants as an example of ongoing enhancement of ERS).

- Enhance data inputs to ERS:
   o Form a Working Group to address the need for a committed cost sharing database for all campuses (Rachelle noted that there was support for a committed cost sharing data base and that the ERS Management Group should look at this)
   o Through the ERS Governance Structure, examine the feasibility of changing the frequency of PPS cost transfer updates to ERS
   o Form a Working Group to study the effort commitment question and develop a recommended approach

- Evaluate existing briefing materials and recommend improvements to further clarify effort reporting responsibilities and definitions
   o User group to be led by Academic Leader with ERS Governance Structure representation

- Implement University policy revisions (ERS Governance Structure)
    - Extended timeline
    - Consequences for non-compliance

- If FDP is accepted by the Federal Government and UCI becomes a pilot site, consider adopting payroll certification as the standard for the entire UC system.

Sue mentioned that discussion of the recommendations was limited; however, the President was very interested in the development of compliance metrics, not just for effort reporting but for the whole research arena.

Rachelle mentioned that there was concurrence to move forward on recommendations regarding the Academic Senate (bullets one and four). It was reported that Provost Pitts has subsequently written to Mary Croughan and Steve Beckwith requesting they charter a work group of faculty representatives to review briefing materials, roles and responsibilities and training materials. Sue and Mike will participate on that group representing the ERS Management Work Group once that group is formed.

Bruce Morgan asked if there was interest from the President in sending a UC-wide representative to the upcoming FDP meeting. Mike responded that the President was supportive of the FDP pilot and that Rich Andrews, the Irvine Controller, has been and will continue to be the primary representative. Sue added that there was discussion with the President that if the FDP pilot is successful and payroll certification is adopted and approved by the Federal Government, UC would adopt this method UC-wide. Bruce mentioned that Riverside is also interested in participating in the FDP pilot.

ERS Compliance Metrics

The Group then turned their discussion to relevant effort reporting compliance metrics. Sue noted that some compliance reports are already programmed into ERS. With the President's focus on effort reporting metrics in mind, Sue had asked the group to suggest useful metrics that could possibly be programmed into ERS. The following ideas were suggested:

1. Percentage effort reports certified on time (Steve indicated that there are already some aging reports in ERS. He will share them with Sue.)
2. Percentage of ER recertifications (inferred payroll transfer activity volumes and difficulty of ERS use (a function of the number of corrections entered by a PI as a result of incorrect/incomplete/erroneous cost transfers )).
3. Percentage of faculty charging 100% time to Federal C&G (This report will be included in the next ERS release and will include a customizable percentage threshold).
4. Certifications being done by knowledgeable people. There was a discussion as to whether looking at the number of certifications done by an individual or numbers of effort reports certified by types of certifier (e.g., PIs certifying their own effort reports, administrators certifying PI effort reports, etc.) would provide some useful information.

5. Comparison of committed cost shared effort to certified cost shared effort (It was suggested that this might not be reportable until all locations have cost share commitment data bases although Rachelle thought initially it might suffice to identify which campuses have cost share databases that upload to ERS).
6. Comparison of effort commitments to certified effort (again this might not be reportable if all locations don't have databases that track effort commitments).
7. Percentage of certifiers who have been trained. (campuses would each have to figure out how to collect this information; Rachelle suggested that initially it might suffice to report whether training is not available, available but not required, available and required of departmental administrators, or available and required of all certifiers).

There was general agreement that systems solutions be in place to capture the necessary measurement information before moving forward with individual metrics. An analysis should take place to determine what information is currently reported out of the system and which measures could be gathered from existing information versus those which will require system modification(s). There was also agreement that metrics which add workload outside of the ERS system to collect data should be avoided. It was determined that Sue and Steve would review the current reports produced by the system to see which of the metrics can be readily produced. There was agreement that of the metrics identified above, numbers 1,2, and 3 are likely the most easily reported, that number 4 may be more useful to campuses as indicators of compliance issues rather than as a hard metric, that numbers 5 and 6 would require additional work to ensure comparative data is available, and that number 7 would be difficult to address retrospectively and, therefore, might not provide valid data.

