Effort Reporting System Management Group
Meeting Notes

August 5, 2004 – Teleconference

This meeting was held by conference call. In attendance were: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, Mike Anthony, John Ellis, Joyce Freedman, Jon Good, Bruce Irvine, Don Larson, Jorge Ohy, Ken Orgill, Charles Taylor

Discussion Topics:

Review and Acceptance of Meeting Notes: the notes for the Meeting of July 15, 2004 were accepted as written.

Project Status Update:
- Jon Good introduced the new "Interim Project Manager" Bruce Irvine. Bruce is a contract employee; OP is trying to fill the position with a permanent career employee.
- An additional contractor has also been hired for the technical work
- Bruce and Jon indicated that the project team is making good progress. There was a conference call with the Technical Group this past Tuesday; this was the first meeting of that group. They will try to meet every three weeks. The Technical Group is just in the process of doing discovery—trying to formulate how to interface the Effort Reporting System with campuses' systems. They are looking at ways to simplify the interfaces. Every campus has different systems in place; therefore, interfaces might be different for each campus.
- In time the Technical Group will need to involve people with more technical expertise on each campus to assist with the interfacing of the systems.
- Jon will put the project schedule on the website and send the links to everyone
- A question was asked about whether or not the project team intended to continue to search for outside vendors. There is no intention to move forward on looking at vendor packages as the decision has been made to build this system in-house, however, the team will continue to conduct due diligence as opportunities present themselves. (The position of the Management Group on vendor packages is articulated in the May 11, 2004 meeting notes.)

Outline of Policy White Paper (written by Sue Abeles)

- Included with the agenda package for the meeting was an outline prepared by Sue Abeles for the White Paper on "Proposed Policies related to UC Effort Reporting". The group was very much in agreement that this is the right list of issues and that the outline was very organized and sensible.
- Sue explained that she was trying to organize the piece according to the minutes and notes of the previous meetings.
- A suggestion was made to add an item on the sensitivity of the effort reporting system's information. There was a discussion regarding what the security level for this data should be.

- o Questions were raised about the need for encryption? Is there a need to keep the information as secure as payroll information? Would this information be available if a request was made under the California Public Records Act (CPRA)? Several members of the group thought it would have to be disclosed under the CPRA and would not be protected as either "confidential" or "personal" information.
- A question was asked about what it would take to make the system as secure as the payroll system and whether the web pages needed to be encrypted in transit. Jon stated that it would not take much more effort but it would be a policy issue. The group seemed to lean toward applying the same standards of security (i.e., encrypted terminal sessions and data transmission) as those that are being applied to the Payroll System. It was agreed to add the questions of the level of sensitivity of the system and security of data to the White Paper list as policy issues. Sue agreed to add these topics to the list.

Cost Sharing Discussion

- It was suggested that the discussion be tabled since Eric Vermillion was not on the call and it was his topic. However, a conversation took place anyway.
  - o How would the system be able to capture a situation in which a PI proposed to spend 30% salaried effort but turned out to only charge 20% salary while still working the 30% time on the project. In such a situation there would be a 10% cost sharing component, which would have to be captured.
    - The group agreed that the 10% would be a voluntary committed cost sharing but did not know how to capture it without an interface to another system.
    - It is clear that in such a case, it would have to be known what was originally proposed and awarded. This would call for an interface with the grant and contract systems on each campus.
    - Charles Taylor and Mike Anthony indicated that whether or not a campus allows a PI to charge salary committed for sponsored projects to other funds should be a local decision.
  - o What about the situation in which a PI proposed to spend 30% on the grant but doesn't do it consistently? At times only expending 10% effort but other times up-to 50%. Is this ok? How would the system handle this?
    - There was a discussion about whether or not the agencies require that effort be spent consistently. Mike Anthony stated that effort could be reported at the end of the grant as long as the total added up to the amount promised.
    - This might be agency specific; we would need to explore various agencies' requirements.
  - o The group confirmed a prior decision to send all active investigators a PAR report regardless of current support. This way the cost shared effort would have a greater likelihood of being captured.

- o It was also decided that the Requirements Group should write up the issue and the specifications to deal with voluntary committed cost sharing and bring it back to the Management Group for review.

Data from External Systems

As a follow-on to the discussion on cost sharing, a decision was made that any data fed to the Effort Reporting System from an external source may NOT be edited in the Effort System (for example – data from a cost sharing system or a grant and contract system).

Next Steps on Drafting the Policy White Paper

- ▪ The next steps will be for Sue to start to fill in the blanks on the outline. She will use the meeting notes from previous meetings. There will be a background section, which will include regulatory references and university policies references. Outstanding policies will be articulated and sent around to campuses and OP for vetting.
- ▪ Sue will try to get a draft copy out before our next meeting

A Guide on Cost Sharing

- ▪ The group decided that it would be useful to have a guide on cost sharing similar to the one introducing the effort reporting system. Joyce volunteered to draft the guide using Ann Pollack's white paper issued previously. The guide should be general.

Next Meeting

- ▪ The next meeting is scheduled for August 26, the decision to hold it in person or by conference call will be made by Pixie and Jon after the Requirement Group's meeting.

Joyce Freedman
8/06/04