Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the April 14, 2005 Meeting
Revised May 12, 2005 - Accepted May 12, 2005

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

Review of 3/10/2005 Meeting Notes

The 3/10/2005 meeting notes were approved without revision.

Management Group Report

Jon Good reported on highlights of the April 12 ERS Management Group meeting:

- the ERS Management Group will continue to meet every 2nd Wednesday for the foreseeable future
- development costs are running significantly under estimate for the current fiscal year and for the project as a whole
- continuation of the ERS Management Group into the maintenance phase has been suggested and is currently under consideration
- the anticipated maintenance workload needs to be characterized in a better way so the budget associated with the maintenance phase can be refined; there is interest in budgeting some amount for future enhancements
- a communications/training specialist will be on board in May to craft a "base" set of communications materials and a "core training curriculum" for campuses to use in preparation for rollout of the ERS
- reviewed feedback on the White Paper and discussed some of the points raised and how changes would be made to the White Paper

Mike Anthony suggested that savings from the development phase be reserved for future enhancements to ERS. Jorge added that enhancements are likely to occur during the maintenance phase, though the particulars of such enhancements aren't yet known.

Greg Carr asked if the schedule for the pilot is on target – Adam responded that the project is still on schedule for an October pilot and a February 6, 2006 production release.

Buck Marcussen commented that the project hasn't yet crossed the threshold of acceptance with faculty. Jon responded that it is the intent of the ERS Management Group to design a communications and training plan and associated materials that campuses can use to inform faculty and staff about the new ERS, what it means to those individuals, and how to use the new system as a means of facilitating the pilot and being prepared for production implementation.

Greg inquired about plans for stress/load testing. Adam responded that this was a planned activity. Jon added that the ERS not a large volume transaction processing system, compared to other systems in the University, but that experience has been that database queries can slow overall system performance if not optimized, thus the need for a load/stress test.

Mike inquired about substantive issues raised in the white paper review. Adam mentioned that one item suggested making explicit that each campus develop and issue a cost sharing policy as opposed to a university-wide policy.

Mike commented that it has been reported elsewhere that the federal government does not endorse tolerances and suggested that the 5% tolerance may be an issue that needs to be researched further and/or carefully worded in the White Paper.

Rick Valdivia asked whether the UCLA issue on voluntary uncommitted cost sharing was raised. Jorge responded that the issue was discussed and the conclusion of the Management Group was that this was a true committed cost sharing in the context of rebudgeting (which the PI has authority to do). (Refer to April 13, Management Group meeting notes for more detail on this topic).,

Adam also mentioned that 3rd party cost share agreements would not be handled in the ERS and a suggestion to use title codes as a method of identifying who should/shouldn't certify for others was turned down.

[A more detailed description of the substantive White Paper issues appears in the notes of the April 13, 2005 ERS Management Group meeting.]

9/12 and 11/12 Appointment Combinations

At the March 10 meeting it was agreed that representatives from those campuses with employees having combinations of 9/12 and 11/12 appointments would find a real-life example or two and validate that the practicality of the factoring method of "equalizing" effort when reporting on individuals with such combinations. The following status reports were given:

- Los Angeles –Adam cited an example – librarian/lecturer – Adam and Pixie have not had a chance to review and determine if the factor method works for these cases
- Davis – (James Ringo) sent in a case that has ½ in School of Medicine, where pay is currently being overhauled (because of the current pay methodology, pay information is not easy to work with in ERS context).

- San Diego (Dan Gilbreath) – had sent Pixie a spreadsheet with example cases which seem to work except for a summer research case where FTE > 1 outside of summer months.

Adam suggested and it was agreed that more time was needed to confirm the factor method works in all cases. This topic will be raised again at the next meeting.

Dan also handed out list of DOS codes and asked whether items that don't include Hours On Pay Status = 'Y' would be included in effort calculations. Jon responded that only those pay distributions where the DOS Hours On Pay Status = "Y" would be included in effort calculations. [NOTE: subsequent to the meeting it was determined that DOS Hours On Pay Status would identify a superset of pay distributions and that DOS Pay Category and Time Code attributes will be used to select pay distributions for inclusion in effort reporting, as originally described in the requirements definition.]

