

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the August 11, 2005 Meeting  
Accepted September 8, 2005**

Attendees: Greg Carr (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), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Jon Good (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Deb Nikkel (UCOP)

Review of 7/14/2005 Meeting Notes

Two changes were discussed and agreed upon. Both changes were on page 2, "Type of Award Code and Flow Through Code Revisions" (changes to notes shown in **bold** font):

- Change second sentence to read: "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.**"
- Change fourth sentence to read: "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."

The 7/14/2005 meeting notes were approved as revised.

Management Group Report

Jon reported on highlights of the August 10 ERS Management Group meeting:

- Change Request Protocol – The Management Group declared the Extramural Funds Managers as functional owners of ERS and, once the system is in production, will be the group that decides which change requests will be pursued and the priority for each request to be pursued. Pixie added that the Requirements Committee will likely be asked to continue to review change requests for at least the first 6-12 months after the production release, as the committee is the most informed about the background of ERS and will be best prepared to quickly assess change requests.
- Data element definition discussion - Jon reported that the definition of a new Effort Reporting Indicator, to be associated with a Fund Number, is underway. It had been suggested in past meetings that an electronic file be provided by UCOP to identify fund numbers that need to have this indicator set. Upon analysis of this request, it became apparent that it is not possible for UCOP to provide campuses with such a file, because of the local financial systems constructs and the fact that campuses set up the fund definitions locally. It was also mentioned that there is a question of whether there is a need for this new data element in Corporate Systems and whether this data element would be collected from campuses. As yet

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the August 11, 2005 Meeting  
Accepted September 8, 2005**

a Corporate “owner” of the new data element has yet to come forward. The issues of Corporate “ownership” will be resolved at UCOP in the next couple of weeks and then campuses will be provided some guidance, likely from UCOP Research Administration, on what funds require effort reporting.

- White Paper – The White Paper was finalized by the Management Group on 8/10/2005, with only a couple of minor changes resulting from a final review. The final version of the White Paper will be published soon.
- Jon commented that Pixie has drafted an “Implementation Planning Guide” that identifies numerous considerations to be given in the planning for implementation of ERS. This document draws on Pixie’s experience rolling out major systems to the UCLA campus over the years. **The document will be shared with the Management Group and Requirements Committee in about two weeks, after it has been polished up.**

Pre-Quality Assurance Work Plan

Adam reported that the Project Team will be sharing with each campus some real life test cases used by the team for testing, and based on actual campus data, sometime in mid-September. Campuses will be asked to examine PPS data and generated effort reports for these test cases to help validate that calculations are correct and associated ERS effort reports are understandable.

Since Davis and UCLA are preparing test cases for their pilots, the Project Team will “borrow” their data for the pre-quality assurance process run here at UCOP.

Cynthia Kane asked whether the other campuses need to provide test cases, given the depth of test cases just described. Adam responded that cases from all campuses are desired. Pixie added that test cases from all campuses should be put through the pre-quality assurance process, as scheduled, to make sure that special cases from all of the campuses are tested and verified before the pilots begin.

There was discussion about what reporting cycles would be used for the quality assurance testing. Pixie pointed out that the test is dependent on Payroll System data that includes “derived percent time”, which was implemented with Payroll System Release 1591. Pixie suggested all campuses find out when Release 1591 was installed (ERS will only work with Payroll System data from that point in time forward) as that date will define the outer boundary for reporting periods that can be included in the test.

Rick Valdivia asked for confirmation that campuses should be gathering Employee ID’s of test cases for the pre-quality assurance test. Adam requested 5-10 cases per campus.

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the August 11, 2005 Meeting  
Accepted September 8, 2005**

Pixie added that in addition to Employee ID, documentation of the conditions for each test case should be prepared for submission to the Project Team.

Erica asked whether SF folks were going to participate in pre-quality assurance test. Jon commented that ALL campuses need to participate in the QA process. Pixie added that some campus conditions are unique to the campus and that all campuses need to participate in the test to make sure that campus-specific cases are addressed in ERS.

Adam mentioned that it would be good for the Requirements Committee to review the results of the pre-quality assurance test together, but the timing of the testing is such that results will not be ready until 1-2 weeks after the scheduled September 8 meeting. Jon suggested that, since the September agenda is very light, perhaps the committee meeting could be moved to later in September to review test results. Greg and others commented that scheduling a meeting later in September could be problematic. **[There was no conclusion on scheduling a timely review of the test results. An attempt will be made via email to find a date for a conference call later in September.]**

Communications and Training Design

Deb Nikkel reviewed the proposed ERS Communications and Training Design document.

Rochelle commented that her impression was that the design document was significantly different from the strategy document and inquired as to why the strategy document wasn't just updated. Deb responded that these two documents are the guiding documents for her work in developing communications and training materials, and that the strategy is imbedded in the design. The strategy and design documents are not end-products that will be viewed by users of the ERS, but rather are intermediate products that both the Management Group and Requirements Committee are reviewing to make sure that the proper direction is set for the work of developing communications and training content.

Erica commented that the communications and training design approach was appropriate for the full-court press that will be needed to implement the ERS.

Deb noted that she will begin working immediately on communication and training end-products in preparation for the pilots. **Deb requested comments from the Requirements Committee be sent to her by Friday 8/19.**

Demonstration of ERS

Adam demonstrated the ERS in its current in-development state. The demonstration was received favorably.

**Effort Reporting System  
Requirements Group  
Notes of the August 11, 2005 Meeting  
Accepted September 8, 2005**

Buck questioned why the label “Effort” appeared in the “Payroll %” column headings but not in any of the other columns on the effort report. Greg suggested removing the word “Effort” from the “Payroll %” column headings.

Buck commented that he was trying to “step back” and look at the demo from the PI perspective and speculated that we probably didn’t catch this early on when ERS page layouts were reviewed because we were all too close to the details of determining what was desired.

**[NOTE: we’ll take a closer look at this particular suggestion and, if necessary, conduct a discussion via email.]**

Adam pointed out that every “save” of a change on an effort report requires that some explanation of the change be entered in the “Comments” field of the effort report. This point had been discussed at yesterday’s Management Group meeting, and the question was raised as to whether comments were needed with every change.

Pixie asked whether there was interest in making entry of comments optional rather than mandatory. For PI’s this would be helpful, but department reviewers would have to find other ways of communicating reasons for any changes made to the effort report. Erica cited the original discussion which concluded for good reasons requiring the entry of comments, but suggested that now that we can see the actual effort report, it may be appropriate to soften the requirement for entry of comments with changes. Greg suggested that there may be some cases where mandatory comments need to be entered; for example, if the Payroll Percent Time is changed, then entry of an associated comment should be a hard requirement. Jon suggested not trying to resolve this issue right away, and wait for feedback from the pilot. Buck noted that it’s pretty certain that this will be a “feedback” item if not addressed before the pilot, and advocated making entry of comments a requirement for only selected changes to the effort report before the pilot so the pilot can proceed more smoothly. **It was agreed that further discussion of this topic would take place via email.**

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for September 8, 2005, from 10-2pm will be a conference call.