

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 10, 2005 Meeting
Revised December 8, 2005 Accepted December 8 , 2005**

Attendees: Cynthia Kane (UCB), Gregg Carr (UCB), Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Dan Gilbreath (UCSD), James Ringo (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Erica Webber (UCSF), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Jon Good (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Deb Nikkel (UCOP)

Review of 10/13/2005 Meeting Notes

Notes of the October 13th meeting were approved without revision.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good provided a report on the significant topics covered by the Management Group that aren't otherwise on the agenda for the Requirements Committee:

- System enforcement of self-certification rules – The Management Group held to their decision not to require self-certification by Principal Investigators and Professionals and that monitoring of self-certification would take place through reporting processes. Pixie pointed out that if the system is required to enforce this requirement, it is possible to identify most employees who should self-certify, using the Title Code attributes of Class Title Outline and FLSA Indicator. The Management Group did agree to revisit the issue six months after the ERS is in production.

Erica suggested that the proposed reporting could be used to build an argument for enforcing the self-certification requirement in the ERS itself. Rick asked whether the system will produce the necessary report. Pixie responded that the interfaces into ERS does not currently include Class Title Outline or FLSA Code necessary to do the report in ERS directly, but an ad hoc report could be generated using reporting tools outside of ERS.

- The Management Group also endorsed proposed changes to the Accounting Manual and the Contracts and Grants Manual that Jorge Ohy has drafted. **The Requirements Committee voiced no concern over the proposed revisions to the two manuals.**

The Management Group also covered topics that are on the agenda for today's Requirements Committee meeting: data element revisions, status of pilots, review of training materials.

Data Element Revisions

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 10, 2005 Meeting**
Revised December 8, 2005 Accepted December 8, 2005

Jon reported that there will be no corporate “sponsorship” of the “Effort Reporting Indicator” data element; the UCOP Research Administration Office (RAO) has no need for this data element and is not willing to be the corporate sponsor.

Jorge had proposed, and the Management Group agreed, that there was value in modifying the corporate Flow Through Code and Type of Award Code data elements, which campuses use locally to decide which funds require effort reporting, for campus consistency. Jorge will circulate the draft revisions to the Flow Through Code and Type of Award Code to the Management Group for discussion at the next meeting and will pursue the changes following this review. (Note: these draft revisions were reviewed by the Requirements Committee at its May 5, 2005 meeting.)

Pre-Quality Assurance Testing – Update

Adam reported the following:

- Work on QA is underway with Davis, Los Angeles, and San Diego data
- Further QA is occurring in the work of setting up the Davis and UCLA pilots. (e.g., finding issues with setting up the ERS database in Oracle that never came up in the Sybase context)

Rick mentioned that when UCLA testers reviewed their data in the system, it became obvious that the level of rollup initially selected was inadequate. The pilot group revised their financial system input file accordingly and are now able to generate effort reports with the desired level of aggregation.

- The list of unresolved “bugs” being tracked currently hovers around 50, much of which is pilot campus feedback, with half being “enhancements” that will be given further consideration after the pilots are completed.

Pilots – Update

Rick reported that the UCLA pilot is going well. UCLA has found and reported to the project team several potential bugs and enhancements. Overall, the ERS looks good and is working pretty well. Users in general and Principal Investigators/Faculty have yet to be involved in the pilot.

James Ringo reported that Davis is waiting for their data load to be completed so they can proceed with testing.

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 10, 2005 Meeting
Revised December 8, 2005 Accepted December 8 , 2005**

Authorization Setup and Terminology

Adam presented a summary of work to date on the internal authorization features of ERS and reviewed key concepts and terminology. [Note: the presentation slides may be accessed here: <http://www.ucop.edu/sysdev1/ers/REQTS/ERSAuthorizationLevelset.ppt>]

Adam acknowledged this requirement responding that an enhancement to provide this functionality would be added to the system but that this feature would not likely be ready for the pilot. This has been communicated to the pilot teams and there is agreement that the security setup for the pilot users will be done centrally.

Buck and Erica both emphasized the importance that a central administrator be able to delegate security administration role to a department user who would, in turn, grant access to ERS functions and assign ERS roles to other users in the department.

Communications and Training

Deb Nikkel reviewed the communications and training materials that have been recently posted to the ERS web site.

Deb played several Captivate movies showing simulated processes like how to certify an Effort Report, Add a Sponsored Project and make an Adjustment to Original Payroll %. In addition, Navigation Fundamentals was previewed.

The group expressed a strong need for an “off-the-shelf training module” exclusively for Principal Investigators/Research/Faculty; followed by three other “categories” of training for Department Administrators, Central Administrators and Security Administrators. The Department Administrator training module(s) would provide learning portals into discrete modularized content for viewers, reviewers, coordinators and security administrators. It was recognized that in some cases content would overlap. Campuses would then need to direct their end-users to the appropriate learning portal or portals, depending on the roles assigned.

Davis and UCLA have reviewed the training simulation modules. There were a number of issues reported: pacing is sometimes too fast and sometimes too slow; the Captivate scroll bar is too far down on the screen and when you use it, you lose content on the upper part of the screen; there were questions about what modules were intended for which audiences.

The issue of training data came up. The simulated modules have all been developed using UCLA data. Each campus will want to use simulations with their own data. It was

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the November 10, 2005 Meeting
Revised December 8, 2005 Accepted December 8 , 2005**

determined that one baseline set of training products would be created with instructions to campuses to modify screens and simulations, where necessary, with their own data.

Deb will continue to develop and refine modules incorporating feedback received to date.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for December 8, 2005 from 10:00am-Noon. This will be conducted via conference call. Call-in number: 866-740-1260; passcode 9870518.