Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the January 13, 2005 Meeting
<u>*Accepted February 10, 2005*</u>

Attendees: Greg Carr (UCB), Amy Kimball (UCB), Cathy Jen (UCB), Maribel Ganal (UCD), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), James Ringo (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Dan Gilbreath (UCSD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Jon Good (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Wayne Kidd (UCOP), Eli Cochran (UCOP)

Review of 12/08/2004 Meeting Notes

Jorge suggested and the group agreed to two clarifications to the 12/8/2004 meeting notes:

- In the last sentence of the last paragraph of "General Discussion" will be revised to read as follows:

  "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 required because of salary caps."

- In the second to last paragraph of "Presentation of Prototype" will be changed to read as follows:

  "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."

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

From the December 8, 2004 meeting, there was the question of whether an effort report would be required for a principal investigator who had no paid effort in the reporting period, but for whom some minimal cost-shared effort was implicitly or explicitly stated in the terms of the funding. The Management Group discussed this issue at its January 12, 2005, meeting and concluded that with no paid effort in the reporting period, minimum cost-sharing would either have to be spelled out in campus cost-sharing data to trigger an effort report or that an effort report would have to be manually generated. The Management Group considers this a local policy/procedure issue and not one for the Effort Reporting System.

Jorge made two suggestions based on prior meetings' discussions:

1. Identify IPA's that should be excluded from effort reporting by introducing a new Award Type code value in Contract and Grant systems.

2.   Identify non-federal grants that require effort reporting by introducing a new Federal Flow Through Code value in financial systems.

It was agreed that these two suggestions would be discussed with the Technical Advisory Group and then the Management Group.

Case Scenarios

Adam handed out worksheets illustrating case scenario examples mined from UCLA Payroll data and walked the group through each example.

Examples covered the following cases:
1.   11-month academic (simple case)
2.   11-month academic with multiple sponsored projects
3.   Non-academic Manager on multiple sponsored projects
4.   9 month academic with off-quarter (summer) research
5.   9-month academic with off-quarter research an administrative pay and changes in distributions from one month to the next

In response to a question about where biweekly pay will be reported when that pay spans an effort reporting period, Pixie indicated that the Pay Begin Date will determine what effort reporting period the pay detail will fall into. Pixie has since corrected that statement to indicate that biweekly pay will be reported based on pay period END date.

Discussion ensued about consolidating effort percent time by fund, then account or organization unit on the effort reports, rather than summing up to the fund level. All "below-the-line" (non-sponsored activities and Other Sponsored Projects) activity will be rolled up into a single line for non-sponsored and a single line for Other Sponsored Projects on the effort report, regardless of fund. For "above-the-line" (Sponsored Projects) it was agreed that roll up should be done if there was sub-categorization of the fund such as the UCLA project number (as in one of the case scenarios) but all agreed that it was important to be able to distinguish the department in cases where one fund number was linked to multiple departments. While all agreed that rollup was required it was also agreed that it would not be desirable to roll everything to the fund level. Exactly how the rollup would be defined was left unresolved pending input from campuses as to the level to which the roll-up of pay detail should occur. **The group agreed to respond to the following question with an email note to Pixie and bring the response to the next meeting for discussion: At what level should pay detail be aggregated and displayed for sponsored projects? (Fund, Fund and Account, Fund and Organization Code, etc.)**

Rick asked whether it will be possible to get reports out of the system to identify effort reports for which certification had not been completed. Extramural Funds management

would need to stay on top of those who haven't yet certified (to get them to certify). The answer is that the Effort Reporting System will have reports to identify individuals for whom effort report certification is outstanding.

Buck asked how the system "assigns" effort reports to departments or department coordinators for certification tracking purposes. The response was that the system will not "assign" effort reports to department coordinators, but that association with one or more departments is implicit via the FAU, account number, or other fields associated with the project for which effort reporting is required.

A question was raised as to whether the ERS system will detect when a pay adjustment has taken place where the PPS adjustment indicators were improperly set and resulted in a total percent time for an individual exceeding 100%. The response was that percent time in excess of 100% should be caught in the PPS context through existing reports. The only valid exception is for off-quarter (summer) research, where percent time in excess of 100% is allowable in PPS. It is also possible that employees working less than full time (usually less than 50%) would not be identified on existing edit reports in PPS if the original time paid and the adjustment time did not total more than 100%..