Rachelle noted that a report on effort reporting metrics to the PCC was requested for the end of August, but that has now been deferred to the October PCC meeting.

Sue, Mike and Rachelle will develop a more detailed proposal of potential metrics, based on the ideas brainstormed, and route it to the Working Group for review and comment.

Time Limits for Generating/Certifying Effort Reports

Jon Good reported that he met with Academic Council Chair Mary Croughan and Vice Chair Harry Powell on July 22nd to discuss the June 4th letter to Professor Croughan providing feedback on her examples and the Academic Council comments . The discussion was essentially a reminder that the examples she had presented in the October meeting were representative of the broader issues raised by faculty. At conclusion of this meeting, Professor Croughan indicated that there was no Academic Council opposition to extending the time period for certification of 120 days.

Sue suggested to the group that existing effort reporting policy be amended to address the increased time period for certification since adoption of the proposed consequences policy seems to be stalled for the time being. Consequences will not likely be addressed by the Academic Council until their broader issues have been addressed. Mike remarked that the time period change needed to get into policy quickly. Jorge will initiate the necessary revisions. The group agreed that since there had been no objection to extending the certification time period by either

the Academic Council or the Vice Chancellors for Research, that review of the revisions would be done quickly with the ERS Management Group and then published.

Requirements Committee Update

Carrie Gatlin & Steve Hunter reported that one issue requiring Management Group attention arose recently during Requirements Committee discussion: a suggestion to decrease the frequency of ERS releases from the quarterly schedule. San Diego and San Francisco campuses reported that the UCOP ERS Hosting release installation requirements (campus testing of releases in the QA environment before release installation in production) were hard to keep up with. Carrie pointed out that diminishing the frequency of releases could make timeliness of enhancements an issue.

Sue noted that there still seems to be a list of enhancements and bug fixes related to the user experience that would be better to address with the current schedule of releases. Maintaining the current schedule would also enable the ERS Management Group to address the reporting of metrics in the system more expeditiously. After some discussion, it was agreed not to slow down releases by continuing with the current release schedule and revisit the topic before December.

The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, August 13th.

Mike asked whether the Management Group should be looking for an analysis of how ERS would be converted to the payroll certification model. It was agreed that this would be dependent on the approach the FDP project would be taking, but that starting to think about the potential for migration is reasonable. Sue will ask Rich Andrews for confirmation of the planned FDP approach before involving others in the analysis.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call for **Wednesday, September 9, 2009, from 1:00pm-3:00pm**.

Remaining scheduled conference calls for 2009:

Wednesday October 7, 2009 1-3pm
Wednesday November 4, 2009 1-3pm (note that this is the first Wed of the month rather than the second Wednesday as was mentioned on the call).

**Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans**
**August 12, 2009**

| Campus | Effort Reporting Period Start | Calendar Start | UCOP Hosting? | Notes | Status/Comments |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Berkeley** | Fall semester 2007 | February 2008 | Yes | | In Production February 2008. |
| **Davis** | July-December 2006 | March 2007 | No | | In Production March 2007 |
| **Los Angeles** | Spring quarter 2006 | Mid-August 2006 | No | | In Production September 2006 |
| **San Diego** | Summer Qtr 2007 | August 2007 | Yes | | In Production March 2008. |
| **San Francisco** | Fall 2006 | April 2007 | Yes | | In Production 4/16/2007 |
| **Merced** | | | | | Using UCLA ERS |
| **UCOP** | | | | | Using UCLA ERS |
| **Irvine** | Unknown | Unknown | Unknown | | ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005; Implementation will depend on outcome of FDP activities – decision should occur in 2nd quarter 2009. |
| **Riverside** | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | Yes | | Preparing for Rollout |
| **Santa Barbara** | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | Yes | | Pilot of Summer 2008 planned for fall early 2009 |
| **Santa Cruz** | To Be Determined | To Be Determined | Yes | | Working on obtaining funding |
| **DANR** | | | | | Using Davis ERS |