- **Effort Reporting System Management Group**
Meeting Notes
<u>November 18, 2004</u> - *<u>Revised   , 2004 - Accepted   , 2004</u>*

In attendance were: Sue Abeles, Mike Allred, John Ellis, Jon Good, Joyce Freedman, Jorge Ohy, Pixie Ogren, Don Larson, Adam Cohen, Karl Heins. Eric Vermillion, Ken Orgill, Karen Rust, and Mike Anthony joined by phone.

Discussion Topics:
<u>Review and Acceptance of Meeting Notes:</u> The notes for the October 28 meeting were accepted.

<u>Project Status Update:</u>
Jon Good handed out an updated schedule.

<u>Update on Requirements Group Progress</u> - There have been two Requirements Group meetings since the last Management Group meeting and Pixie reported on discussions from both the November 3 and the November 17 meetings.
- Alternative Report Format - At the November 3 meeting an alternative report format was proposed and discussed but no conclusions were reached. The proposed format would require certifiers to indicate only the total effort without the need to indicate direct charged and cost sharing amounts. This proposed format represents a departure from formats discussed up until now. (See 11-3 Requirements Group meeting notes) At the November 17 meeting the discussion concerning alternative report formats was continued. While some report formats represented presentation issues, others had an effect on underlying policies and stated requirements. It was suggested that a vote be taken to determine whether each of the five campuses supported recommending the alternative format to the Management Group. The vote was as follows:
  Berkeley - all three members voted No
  San Francisco - one member presented voted No. It was assumed that of the two members who were not present, one would vote No and one would vote Yes.
  Davis - Two members voted No, one member voted Yes
  Los Angeles - Both members voted No
  San Diego - Both members voted No
- Multiple Categories for Non-Sponsored Funds - There was also a vote taken on the question of whether or not multiple categories were needed for below the line reporting of non-sponsored funds. The vote was unanimous that one category for non sponsored funds would be best, with a second below the line category for other sponsored projects.
- Design Issues
  o Biweekly pay will be included in effort reports based on pay period end dates rather than pay period begin dates. Biweekly is the only pay schedule in which pay periods cross months and include time from two months.
  o Fund numbers need to be maintained historically so that they can be translated correctly for prior periods.
  o Discussions will continue concerning how to handle reporting for employees who have pay which falls into more than one effort reporting period category. This could happen in situations where an employee has combination 9 and 11 month appointments. In that

case, the system would need to do some special handling. The special handling is required because an effort report for a 9 month employee includes four months' pay while an effort report for an 11 month employee includes only 3 months pay. Mixing the two payment types together would skew the percentages in favor of the 9 month pay. The system needs to have specific instructions how to handle these special situations.

Reporting for Part Time Employees - Pixie raised a question posed by the Requirements Group concerning reporting of effort for part time employees. The Requirements Group asked whether all effort reports needed to total 100% or if effort reports for part time employees could reflect the percent of time paid. The Management Group concluded that this would be too confusing and confirmed that the system should convert part time payments to 100% effort.

Non-Employee Use of System - There was a brief discussion at the October 28 meeting concerning the use of ERS by non-employees. Although there would be no effort reports produced for non-employees it is possible that non-employees could require access to the system as coordinators, reviewers, or certifiers. The decision could affect how the security and access controls are handled by ERS. A decision was made to provide the ability for non-employees to access ERS, even though their usage is likely to be limited.

Defining Project Scope - A discussion was held concerning the need to clearly define the scope of the project and to define a process for dealing with issues that appear to be outside the scope. Jon Good presented a visual depiction of the project scope. Group members felt that this depiction would be useful in conveying project scope. Jon will make adjustments to the graphic and send it out for review. The Management Group restated that it was the role of the Management Group to address issues or suggestions which were outside the project scope. Items outside the scope could take two forms. The first would be a situation in which a proposal was made to change some system feature in such a way that it affects requirements and design decisions to date. The second would be a request for additional functionality that had no affect on other system requirements or design. In the first case, questions could be referred to Management Group for their decision. In the second case, the Management Group could review, and if they felt it was appropriate, could add the item to a list of enhancements for a phase II.

Voluntary Uncommitted Cost Sharing - Pixie distributed, in advance of the meeting, a writeup prepared by Mike Anthony concerning the advantages of recording uncommitted cost sharing. The Management Group discussed this briefly and concluded that there was no advantage and perhaps some disadvantage to recording uncommitted cost sharing,

Alternative Report Format - The group reviewed the alternative report format and concluded that the format was more confusing, didn't allow the system to perform adequate edits and compliance monitoring, and provided no additional benefits. They also concluded that the format was more likely to result in reporting of voluntary uncommitted cost sharing which is counter to their earlier decision not to report uncommitted cost sharing. The format proposed earlier (modified versions of the format in the Requirements Document) will be the basis for the format.

Below the Line Categories - The Management Group agreed with the Requirements Group recommendation that below the line there be one category for non-sponsored funds and one category for other sponsored.

Department Feedback - Now that we are designing the actual effort report layouts it is important that we get feedback from department representatives concerning the screen presentation and system navigation and functionality. Campuses will set up department meetings as soon as possible, most likely in January, so that we can present some screen mockups and information to them and get their feedback. Adam indicated that a mockup could be available for discussion at the next Management Work Group meeting.

White Paper - Sue distributed the draft white paper in advance of the meeting but most people did not have a chance to review thoroughly. Sue asked that people read through and send her comments. The plan is to finalize the draft for presentation to the Requirements Work Group and to be able to share it with the campus work groups and the Controllers in January.

Next Meeting
It was decided that the next meeting which is scheduled for December 9 will be conference call only.