Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the June 9, 2005 Meeting
Revised   July 14 , 2005 - Accepted   July 14, 2005

Attendees: Cathy Jen (UCB), Amy Kimball (UCB), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Rochelle Cabellero (UCLA), James Ringo (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Erica Webber (UCSF), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Jon Good (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Wayne Kidd (UCOP), Eli Cochran (UCOP), Deb Nikkel (UCOP)

Review of 4/14/2005 Meeting Notes

The 4/14/2005 meeting notes were approved as revised.

Review of 5/12/2005 Meeting Notes

Rochelle Caballero commenting on write-up of Notification Requirements (p.6), suggested that the first bullet point be reworded simply to read "Whenever possible notifications should go to effort reporting coordinators directly rather than PI's."

Rochelle also suggested that the list of scenarios be formatted to present Condition, Notification Type, Timing of Notification, and Destination of Notification in bullet form to make the details easier to read.

Cathy Gen noted on p.3, last bullet, "HRIS" is incorrect and should read "HRMS"

With these changes, the meeting notes were approved.

Management Group Report

Jon reported on highlights of the June 8 ERS Management Group meeting:

The Management Group had endorsed the concept of recommending data element definition changes on a university-wide basis in support of ERS. (See next topic for a detailed discussion of proposed data element definition changes.)

The first phase of modifications to PPS to implement the NIH Salary CAP had been issued as PPS Release 1647 on June 6. The second phase of PPS modifications will address reporting "over cap" conditions detected in the Payroll Compute process and is planned for release later in the summer.

For the pre-quality assurance testing activity planned for this summer, the Management Group is looking to campus working groups to provide participants.

Type of Award Code and Flow Through Code Revisions

Jorge handed out a one-page document, "Fund Attributes", which identified suggested revisions to "Type of Award Code" and "Flow Through Code" values. As previously discussed with the Requirements Committee, the purpose of the suggested revisions is to find a way to identify Interagency Personnel Agreements (IPAs) as shown in proposed "Type of Award Code" code values list, and to identify non-federal funds requiring effort reports as shown in the "Flow Through Code" code values list. A lengthy discussion followed.

In response to a suggestion that campuses should be determining which funds require effort reporting, Pixie remarked that the Management Group had discussed the issue of campus-by-campus determination of which funds require effort reporting and which do not, and had concluded that it was important for that determination to come from UCOP Research Administration and had put this recommendation in the Effort Reporting White Paper. Jon added that it is the Management Group's direction to have university-wide consistency in coding of fund attributes so as to avoid having an inconsistency cited in any audit of effort reporting. The Management Group understands that identification of funds requiring effort reporting needs to be included in the feed of fund information from campus financial systems into ERS.

There was significant discussion on whether the use of Sponsor Code would provide the necessary identification of non-federal sponsors requiring effort reporting. In the end, it was agreed that identification of effort reporting requirement as a fund attribute gives flexibility to identify specific projects, for a given sponsor, that do/do not require effort reporting when that sponsor does not/does require effort reporting.

Rick Valdivia inquired about three types of federal funds and how to exclude them from effort reporting:

- **work-study/financial aid** – pay is made from work study funds, so exclusion from effort reporting does need to be indicated for work study funds
- **interns and residents** – Payments are made as salary for physicians and dentists appointed to the integrated/affiliated residency program with the Department of Veterans Affairs, using funds in the federal fund group. Exclusion from effort reporting of interns and residents funds needs to be indicated.
- **control funds** – these are federal funds for compensated absences used to feed vacation accrual pools. The group concluded that no pay is made directly from these funds, so distinguishing these funds as not requiring effort reporting is not necessary.

James raised the question of whether work study program staff who are paid from work study funds have to report effort. **This question needs to be investigated.**

It was agreed to revise the list of values for "Type of Award Code" and "Flow Through Code" as follows:

Type of Award Code
       Current Codes
              '1' Cooperative Agreement
              '2' Contract
              '3' Grant, including State Interagency Agreements and Memoranda of Understanding
              '4' Gift

       Suggested revised and additional new values:
              '3' Grant
              '5' Interagency Personnel Agreement (IPA)
              '6' Interns and Residents (Resident Physician Agreements)
              '7' Work Study/Pell Grant/Financial Aid

              [NOTE: the assignment of code values '6' and '7' to the associated description was done for the purposes of these meeting notes only and was not discussed in the meeting itself. Actual code values are subject to change prior to being issued by UCOP IR&C in university-wide data element definition revisions.]

Flow Through Code
       Current Codes
              '1' Gift, contract, grant, or other agreement funded 100% by a non-federal, non-foundation source.
              '2' Gift, contract, grant, or other agreement funded partially by federal funds and partially by a State or private source.
              '3' Gift, contract, grant, or other agreement funded 100% by federal funds, although allocated by a State or private source.
              '4' Gift from a campus foundation comprised of foundation endowment income.
              '5' Gift from a campus foundation that is not foundation endowment income.

       Suggested revised and additional new values:
              '0' Gift, contract, grant, or other agreement funded 100% by a non-federal, non-foundation source - effort reports required.
              '1' Gift, contract, grant, or other agreement funded 100% by a non-federal, non-foundation source - no effort reports required.

