

Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the December 8, 2004 Meeting
Revised January 13, 2005 - Accepted , 2005

Attendees: Greg Carr (UCB), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Amy Kimball (UCB), Cathy Jen (UCB), Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Maribel Ganal (UCD), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Mike Anthony (UCSF), James Ringo (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Sandra Brierley (UCSD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Jon Good (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Wayne Kidd (UCOP), Eli Cochran (UCOP)

Review of 11/17/2004 Meeting Notes

The notes from the November 17th meeting were reviewed. Mike commented on the wording in the Requirements Group Notes (from the 11/3/2004 meeting), in particular the paragraph beginning: *This approach is not in agreement with several edit requirements...* (following the second bullet). Mike suggested that this paragraph could be revised to indicate that an edit could be put in place to highlight when the entered effort exceeds the sum of changed effort and committed cost sharing and that the wording of this paragraph seemed inconsistent with the text cited in the second bullet. [Subsequent research into the wording in question, the paragraph was put in to address the inconsistency with the suggestion made in the 11/3/2004 meeting that the edit could be done if assumptions were made about certified effort always applying first to charged effort. The paragraph will remain unchanged.]

Jorge suggested, and it was agreed, that the wording in the conclusion of “Question #1 – Are multiple categories needed for non-sponsored funds?” should be changed to *Campuses were unanimous that they would not need this information in their F&A calculation and so there was no purpose for multiple categories.*

Management Group Report

Jon reviewed discussions and decisions of the Management group on November 18th on items elevated from the Requirements Group. Issues concerning voluntary uncommitted cost sharing, reporting for part-time employees, non-employee use of the system, and alternative report format were reviewed. The outcome of the Management Group discussion can be seen in the notes from the November 18th meeting at: http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/ers_mgmt_mtg_notes_20041118_draft.pdf

General Discussion

The group began discussion of several survey questions posed in the meeting agenda.

Can you estimate what percentage of the PAR's for your department or campus are currently and correctly certified as they are issued? In other words, they are correct and require no changes before certification.

Discussion ensued regarding this question. Buck reported that at Davis, reports for approximately 90% of general, salaried employees are certified as issued but that 90-95%

Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the December 8, 2004 Meeting
DRAFT – 1/4/2005

of reports for faculty are currently changed due to salary cap or “salary recovery” issues. There was general consensus that the percentage of PAR’s changed across the University was similar. It was also noted that the new method of calculating effort, which is based on percentage of time rather than gross pay, will significantly reduce the number of changes made by Principal Investigators because of salary caps.

Presentation of Prototype

Eli presented a preliminary prototype of the web application user interface. The group walked through an effort report list page as well as the effort report page itself.

The group reiterated that effort reports which require adjustments to payroll amounts should prompt for action to initiate appropriate expense transfers. (The requirements already state this.)

A suggestion was made that clicking on the “Certify” button on the effort report page trigger a prompt to the certifier with the language of the certification statement currently contained on the A21 PAR report (or some agreed upon language) and requiring a positive action to finish the certification.

The group re-iterated the requirement that comments must be added to the effort report every time a change was saved, whether or not the effort report is certified at that time, and that comments should not be required when the report is certified without further change (whether or not the report was changed prior to being called up for certification).

Jorge raised the issue of whether a principal investigator on a sponsored project would have to show at least a minimal percent effort regardless of actual effort in any given report period. The rationale was that on a large project, the PI would have to be at least minimally managing the activities of the project even if they were not actively performing research during the period. This issue will be raised with the Management Group.

The group discussed whether a report that requires multiple certifications (of individual sponsored project lines) should also require a final “master” certification of the complete report. This idea was rejected as introducing an unnecessary additional layer of oversight.

Sandra suggested that the web application allow navigation among effort reports for multiple people, as well as navigation among versions of an effort report for a single person. This capability would be useful to a departmental coordinator that has to review a list of effort reports made up of multiple people from the same department. The ERS development team will evaluate incorporating this feature in the system design.

Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the December 8, 2004 Meeting
DRAFT – 1/4/2005

Buck asked whether there was a need to certify for UC faculty working on sponsored projects at an outside institution. The group affirmed that since these faculty would likely be paid by the outside institution, that UC has no responsibility to certify effort based on that outside pay. However, if the faculty member has any UC pay from sponsored project funds, then certification for UC-paid effort will be required.

Rick mentioned that UCLA has “IPA’s” which are funds that should be excluded from effort reporting. Adam responded that the system will allow individual funds to be flagged whether they are sponsored or non-sponsored, and separately whether they require certification or not.

Next Meeting

The next ERS Requirements group meeting will be Thursday January 13, 2005. The time and location will be confirmed via e-mail shortly along with an agenda for the meeting.