Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the October 12, 2006 Meeting
<u>*Accepted November 9, 2006*</u>

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

<u>Review of 9/14/2006 Meeting Notes</u>

Erica Webber commented that the text on page 1, 3rd paragraph, beginning "Erica Webber pointed suggested…" should be changed to read "Erica Webber suggested…".

On page 2, 7th paragraph, it was pointed out that the conclusion of the discussion was that summary and detailed reporting modes were no longer needed but did not state which of the two would be incorporated. Adam will provide appropriate language to reflect that the report will be presented in detail mode.

The September meeting notes will be revised and redistributed for review on the November 9th conference call.

<u>Follow-ups from Previous Meetings</u>

<u>Management Group Report</u>

Adam Cohen reported that Base ERS Release 7 would be issued on November 1. This release will address a number of enhancements and issues resulting from testing and actual production. With Los Angeles running ERS in production, and Davis, Berkeley, San Diego, and San Francisco engaged in testing in preparation for rollout, there have been more items to address. A subsequent release, to be scheduled, will include compliance monitoring reporting and more enhancements.

Jon Good briefly reported on highlight issues discussed by the Management Group:

- Annual certifications for professorial and professional staff – Davis is conducting an analysis of going with annual certifications. The Management Group recognizes that any move by one campus to annual certifications will generate faculty pressure on the other campuses to adopt annual certifications. The Management Group will be reviewing the Davis analysis at the November meeting.

- An issue of whether comments on effort reports should be treated as "private" was also discussed. The Management Group agreed that the contents of effort reports, including comments, are public information and that this should be emphasized in training.

- The community-source Kuali project has expressed interest in UC contributing the Effort Reporting System to the Kuali Research Administration system that is currently being planned. The Management Group discussed without reaching conclusion and will continue discussion at its November meeting.

Compliance Monitoring Reporting

Adam introduced the revised requirements definition document reflects the discussion and feedback from the 9/14 meeting. The document was not reviewed further.   Adam noted that the reference to the certification listing report (page 6 of the requirements) addresses Erica's comments from the 9/14 minutes review.

Adam discussed another document which presented a rendering of what the compliance reports might look like. All three report formats, in summary and detail modes, were reviewed.

James Ringo asked if the Statistical Report-Summary mode could be modified to include total population of reports in addition to the breakdowns shown for each report status. Adam responded that this would be added to the design.

James noted that in the Statistical Report-Detail mode, the total line for "recertified reports" had a typo in mockup showing text of "reopened" instead of "recertified". Adam responded that this would be corrected.

James asked, regarding the Certification Listing Report-Detail mode, whether the text "Self" will appear under the certifier name to show that the report was certified by the individual for whom the report was generated. Adam confirmed that this was the correct understanding.

Adam Cohen noted that the mockup for this particular report has an example of a multiple certification report which shows three separate lines for each certifier (see Physics Department.)

James asked whether the Certification Listing Report can have an indication of whether the certifier for a particular report is the PI for the project in the cases when the certifier is someone other than the individual for whom the report was generated. Adam responded that this would be possible in the case of multiple certification reports, where each project on the effort report is certified individually and the certifier can be identified. In the case of an effort report which has multiple projects, but is not put into multiple certification mode, it would only be possible to determine that the certifier is a PI for one of the projects on that report.

Mark Cooper asked whether it is necessary to show the "award" (Sponsored project line) for which certification took place, particularly in the case of multiple certifications. Adam responded that the purpose of this compliance report is to show who certified effort reports for others (including multiple certifications), without regard to the sponsor's award information.

Mark then asked what would be the next step, procedurally, if an effort report was determined to be certified by an inappropriate individual. James responded that this report was proposed as a departmental tool to follow-up with training and, possibly recertification as appropriate.

Adam then noted that one aspect of the compliance reporting enhancement that wasn't included in the mock-ups are the lead-in screens where the report is selected and appropriate options are presented. These screens are described in narrative in the requirements document. Dialogs will prompt for report options that will be consistent across the compliance reports. The dialog will contain a list of all reporting periods in the database, as well as options for report sorting and grouping (by period, department, etc.)

