

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the February 10, 2005 Meeting
Accepted March 10, 2005**

Attendees: Greg Carr (UCB), Cathy Jen (UCB), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), James Ringo (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Lyle Kafader (for Dan Gilbreath - UCSD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Jon Good (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Wayne Kidd (UCOP)

Review of 1/13/2005 Meeting Notes

The notes were approved without comment.

Aggregation of pay detail on effort reports

A discussion of how to roll up pay detail for a given sponsored project was held, with the conclusion that rollup would vary by campus because of the different Financial Accounting Unit (FAU) structures in use. Roll-up is necessary to show sufficient meaningful detail and at the same time avoid showing multiple lines of smaller effort percent for a single sponsored project, which would make interpreting effort reports unnecessarily more complicated to certifiers. One example: when an individual is paid through two different departments for work on a single sponsored research project, different account numbers are used in conjunction with a common fund number. In this case, campuses would most likely want the rollup to show the distinct departments rather than rolling up to a single sponsored project. Another example is the use of account/cost center at some of the campuses which could require a further distinction in the rollup so that the rollup totals showed a distinction by account/cost center/sponsored project .

The group agreed that roll-up by sponsored project and department was appropriate in most cases.

Erica suggested that, because of sensitivity over who can see pay detail, access to the drill-down payroll data should be restricted in the following manner:

An individual can see the payroll drill-down for their own effort reports.

An individual viewing pay detail for others should only be allowed when local Payroll/Personnel System permissions exist for that individual to see pay detail.

Review of Case Scenarios

Adam reviewed the case scenarios document which presented simulated effort reports based on live payroll data as submitted by campuses. The cases were reviewed individually to validate the effort report calculations and presentation. The review of these cases triggered discussion of several issues related to presentation of the effort report.

Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the February 10, 2005 Meeting
Accepted March 10, 2005

First, a case scenario was presented where the effort for a particular project was less than one percent. Due to rounding, the report displayed this amount as zero effort.

The group affirmed that this was the correct calculation, but asked that a note be displayed on the effort report to alert the user to the fact that zero effort may be due to rounding, and that the complete detail of the calculation can be verified by looking at the payroll "drill down" page. The group also noted that this issue would need to be addressed in training for ERS users.

Second, a scenario was envisioned where the calculated percent effort for a particular project might net out to zero after transfers of expense were processed. While the calculated effort in this situation would be correct, the group felt that it was still necessary to display this project on the effort report so that it could be certified. The underlying payroll detail would allow the user to see how the zero percent effort was derived.

The group then discussed a related issue of how to present payroll detail on the "drill down" page. The group agreed that all payroll records should be displayed, even those that were excluded from the percent effort calculation. These excluded records should be grouped separately on the drill down page, with some visual indicator that they were excluded from the percent effort calculation.

In discussion of case scenario 8, involving cost sharing, adjusted cost sharing was shown for a sponsored project and a corresponding offset shown for non-sponsored activities. The ERS system will automatically apply cost sharing offsets to Non-Sponsored Projects. However, it is possible in some circumstances that the offset could need to be applied to an "other" sponsored project. For consistency of entry instructions on the effort report, and so the user was not required to enter + or - with cost sharing amounts, it was proposed, and the group concurred, that a separate line for the entry of a cost share offset against "other" sponsored projects should be included in the effort report. This offset line would require the user, by clicking a button, to acknowledge that approval had been granted by the sponsoring agency to allow the cost sharing from another sponsored project be charged to their sponsored project. Any cost sharing entered by the user on this additional line would be recorded as a negative amount since it is a cost sharing offset. Any cost sharing entered on the regular line on Other Sponsored Project would be recorded as a positive amount since it represents cost sharing on that Other Sponsored Project. Having the capability to add an additional line to record offsets or negative amounts allows the system to assume that cost sharing entered on the regular line is a positive amount. Because the data for the Other Sponsored Projects category data is rolled up to a single number rather than distinguishing by individual sponsored project, any cost sharing or cost sharing offset will apply to the total of "other" sponsored activity, not to individual detail lines. . The Other Sponsored Projects category is the

Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the February 10, 2005 Meeting
Accepted March 10, 2005

only place where a cost sharing amount could be entered as either a positive or negative amount. Amounts entered for Sponsored Projects will always be considered as positive while the amounts entered by the system in the Non-Sponsored Projects category will always be considered to be negative.

The case scenarios document will be posted to the ERS project website for use in discussions with campus ERS workgroups.

Review of Prototype

The current prototype was then reviewed which incorporated feedback from the last requirements group meeting on the payroll drill down page and a redesign of the search page. Several new features were demonstrated as well, including the method of adding a new project to the effort report. The group commented on this last feature deciding that when a new line is added to the effort report, a project must be selected on the new line before the report can be saved. In other words, a blank line should not be allowed on an effort report.

Next Meeting

The next ERS Requirements group meeting will be Thursday March 10, 2005 from 10:00am-2:00pm, in Oakland, conference room 9204 at 1111 Franklin.