Pixie agreed to put together some examples for the next meeting on how to handle off-quarter research - effort reports for off-quarter research should be able to be produced by ERS any time of the year.

Buck asked whether the group will continue reviewing case scenarios at the next meeting. Jon responded that the Management Group is looking forward to having case scenarios and mock-ups ready to begin campus work group discussions that will begin in mid- to late-February, so some work will need to be done to reach conclusion on the case scenarios. That will include gathering campus-specific examples as well as cleaning up and reviewing the case scenarios discussed today. As a result, it will be necessary to further the work on case scenarios before the next Requirements Group meeting, then review and discuss further at the February 10 meeting.

It was agreed that the case scenarios reviewed during this meeting were close to covering 80% or so of all Effort Reporting cases. The group agreed that the following examples would round out the population of case scenarios:

1. Hourly paid, variable percent, student activity – a graduate student researcher would be a very good example
2. An academic with a combination 9 month and 11 month pay
3. An individual paid over a salary cap

Next Steps:

1. The ERS Team will clean up the Excel spreadsheet containing the examples discussed today and send along to the Requirements Group (emailed 1/13/2005 following the meeting; spreadsheet also available on the web at: http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/REQTS/ERS_Case_Scenarios.xls).

2. **Campuses will provide the ERS Team at least one example of a current effort report and supporting PPS detail fitting a scenario so preparation of examples can be prepared for discussion in campus work group presentations.**

   The deadline for submission of campus examples is January 27, 2005. Submissions should be made to Adam and Pixie.

   The following individuals were identified as responsible for providing examples:

   > Berkeley – Amy Kimball & Cathy Jen
   > San Francisco –Erica Webber
   > Davis – Buck Marcussen & Maribel Ganal
   > Los Angeles – Rochelle Caballero & Rick Valdivia
   > San Diego – Dan Gilbreath

Review of ERS Prototype

Continuing the review of mock-ups of Effort Reporting System screens begun at the December 8, 2004, meeting, options for drilldown into the pay detail represented on the effort reports was reviewed. Two options for drilldown were presented: 1) a limited drilldown display of detail associated strictly with sponsored projects ("above the line" detail on the Effort Report), and 2) a full detail display showing all pay detail for the reporting period. This prompted agreement on two points:

1. The layouts of the detail displays were reasonable
2. *Both* drilldowns would be useful, to different users of the system. The limited drilldown would be useful to most individuals certifying their own effort, while the full detail display would be of value to principal investigators as well as reviewers and department coordinators.

Dan commented that the full detail display needs to include all payroll information for the reporting period, not just the information related to the effort being reported, since real life doesn't necessarily correspond to the nearly perfect examples presented.

Buck and Erica commented that the display of pay rates/salaries in the drilldowns is problematic because of researchers not wanting others to see their pay information. It was pointed out that, even though there is no truly confidential information (as defined by policy or statute) in the Effort Reporting System, the display of pay rate information would present challenges to some campuses' practices protecting such information.

It was suggested that permissions to view pay rate information be set up at the department coordinator and principal investigator levels, since pay information can be of value in relating back to PPS when trying to understand just what payroll activity took place. This approach, while limiting access to sensitive information, could also limit the functionality of the system for some users.

As a follow-up to this issue, the ERS Team will investigate with the Technical Advisory Group what options exist for limiting the display of pay rate detail by individual user, based on some privilege set. One suggestion is to use the definition of pay privileges in PPS as source info for privileges in ERS to look at pay rate detail, Another suggestion was to make the display of pay rate detail a campus-level option.

Review of the prototype continued with the presentation of the screen used to specify selection criteria for the listing of effort reports. While the concept of saving selection criteria for different lists was considered useful, strong concern was voiced about the complexity of the screen on which search criteria was specified…the screen would be too complex for most principal investigators. **Based on this feedback, the ERS Team will re-examine the specification of selection criteria for listing effort reports.**

Next Meeting

The next ERS Requirements group meeting will be Thursday February 10, 2005 from 10:00am-2:00pm, in Oakland at the Treasurer's Office.