9/12 and 11/12 Appointment Combinations and Title Code Attributes

Campus status reports on verification of the factor method for campus handling of individuals with combinations of 9/12 and 11/12 appointments, and verification of campus handling of Title Code "Basis" and "Paid Over" attributes:

- Los Angeles – (Pixie) reported UCLA as a general rule there are no combinations 9/12 and 11/12 appointments, but where they do occur, it appears that the calculation works correctly.

- Berkeley – Cathy & Amy noted that Berkeley is essentially the same as UCLA insofar as combination appointments go. Pixie's suggested that two points of follow-up from Berkeley were needed: 1) is HRMS is doing a calculation based on the annual rate and Basis/Paid Over codes and passing result to PPS? 2) is there a valid reason for entering Basis/Paid Over rather than having the system derive it. **Amy to follow-up with Cynthia.**

- Davis – (James/Adam) Adam had provided James with an analysis of the Davis test case with winter quarter data as the basis and the result is the factor methodology works. Davis has run some other cases through and is getting correct results.

  Buck noted that the School of Medicine is looking at how to convert their by-agreement payments to regular payments, which appears to have become a quite complex problem in cases where the employee has combination 9/12 and 11/12 appointments. However, there are a total of 16 people on the Davis campus with these combination appointments and they are now looking towards paying these individuals wholly on either a 9/12 or 11/12 schedule.

With the exception of the pending responses to the questions for the Berkley campus, all campuses have confirmed that the factor method will work and that Title Code attributes will not pose a problem for the ERS.

Communications and Training

Communications

Deb Nikkel handed out the first schedule for development of communications and training. A key point about the schedule is the plan to get core training materials out about six weeks prior to actual production release to provide sufficient lead time for

campus customization of the materials and actual training. Discussion of this point led to the question of when campuses are really planning on implementing ERS and when core training materials will really be needed by the campuses for production preparations. Deb will talk to campus representatives for input on this topic.

A pilot of the new ERS is being planned for this fall with the Davis campus in October. This led to a question about whether it made sense to begin piloting if cost sharing commitment data was not available to be imported into ERS. Buck Marcussen said that he thought there may actually be an advantage to running the first effort reports without importing the cost sharing commitment data. His point was that it would be much easier for users to review the ERS calculations and understand what the system was doing with the calculations based on pay if data was coming in from just one source. Most people felt that the department would be able to manually populate the cost sharing information and become comfortable with the calculations based on pay on the first reporting period and then introduce the cost sharing info on the next reporting period.

Deb inquired as to when campuses would want core training materials. The consensus was that the sooner training materials were available, the better – generally 6-weeks before the application arrives. Customization of training materials at the campus level needs to be coordinated with the customization of the ERS in the campus context.

Deb distributed handouts of two PowerPoint presentations, one a "Master" presentation which covers the full spectrum of information related to the project, and an "Executive" presentation drawn from the Master presentation and tailored to an executive level audience.

Buck remarked that definition of "effort" is missing from the presentation – faculty looks at "effort" differently from most others. Buck suggested that the presentation needs to connect the faculty to the concept of "effort" as closely as possible. He also suggested adding a slide that shows different types of effort (e.g., actual, committed cost shared effort, etc.)

Buck suggested adding "Protection of the PIs" to the slide "Anticipated Benefits".

It was the general consensus that the presentations were helpful and valuable and the right level of detail for kick-off presentations.

Pixie noted that Mike Allred had suggested and the Management Group agreed to creating a "core" FAQ page.

Deb will send out electronic version of PowerPoints to the Requirements Group for review. Feedback/comments on the presentations need to be provided to Deb by June 17, which is the same deadline as for the Management Group review of the presentations.

Buck asked how vacation factors into effort reporting training (e.g., lab tech goes on vacation for a month then comes back and is asked to certify effort that includes vacation). Should vacation be treated as effort? It was the consensus of the group that vacation should be treated as effort. Buck suggested that this item should be included in the FAQ.

Review of Target Audiences

There was a review of the target audiences identified by the Management Group in the March 2005 meeting. Each audience has distinct responsibilities with regard to policy, compliance, administration and system usage. Therefore training modules must be delivered that teach effort reporting policy and administration, roles and responsibilities and ERS system usage.

Training audiences and their general responsibilities with regard to effort reporting were delineated and defined as shown in the chart below.

Training Audiences for Effort Reporting and Responsibilities

Audience:	Responsibility:
Faculty Principle Investigator	• Project Oversight • Compliance • Administrative • Certification
Other Faculty and key Academic Personnel	• Compliance • Administrative • Certification
Department Research Administrators (Fund Managers, MSOs)	• ERS Implementation • Compliance • Administrative
ERS Coordinators	• Notification • Coordination • Administrative
Departmental security administrative staff	• Set up users • Grant appropriate access

For purposes of training it is necessary to define the performance that must occur by "role" in order for the system to be fully utilized. Those roles were initially determined to be:

System Roles and Responsibilities

System Role	Responsibility
Viewer	• Access ERS • View effort reports
Reviewer	• Access ERS • Review effort reports • Edit effort reports • Add comments
Certifier	• Access ERS • Review effort reports • Edit effort reports • Add comments • Certify effort reports
ERS Coordinators	• Access ERS • Notify employees to certify effort • Track completion of certification • Follow-up on late, incomplete effort reports
System Administrator	• Access ERS • Assign IDs • Grant appropriate access per responsibility

During the Assess Phase of the Communications and Training Project activities all roles, responsibilities and training content requirements will be specified.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for July 14, 2005, from 10-2pm will be a conference call.