

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the March 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted April 13, 2006**

Attendees: Buck Marcussen (UCD), Rochelle Caballero (UCLA) by telephone, Rick Valdivia (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), James Ringo (UCD), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCLA), Adam Cohen (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), Wayne Kidd (UCOP)

Review of 2/9/2006 Meeting Notes

Review of the 2/9/2006 meeting notes prompted discussion on the following points:

- Rochelle Caballero asked there would be discussion on the topic of having a rotating chair of the Requirements Committee, as had been mentioned at the last meeting. Jon suggested, and the group agreed, to defer discussion for a few of meetings to allow the Requirements Committee to focus on working through the enhancements request list, and developing protocols for deciding which requests to pursue and the relative priorities of those chosen for maintenance.
- Buck Marcussen asked about local variations in the ERS resulting from campuses being on different release levels or from local modifications to the ERS itself. Jon responded that, like the Payroll System, campuses will control when releases are installed in production. Jon commented that to be consistent with the Management Group's desire to have a uniform effort reporting system across UC, that local modifications of ERS program code should be avoided and that local variations should be handled through mechanisms built into the system.
- Mark Cooper asked whether there would be regulatory changes requiring modifications to ERS. Jon responded that regulatory changes need to be expected and would be considered mandatory if regulatory changes come about.

The 2/9/2006 meeting notes were accepted as written.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon briefly reviewed key discussions of the Management Group, which had met via conference call on March 8:

- Schedules – there are now two schedules on the project web site, the Development Schedule which has been in use over the past two years and a new Maintenance Schedule which shows planned releases and other maintenance-related activities. All items on the Development Schedule now show as completed

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the March 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted April 13, 2006**

except for a few remnant tasks such as training materials, pilot support, and the PPS Salary Cap fix.

- Training Materials - the presentation formatting of training materials by NIIT was slightly behind schedule, but that work should be completed in the next two weeks.

Fund Table Code Definitions

Jon reported that there had been no further discussion on the Management group conference call. Berkeley and San Diego have already responded that there was no problem in adding the necessary fund table attributes to local financial systems. Responses from three campuses are still pending. Jon will be sending a reminder note to the Management Group representatives from the remaining three campuses.

Enhancements Requests Review

Jon introduced the review of enhancements requests by pointing out that one of the derivative results of the review would be some guidelines for future review of enhancements requests and prioritization of requests for implementation that would enable reviews to take place via conference call.

Conclusions of the discussions on each request will be documented on the enhancements list itself rather than in the meeting notes. Key points that transcend the requests themselves or point to guidelines for review will be documented in the meeting notes.

The committee reviewed the following items from the enhancements list:

- #350, two reports generated for a PI-regular and off-quarter
- #380, populate adjusted cost sharing on non-sponsored line
- #381, set zero reports to 'not required'
- #319, report list button to highlight exception reports
- #301, show status field has limited values
- #148, require comments on reopened reports
- #224, Projects tab should be based on alternate fields
- #371, Funds tab FAUs should be grouped
- #387, Late pay should not update the adjusted payroll % column

Bug #334 and #388 were withdrawn from the list since after review by the development team, these issues were re-categorized as bugs, not enhancements.

There was brief discussion of whether approval would require consensus or a majority of campuses voting in favor of a request. Adam and Pixie both noted that consensus has

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the March 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted April 13, 2006**

been the norm for the project to date and that this should be continued. Further, if consensus cannot be reached, then the matter should be referred to the Management Group for discussion and resolution. Jon emphasized the point that consensus was important in keeping with the statement of the Management Group at the onset of the project that the University needs a uniform effort system across all campuses.

The start of guidelines to emerge from review and discussion of the enhancement requests:

- **Enhancement Request Classifications** to be assigned to individual requests:
 1. **Bug Fix** – *an existing function or feature of the ERS that does not behave in a way that is consistent with the requirements. The function or feature could have resulted from the original requirements for ERS or requirements from subsequently approved enhancement requests.*
 2. **Original Requirements Refinement** – *clarification or refinement of an existing function of the ERS where the underlying requirements did not anticipate a real-life situation*
 3. **Enhancement** – *a function or feature that has not been previously articulated as a requirement for the ERS.*
- The **priority** given to implementation of enhancement requests will normally follow the sequence of the above classifications. That is, Bug Fixes will have highest priority, Requirements Refinement will have next highest priority, and Enhancement will have lowest priority.

Dispositions that will be used to describe actions resulting from review of enhancement requests:

- Defer (look at the enhancement request later)
- Refer to Management Group for Resolution
- Approved Enhancement Request
- Rejected Enhancement Request
- Further Analysis and Discussion Needed

Discussion of enhancement requests will continue at the next meeting on April 13, 2006. The group agreed that at this stage of enhancement request review it was valuable to meet in person to not only view example screens but to be able to “chalk-talk” at the white board as well.

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the March 9, 2006 Meeting
Accepted April 13, 2006**

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 13, 2006 from 10:00am-2:00pm. This meeting will be an in-person meeting at UCOP in Oakland, 1111 Franklin St., Conference Room 12322.