Feedback on Verification of 9/12 Title Code Attributes

At the March 10 meeting it was agreed that all campuses would 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). Following up on this item, status was reported as shown below:

- Berkeley (Cynthia Kane): period attributes are tied to descriptions – will go back to reconfirm this because of Berkeley using a HRIMS system as front-end to PPS. Also need to get confirmation in a more formal manner that basis/paid over is accurate in PPS.
- Los Angeles (Rochelle Caballero) –Verified that 9/12 titles with proper attributes are being used in PPS appointments
- San Francisco (Mike Anthony) – campus has 11/12 appointments only – not an issue
- Davis (James Ringo)– still checking
- San Diego (Dan Gilbreath) -Dan handed out a list of title codes which appear to be problematic at San Diego – it appears that the use of title code attributes are inconsistent on his campus. Adam and Jon will take a closer look to verify whether the title codes are indeed problematic.

ERS Notification Requirements

Adam introduced this topic as one where the goal is to refine the last few items in the requirements regarding notifications and reporting

The key points about notifications to be addressed are:
- For what events are notifications needed?
- When will the system send a notification?
- To whom will the notification be sent?

It was proposed, and the group agreed, that a guiding principle for notifications is to notify (home) department effort reporting coordinators rather than the certifiers, wherever possible.

Jon reminded the group of past discussions and agreements that the departmental effort reporting coordinator is the individual who will be responsible for ensuring that review of effort reports takes place prior to those reports being certified and, as a result, it just makes much more sense to notify department coordinators directly rather than bother PI's with notifications they may not understand.

Adam presented the following four scenarios as the basic set of situations for which notifications should bee issued:

1. **Condition:** The start of a certification cycle has begun and effort reports for the associated reporting period are available for review/certifications. **Notification type:** generic (no specific effort report detail is included in the notification). **Timing of notification**: at the conclusion of the batch process to generate effort reports for certification (e.g., 30- 45 days after close of reporting period). **Destination of notification:** department effort reporting coordinators.

2. **Condition:** Time-based reminder of the deadline for certification of effort reports. **Notification type:** generic. **Timing of notification**: Some campus-specified number of days prior to the deadline for certification of effort reports. **Destination of notification:** department effort reporting coordinators.

3. **Condition:** Change of payroll information which impacts the percent time for which any effort has been opened/certified. **Notification type:** Specific (pertaining to the one effort report only). **Timing of notification**: Immediate, when the ERS detects a change in percent time from a payroll adjustment that merits re-review/recertification of an effort report. **Destination of notification:** department effort reporting coordinators.

4. **Condition:** When a multi-line certification report has been updated and reflects a significant change requiring re-certification of the effort report (where change from one department may impact other department[s]). **Notification type:** Specific (pertaining to the one effort report only). **Timing of notification**: Immediate, at the time a change to the effort report is made, as described above.. **Destination of notification:** just to the department effort reporting coordinator for the employee's home department.

Adam pointed out that to reduce the number of actual notification emails sent to a single recipient, the ERS is being designed to consolidate multiple notifications of a given type into a single email note for each recipient.

The group concurred with this set of notifications.

The group was adamant that there was no need to have multiple cycles of delinquent certifications (e.g., 30, 60, 90 days past due).

Discussion of reminders led to the addition of the following reminder notification:

5. **Condition:** Time-based reminder of the deadline for certification of effort reports. NOTE: this reminder may occur more than once on a schedule determined by the campus. **Notification type:** generic. **Timing of notification**: Some campus-specified number of days prior to the deadline for certification of effort reports. **Destination of notification:** all principal investigators associated with funds on a report awaiting certification with cc's to department effort reporting coordinator of the home department of the individual for whom certification must be obtained.

It was agreed that further compliance monitoring should be taken up at the campus level using reporting tools, most likely by department coordinators.

Jon suggested that there a control mechanism was needed to address the situation where no individual is in the role of department coordinator (or never was) and generic messages are not being read. It was suggested that there should be a second individual identified as a "control point" to receive notifications concurrent with those sent to the department coordinator. **The group agreed that two email addresses should be required for all types of notifications.**

Next Meeting

Scheduled for May 12, 2005, from 10-2pm. Location will be 1111 Broadway 14th Floor (UC Treasurers Office). This will be an in-person meeting.