

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the August 10, 2006 Meeting
Revised October 12, 2006 Accepted November 9, 2006**

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Rochelle Caballero (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), Jorge Ohy (UCOP), Buck Marcussen (UCD), James Ringo (UCD), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Adam Cohen (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), Pixie Ogren (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Review of 8/10/2006 Meeting Notes

Jorge Ohy suggested revising wording on page 3, under “Other Topics, second sentence to read: “Jorge noted that one particular highlight of the audit was that the NSF faulted Penn for allowing department managers to certify effort reports without having a process for documenting how managers have the appropriate knowledge of what the individuals for who effort reports were certified actually did. It was suggested that this topic be brought up with the Management Group for further discussion.”

Erica Webber suggested revising wording on page 3, under “Enhancements Requests Review”, second paragraph, first sentence, to remove “ERS” which was extraneous to this sentence.

With these modifications, the notes of the August 10, 2006, meeting were accepted.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good reported that the September 14, 2006, ERS Management Group conference call was cancelled because of a scheduling mix-up. The next Management Group meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, October 11.

Compliance Monitoring Reporting

The group reviewed a draft of the ERS Reporting Requirements document. Regarding general requirements, the question was posed whether a report could be requested for an organizational unit and have all of the subordinate units included automatically. Adam Cohen replied that the user interface for this type of hierarchical selection would be provided, but the feature would depend on the campus loading its organizational hierarchy through the Department Interface.

The requirement for producing compliance reports on-demand raised concerns about the possibility of multiple users requesting large reports concurrently and affecting on-line performance. The development team will carefully model the queries used to produce the reports to assess the potential for a performance issue.

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the August 10, 2006 Meeting
Revised October 12, 2006 Accepted November 9, 2006**

The group requested that the existing Export/Print/Send toolbar functions be provided for compliance reports. Adam Cohen responded that this would be incorporated in the design.

Regarding compliance report R1 (effort report status report), the group requested that a filtering criteria be provided to allow selection of one or more effort report status code values to be included in the report. Adam Cohen responded that this would be provided but when the report is filtered to a specific status code, the calculation of “percent of total” would not have any meaning and would be suppressed.

The group requested that report R1 include a “grand total” line as well as a subtotal line for each grouping level.

Regarding compliance report R2 (certification listing report), the group requested that the title code of the person for whom the effort report was issued be added to the compliance report display, as well as the title code of the certifier. After some discussion the group articulated the requirement that it is important to know when an effort report for an academic employee was certified by someone other than the person for whom the report was issued.

The group affirmed that it was useful to see a listing of all effort reports that were certified by someone other than the person for whom the report was issued. The group identified certain situations, such as effort reports for student employees, where effort reports were expected to be certified by someone other than the person for whom the effort report was issued. The compliance report should allow sorting on the title code columns of both the certifier and the person for whom the effort report was issued, to allow these situations to be identified by grouping them separately.

Adam Cohen pointed out that since an employee can have multiple appointments and hence multiple title codes, ERS will have to derive an “effective” title code for use in making the determination of whether the employee is an academic. Such logic already exists in the system for determining what reporting schedule an employee should be placed on, and this logic can be used for this compliance report as well.

The group noted that with this refinement of the requirement, it would no longer be necessary to provide summary and detail modes as originally described in the draft requirements document and this report would be presented in “detail” mode only.

Regarding compliance report R3 (statistical analysis report), the group requested that the columns Age, Adjustment Age, and Times Reopened display a blank rather than a zero when the derived value for these columns is zero.

During the discussion of this report, the group clarified that the summary mode of this report should display only min/max/average for each grouping level of the report, while

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the August 10, 2006 Meeting**
Revised October 12, 2006 Accepted November 9, 2006

the detail mode will display calculated values for every effort report included in the compliance report.

Enhancements Requests Review

Ashley Clipson reported that UCSD would like to hold off consideration of enhancement request #515 (originally requested by UCSD) until further discussion with the UCSD campus implementation team has taken place.

Erica Webber asked for a brief discussion of a request that UCSF had made after the materials for the conference call were distributed: In ERS, only a PI has the ability to see all of the effort reports associated with his/her projects, through the “My Projects” feature. Other ERS users, particularly department ERS coordinators or reviewers, have a need to be able to see effort reports across all projects associated with a single PI, but this “My Projects” capability is currently only available to PI’s. It was generally agreed by all that this capability could be very useful. The development team will investigate this request further for inclusion in a future release.

Other Topics

Mark Cooper reported that an ERS Users Implementation Meeting is being set up for November 1, 2006 in San Diego. Berkeley, San Francisco, and Davis have already indicated they would participate. Mark will be following up with UCLA and Adam about participating in this session, which will focus on implementation issues and experiences.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 12, 2006. This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.