Erica noted that with respect to the Certification Listing Report –Detail mode, that the group had agreed that there would be an "academic indicator" on which reports could be filtered. Adam responded that he thought the Title Code would satisfy this requirement. After further discussion, the group agreed that specific indicators of the academic status of the person for whom the report was created, and the person or persons certifying the report, would be useful and should be added to the report.

Buck Marcussen asked whether these reports would be available to everyone or to central offices only. Buck expressed the view that it would be really useful for department effort reporting coordinators to run these reports and asked whether they would be able to run these at the department level. Adam responded that the Requirements call for making these reports available to department effort reporting coordinators and above. Adam suggested that a new role might be used to control access to the compliance reporting feature, but after some discussion the group agreed that there was no need for new roles and that holders of the Coordinator role are likely to be the ones who will use this feature of the system.

Erica noted that the mockup of the Statistical Report-Detail mode, appears to show multiple lines for an effort report. Adam responded that this was an anomaly of the sample data in the mock-up and in the actual report, there would be one report per line.

Buck asked whether the Statistical Report should be strictly a report of exceptions on report age for certified reports as opposed to showing a line for each effort report in the database. Erica and Rochelle Caballero both stated that the group had agreed at its last meeting that the report could not serve all potential situations or provide detail for

answers, recognizing that coordinators were going to have to use other tools to analyze individual cases in detail.

With respect to the Certification Listing Report-Detail mode, Adam proposed putting a filter in place on the "Self" indicator to allow the report to be sorted alphabetically by individual name. The group agreed that this was a good idea.

There was general agreement within the Group that the reports look reasonable and would satisfy the compliance reporting requirements.

Adam stated that the ERS development group will start on design work and there may be additional detailed issues to discuss. The group agreed that it would be acceptable to discuss design issues via email.

James asked whether it would be possible to add "total certified by others" and "total certified by self" and associated percent to the Certification Listing-Detail mode report. Adam responded that this would be added to the report.

Enhancements Requests Review

The committee reviewed the following items from the current enhancements list:

Item #576 – "Select All" Search Option – Approved - agreed to make this function in the way in which it says it's supposed to behave.

Item #578 – Create error message if attempt to give two searches the same name – Approved – agreed that searches must have unique names within a users list of searches

Item #580 – Add comments to previous versions – Deferred until we get a handle on volume need – Adam will also to talk to Jorge Ohy for audit considerations.

Item #582 – Overdue Reports Notification – Approved as a system option – Several members of the group agreed with keeping in mind the pro-active approach and handling late items in a manner similar to what is done today.

Item #583 – Enhancement to decentralized security feature – reclassified as a BUG

Item #611 – Ability to associate multiple PI's with an FAU – Adam will follow-up and research and the issue will be discussed at the ERS User Group meeting on 11/1.

Connie Brown brought up some additional items for discussion that had not been submitted via the enhancement request process.

1. Since work-study funds are not required to be certified, is it possible to list them under "other sponsored projects" instead of "sponsored projects"? UCLA is running into a problem of how to show effort if the employee worked on a federal project even though paid on work study funds.

Adam will follow-up on this issue and respond to Connie directly.

2. Enhancement - Is it possible to show the comments for the reports without going to "view history" file? The department would also like to see the saved comments in the "edit" file.

Adam responded that the design of the edit tab does not provide space for viewing existing comments without forcing the new comment entry field to the bottom of the page and requiring scrolling. Since many report changes require a comment, users would be forced to scroll down in order to access this field and the Save/Certify buttons that are at the bottom of the form.

Connie Brown also reported an issue where a user with permission to a group of effort reports could not view or edit any of those effort reports. Adam will follow-up on this issue with UCLA and will respond to Connie directly.

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 UCOP about participating in this session, which will focus on implementation issues and experiences.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 9, 2006. This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.