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This meeting was conducted as a conference call. Participants included:

Sue Abeles, James Ringo for Mike Allred, Matt Hull, Don Larson, Kirk Lew, Bobbi McCracken, Bruce Morgan, Jorge Ohy, Marcia Smith, Luanna Putney, Carrie Gatlin, and Jon Good.

Discussion Topics:

Review of 10/7/2009 Meeting Notes

The October 7, 2009, meeting notes were accepted as written.

ERS Metrics

Luanna Putney reported that there was limited time on the 11/3/2009 President’s Compliance Committee agenda for discussion of the topic. However, Sheryl Vacca did present a brief overview of the fact-finding results that prompted the metrics, and there was a brief discussion about the metrics themselves. President Yudof did have some questions and comments on how the metrics were developed and what they meant, and took particular interest in the metric that measures the percentage of self-certified effort reports. Luanna indicated that she was not at the PCC meeting and did not have the details of the President’s comments. The PCC did not raise any questions about the timing of starting to measure.

Carrie Gatlin reported that work on the incorporation of the metrics reports is underway and are planned for release as follows:

- The January 2010 (formerly planned for December) release will include reports supporting the following metrics:
  1. Percent of effort reports certified by due date(s) – either a modified existing report to roll data up to the campus level or a new report
  2. Percent of effort reports certified in a given reporting period (new report) rolled up to campus level
  3. Individuals knowledgeable of work performed (individuals certifying different numbers of effort reports) – new report

- The March 2010 release will include reports supporting the following metrics:
  1. % of recertified effort reports, at version 2.0, for a given cycle divided by the number of effort reports requiring certification, for the effort reporting certification cycle
2. % of recertified effort reports, over version 3.1, for a given cycle divided by the number of effort reports requiring certification, for the effort reporting certification cycle
3. % of PI/faculty member effort reports self certified divided by the number of effort reports eligible for self certification, for the effort reporting certification cycle

A Requirements Committee member from UCLA, Maurice Taylor, will sponsor the metrics modifications through the Requirements Committee and follow-up with testing.

Time Limits for Generating/Certifying Effort Reports

Jorge Ohy reported on the feedback received on the latest proposed language. Four campuses had provided comments. The UCSF comments had been distributed to the Management Group on 10/19/2009. Three other campuses had responded that the proposed consequences language was okay as drafted.

The Management Group agreed to move forward with the consequences language as drafted.

Jorge reported that the change to the time period for certification, which had earlier been agreed upon, is in the process of being published. The Accounting Manual modifications have gone out to the printers and should be distributed in the next day or so. The Contract & Grant Manual revisions should also be published very soon.

Sue Abeles mentioned that the last Management Group review had focused on consequences language. After discussion of next steps, it was agreed that language should be added to satisfy Vice Chancellors for Research, who are looking for stronger consequences than what had been proposed months ago.

Next steps:

1. Jorge Ohy to revise the consequences language to incorporate the consequence of having research funding withheld
2. Jorge Ohy will coordinate with Ellen Auriti to get the revised language before the Vice Chancellors for Research for endorsement

Requirements Committee Update

Carrie Gatlin reported that Requirements Committee last met via conference call on October 8th.

No issues were raised in last call requiring Management Group attention.

Release 10.2 was issued on 10/16/2009, and included the following enhancements:
Hover text for Payroll Detail column headings were added to provide users with additional contextual help
A report list column heading was externalized for campus customization
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.

Carrie also mentioned that PPS Release 1880 had also been issued to add Title Code attributes to the interface file fed to ERS. This modification is in support of Base ERS metrics reporting.

The next release, 10.3, is slated for January 2010 and will include the following enhancements:
- Technical bug (label being cut off in the database)
- Bug Fix– certification due date based on date/time stamp being corrected to focus on date only
- 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. This enhancement is still being discussed with the Requirements Committee to get a better understanding of the real business requirements.

The Requirements Committee will next meet via conference call on Thursday, November 12th.

Project Finances

Jon reported that the Base ERS FY 2009-2010 budget remains unchanged from what was proposed in May and that the final spread of campus costs awaits publication of the FY 2008-2009 TDC numbers. Jorge confirmed that those numbers should be available by the end of the month.

Next Meeting

It was agreed not to hold a conference call in December and resume in January.

The next meeting is scheduled as a conference call for **Wednesday, January 13, 2010, from 1:00pm-3:00pm.**
### Effort Reporting System Go-Live Plans

**November 5, 2009**

<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>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>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparing for Rollout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot of Summer 2008 planned for fall early 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on obtaining funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Using Davis ERS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>