

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting
Revised and Accepted August 11, 2005**

Attendees: Greg Carr (UCB), Cathy Jen (UCB), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Amy Kimball (UCB), Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Dan Gilbreath (UCSD), James Ringo (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Erica Webber (UCSF), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Jon Good (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Wayne Kidd (UCOP), Eli Cochran (UCOP), Deb Nikkel (UCOP)

Review of 6/9/2005 Meeting Notes

Dan Gilbreath commented on p.5 1st full paragraph, last sentence (suggesting that the employee could enter cost sharing information “easily”) as not true. Erica commented that it was more about the department and not the employee. All agreed that the sentence should be revised to read:

“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.”

The 6/9/2005 meeting notes were approved as revised.

Management Group Report

Jon reported on highlights of the July 13 ERS Management Group meeting:

- “Pre-Quality Assurance Phase is still on target for September. Preparation for this activity will be a topic for further discussion at the August 11, 2005 Requirements Committee meeting.
- Data element definition revisions were discussed and the Management Group endorsed the notion of those revisions. [Further discussion on the topic appears below.]
- Pilot Preparations – there was discussion of the pilot with the Davis campus. There will be further planning discussions in the coming weeks.
- Communications and Training Strategy – the same material discuss with the Management Group will be discussed with the Requirements Committee in this meeting. [See below for details of the discussion.]

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting
Revised and Accepted August 11, 2005**

Type of Award Code and Flow Through Code Revisions

Jon reported that an internal discussion took place at UCOP with the primary users of, analysts responsible for, Corporate Systems on the topic of proposed data element revisions in support of ERS. The key issue to come out of the discussion was that rather than tack on additional values to existing data elements, that a new data element be created as an attribute of Fund Number. Rick mentioned that manually updating local campus fund profiles would be time consuming and suggested that UCOP provide a list in machine-readable form that could be used by the campus to update local systems.

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

Following up on the one remaining question about Berkeley's HRMS, Cynthia Kane reported that the HRMS does have edits on the basis/paid over dropdowns, but there are circumstances where the basis/paid over do need to be overridden. Result will be that these cases may not be reflected properly in ERS. This needs to be resolved at the Berkeley campus level.

[In an email note on 7/29/2005, Cynthia reported that the Berkeley HRMS does derive basis and paid over values from Title Code. Inconsistency between dropdowns and the derived values of basis/paid over result in errors. Though the ability to override does exist, overrides are not used and monitoring is in place to insure that overrides do not happen. The factor method of calculating effort for combinations of 9/12 and 11/12 appointments does work for the Berkeley campus.]

Communications and Training Strategy

Deb Nikkel reviewed the proposed ERS Communications and Training Strategy. Five communications phases were identified and discussed – commitment, orientation, planning, preparation and implementation. Communications objectives, audiences and deliverables were described for each communication phase (on page 6 of the strategy document). Six training modules were identified and discussed – Project Oversight, Policy/Compliance, Administration, Coordinator, System Usage and System Security Administration. Proposed topics and content for each module were reviewed.

The group agreed to provide Deb detailed feedback on the strategy document details by July 29, 2005.

Erica asked whether comments on the master slide show had been received that resulted in revisions. Deb responded that she received feedback from a number of sources and that all appropriate revisions have been made. However, she is waiting on clarification of one comment to make the final revisions to the master slide show which will then be posted

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the July 14, 2005 Meeting
Revised and Accepted August 11, 2005**

on the web along with a list of comments and feedback. **Deb will communicate with the group when the final master slide show is ready.**

Buck, referring to the timing of training material availability in the context of the Davis pilot, asked whether all campuses would be looking at training materials at the same time. Jon responded that materials would be available for viewing but that the value of feedback is diminished if the training materials are introduced, even for evaluation, without immediate follow-on use of the system to gauge the efficacy of the training.

Greg Carr suggested that for just PI's and faculty, the modular content approach might not be appropriate and that materials specifically tailored to each of these two audiences would be more appropriate and valuable to the training process.

There was general agreement that communications channels need to be established to inform campuses when updated training materials are available as well as when updated ERS source code is available. **The project team will address communications protocols and channels as the production release date draws near.**

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for August 11, 2005, from 10-2pm will be a conference call.