Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the March 10, 2005 Meeting
Accepted April 14, 2005

Attendees: Mike Anthony (UCSF), Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Greg Carr (UCB), Cathy Jen (UCB), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Amy Kimball (UCB), 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 2/10/2005 Meeting Notes

The notes were approved without comment.

Management Group Report

Jon reported that the ERS Management Group had met on 3/9/2005 and focused its discussion on the development of a strategic plan for communications and training. The management group had concluded that some common communications and training materials could be developed, and examined the target audiences and potential messages to be communicated to each audience. The objective of this exercise is to get a complete list of constituent audiences at all of the ERS sponsoring campuses, determine what messages need to be communicated to each, then develop communications and training materials to address the different audiences. The Management Group is looking to develop communications targeted to high-level audiences (vice chancellors, deans, department chairs) within 3 months and for the remaining audiences within 6 months. To that end, the Management Group has agreed that the ERS project team should try to locate a resource with communications/training experience to guide the process. **Jon asked for email from anyone on the Requirements Group who was interested in taking on this task or who knows of a campus resource who would be good at this task.** Project funds are available to cover costs of a campus-based resource working as the communications/training expert. Jon will also pursue other channels at the campuses to determine whether a campus-based resource is available before looking at outside resources.

9/12 and 11/12 Appointment Combinations

Pixie introduced this topic by stating that the purpose of the paper is to put in one document all issues and considerations related to combination appointments. The main issue is that 9/12 appointments aren't paid on a 1-1 basis with monthly pay periods.

The analysis in the paper proposes using a factor to "equalize" percent effort associated with 9/12 appointments to 11/12 appointments. 9/12 payments would be flagged as having been "factored (at 75%) in the pay data drilldown display.

Buck asked how the reporting period will appear to the individual doing the certification. Pixie responded that while the service periods for 9/12 payments would vary slightly from the service periods for 11/12 they were probably close enough so that we could simply use the full month as the service period. For example, the service period for fall quarter 9/12 would be Sept. 25 through Dec 16, while the service period for fall quarter for 11/12 would be Oct 1 through Dec 31. It would probably be sufficient to say that the service period for both was October through December since the faculty member would probably think of in those terms anyway. : the header display would be the same as has been discussed before – headers with Reporting Period (e.g., 2nd fiscal quarter – October-December) and the associated pay period end dates.

Rick asked what population of employees had 9/12 and 11/12 appointment combinations. Pixie noted that an individual with both types of appointments typically was someone in a medical school with cross-over to a life sciences department. Responses from the campuses to this question:

- UCSF has strictly 11/12 appointments
- UCB has moved to all 9/12, though straggler 11/12 appointments remain
- UCD has the 9 & 11-month combination appoints regularly
- UCLA has the 9 & 11-month combination appointments on the EDB but generally all pay comes from the 11-month title.
- UCSD has the 9 & 11-month combination appoints regularly

Rick asked whether it would it be helpful to walk through the math as proposed by the analysis. Dan suggested that campuses that have this situation should go back and "test" the suggested solution to make sure that the math works. **Campuses with employees with combinations of 9/12 and 11/12 appointments agreed to find a real-life example or two, check that the logic proposed in the paper works properly, and then give feedback to Pixie. Pixie asked that any problems experienced in such "tests" be reported to her immediately.**

James asked about how the system will address 11/12 appointments that get pay for a 12th month? Pixie suggested that this would be off-quarter research (summer research). Other campuses reported that they did not, to their knowledge, pay 1/11 payments. Pixie suggested that a different DOS code should be used to indicate pay in the 12th month, and if necessary this could be handled as an exception or in a manner similar to the nine month off-quarter research. This needs to be explored further since the 1/11 could be paid in any month of the year and could not be defined as part of a regular schedule. If this truly is a rare occurrence, it may be sufficient to produce an edit message based on a unique DOS code. Pixie will follow up with UCD. It would also be helpful if workgroup members would verify that their campus does not issue 1/11 payments

Dan asked whether 9/12 and 11/12 appointments are indicated by Title Code. Many academic year title codes appear to be used with full-year appointments at UCSD. Pixie

responded that Title Code does have attributes indicating 9/12 and 11/12 appointments, and that Title Codes are strictly controlled.

All campuses will verify with the academic personnel offices that assignment of 9/12 titles are happening with appropriate attributes to the title code (e.g., basis and paid over values).

White Paper Review

Review of the white paper with the Requirements Group is one of many reviews being conducted concurrently. Comments should be submitted via email to <email address> by April 1.

Review of the white paper generated a lot of comments, many of a detailed nature on the choice of words or phrasing, presentation format, and organization. Significant points

- p.10 "Clinical Trials" – Mike commented that San Francisco feels that this statement (late set up of a fund for a sponsored project) advocates bad behavior. Greg suggested that this is not strictly a problem with clinical trials. Erica pointed out that this situation might well be an issue because campuses are "parking" funds for one project in another project until the project fund number is actually set up. The group agreed that this statement should be removed from the white paper. Mike suggest that wording should be incorporated to the effect that any delay in setting up funds (e.g., not set up in advance of award) will necessitate cost transfer for up to 120 days after the ERS reporting period has concluded. (Pixie asked James Ringo to check if this was originally a Davis campus issue.)

- p.12, 2nd full paragraph – Buck recommended expanding the reference to A-21 section J.10 and noting that any tuition remission not "paid through payroll" should be tracked through some other means.

- p.14 point.3, "recommended policy statement" – Erica commented that "project (award) level" should emphasize "sub-projects". Rick noted that this point is addressing what *funds* are to be certified. Pixie will suggest improved wording

- p.19 point 2 "Campuses Differences" – Erica remarked that the statement "however, no campuses appear to be mandating a maximum…." is not true – the wording on this point needs to be brought into consistency with policy statement in p.19 point 3. It was suggested the last part of sentence be removed. Dan also suggested that the wording regarding "attempt to monitor" in first part of sentence be removed.

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

Jorge raised the past discussion of a joint management / requirements group meeting to specifically discuss issues surrounding white paper. The group did not particularly see a need for such a meeting. Mike suggested at some point a joint meeting to celebrate project successes might be warranted.

Prototype Review

Adam and Eli reviewed version 5 of the prototype which incorporates further revisions of the search page and additional features on the effort report page. Adam reported that the prototype will not be refined any further unless a particular system design issue needed to be modeled for the Requirements group to review. The latest version of the prototype (version 5) and all prior versions are accessible via the project website.and can be shared with campus work groups.

Version 5 of the prototype presents two "paths" through the system with different views for a departmental effort reporting coordinator and a effort reporting user that certifies only their own reports.

The effort report list page now defaults to show those from the current reporting period, not all reporting periods. A message has been added to indicate if the there are "old" reports from prior periods. The Requirements group asked that the development team provide the ability to click on the message to get the list of "old" AND "open" reports that would have triggered the message. The group agreed that in general, the prototype looked good.

Adam reviewed a new feature which allows entry of negative cost sharing on a special offset line for "other sponsored projects." Erica responded that this same feature needs to be available for sponsored projects as well because there are exceptions where cost sharing on one sponsored project can be fulfilled from another. The development team will review this issue and bring forward design issues at a future meeting.

Pixie asked the group whether it is acceptable for the people, department and project lists on the search screen to display all of the values in the system even if the user does not have security access to view those records. The group agreed that there was no risk to displaying this information as long as the security features of the system prevented the user from accessing records for which they were not authorized.

Next Meeting

The next ERS Requirements group meeting will be Thursday April 14, 2005 from 10:00am-2:00pm, in Oakland, conference room 11326 at 1111 Franklin.