

**Effort Reporting System Management Group**  
**Meeting Notes**  
**October 7, 2009**  
**Accepted November 5, 2009**

This meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included: Sue Abeles, Rich Andrews, Jim Corkill, John Ellis, Don Larson, Kirk Lew, Bobbi McCracken, Bruce Morgan, Jorge Ohy, Marcia Smith, Rachelle Jeppson, Luanna Putney, Carrie Gatlin, Steve Hunter, Erica Webber, and Jon Good.

**Discussion Topics:**

Review of 9/9/2009 Meeting Notes

The September 9, 2009, meeting notes were accepted as written.

Impact of Furloughs on Effort Reporting

Carrie Gatlin and Sue Abeles reported on their discussion with the Requirements Committee via conference call on 9/23/2009: Jorge Ohy shared work with PWC on the Furlough Exchange Program; the list of concerns raised by Requirements Committee was reviewed in this context; everyone understood that the decision to move forward was made by Provost Pitts and Vice President for Research Beckwith fully aware of the risks; the program was necessitated by the need to retain faculty and the business needs outweighed the relatively small compliance risk related to payments in July/August that are prepayments for 9-month faculty. Carrie reported that there were no subsequent follow-up questions or comments from the conference call. Carrie will close the loop on this topic with the Requirements Committee on their next conference call so that participants will know to whom on each campus to go with questions.

Time Limits for Generating/Certifying Effort Reports

Jorge Ohy reported that he had talked with the folks who produce the Accounting and Contracts & Grants manuals, and the changes pertaining to the 120-day certification time limit should be published in the next week or two.

Rachelle Jeppson reported on a discussion with Vice Chancellors for Research about the status of the policy changes, specifically consequences language. The VCRs feel strongly that UC-wide policy language is needed covering consequences for failure to certify effort and they want to engage the Academic Senate to move forward with such language. There was particular interest in cutting off access to funds for non-compliance by certain VCRs.

Sue noted that the Management Group's initiative to put consequences language in place has been delayed because of issues raised by Academic Senate, and that the interest of the VCRs could be helpful in continuing the discussion with the Academic Senate.

Luanna Putney noted that Ellen Auriti (UCOP Research) has been working with the Academic Council on issues of interest to the VCRs and would be a good person to work with on the consequences topic.

It was agreed that Jorge would distribute the most recent version of the consequences language and that the Management Group would review once again before connecting with Ellen Auriti. [The consequences language was distributed via email during the conference call. Suggested changes were to be emailed to Jorge Ohy by October 12<sup>th</sup>.]

Rich Andrews commented that consequences need to be consistent across the UC system, noting that UCIs aggressive consequences for failure to comply with Sexual Harassment Prevention Training requirements were difficult to enforce given other campuses having lesser consequences.

### Requirements Committee Update

Carrie Gatlin reported that Requirements Committee last met via conference call on September 10<sup>th</sup>.

Other than the concerns about the Furlough Exchange Program which led to the 9/23/2009 conference call (see above), no issues were raised in last call requiring Management Group attention.

The next Base ERS release originally scheduled for the end of September, Release 10.2, is still in the quality assurance process and release is now planned for the week of October 9<sup>th</sup>. Release 10.2 will include the following enhancements:

- On the Report List, a column label (currently labeled “For” for the employee name) will be externalized as a campus parameter
- On the Payroll Details page, explanatory help text will be added as a user hovers over a column heading
- A new compliance report identifying individuals certifying over a threshold percent of effort expended on sponsored funds; the threshold is a parameter which the campus can specify.

The following enhancement has been pulled from Release 10.2 for clarification of requirements to make sure that the appropriate problem is being solved and will be discussed further with the Requirements Committee on the October 8<sup>th</sup> conference call:

- New certification tolerance: if there is late pay coming in that is within 1% of what’s needed for certification, the system will set the status to certified for the effort report.

### ERS Compliance and Audit Review

Rachelle Jeppson provided a status update on activities in follow-up to the Compliance and Audit review:

- Effort Reporting Metrics – The ERS Management Group is actively discussing this topic (see “ERS Metrics”, below). A status update will be provided to the President at the next President’s Compliance Committee meeting in early November.
- Training Materials Review – Sue Abeles and Sam Traina co-chair a work group reviewing training materials. Work Group members have been identified. The first work group meeting is scheduled for November 19<sup>th</sup>. Initial feedback from Sue and Sam Traina indicates that a lot of good materials already exist, so the group will also explore whether faculty and researchers know about those materials. It is anticipated that the work group will only require a couple of meetings and conclude its activities by end of December or early January.

### FDP Update

Rich Andrews reported that on August 25<sup>th</sup> he and Luanna Putney attended a meeting with representatives from the Office of Naval Research and HHS. At that meeting there was a presentation on payroll certification as a third option to meet effort reporting requirements, and interest was expressed in doing a pilot study with a few institutions around the country.

In September, there was an FDP meeting where the Office of Naval Research presented draft criteria for entry into the pilot program. It is anticipated that the criteria will be finalized relatively soon so that the pilot may proceed. When criteria are further along, they should be able to proceed with the pilot. The goal is to have the pilot criteria in place before the next FDP meeting in January, so the FDP project can move forward then.

### ERS Metrics

Walking the group through the metrics powerpoint distributed prior to the conference call, Rachelle Jeppson noted that the proposed metrics had been refined based on feedback from the last conference call.

It was noted that collection of data in support of the metrics is anticipated to be on cycle with campus effort reporting schedules. Campuses will want to review measurement data before submitting.

Comments on the metrics powerpoint should be forwarded to Rachelle.

Carrie Gatlin reported on the technical analysis of the proposed metrics, which indicates whether ERS already has data that would form the basis of each of the proposed metrics and, if not, whether equivalent data is available from processes in place at any of the campuses

Erica Webber and Steve Hunter examined data availability, which ERS reports exist, and what campuses are doing locally. Some, but not all, campuses have provided feedback on what local measurement data is available. The Requirements Committee members were contact points for

this campus feedback. This request for feedback will be re-iterated on tomorrow's Requirements Committee conference call.

Erica Webber walked the group through the technical analysis spreadsheet (distributed before the conference call). Key points resulting from the discussion:

- The Management Group would like to see measurements at both department and campus levels for the first five metrics.
- Measurements must be retained or must be able to be recreated to support trend analysis.
- Metrics related to committed cost sharing and comparison of actual effort to commitment would be best accomplished via survey of campuses rather than a cost-prohibitive solution within ERS.

Next steps: Carrie, Steve, and Erica will develop time and cost estimates to implement metrics 1-6 in ERS.

#### Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call for **Wednesday, November 4, 2009, from 1:00pm-3:00pm.**

**Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans  
October 7, 2009**

<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 semester 2007	February 2008	Yes		In Production February 2008.
<b>Davis</b>	July-December 2006	March 2007	No		In Production March 2007
<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		In Production March 2008.
<b>San Francisco</b>	Fall 2006	April 2007	Yes		In Production 4/16/2007
<b>Merced</b>					Using UCLA ERS
<b>UCOP</b>					Using UCLA ERS
<b>Irvine</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		ERS Overview presented 12/5/2005; Implementation will depend on outcome of FDP activities – decision on whether there will be an FDP pilot is still pending.
<b>Riverside</b>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	Yes		Preparing for Rollout
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	Yes		Pilot of Summer 2008 planned for fall early 2009
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	To Be Determined	To Be Determined	Yes		Working on obtaining funding
<b>DANR</b>					Using Davis ERS