

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the September 13, 2007 Meeting
Revised October 11, 2007 Accepted October 11, 2007**

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Cynthia Kane (UCB), James Ringo (UCD), Debra Henn (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), Connie Brown (UCLA), Maurice Taylor (UCLA), Guy Stocks (UCLA), Erica Webber (UCSF), Wendy Hom (UCSF), Linda Lenox (UCSF), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Introductions

Wendy Hom, Compliance Manager, Controllers' Office, UCSF.
Linda Lenox – Help Desk/Security Manager, Controller's Office, UCSF.

Wendy is replacing Erica Webber on the committee as Erica will be leaving UC soon.

Review of 8/9/2007 Meeting Notes

The August 9, 2007, meeting notes were accepted without revision.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good reviewed highlights of the Management Group conference call of 9/13/2007:

- Santa Barbara and Riverside will be coming up on ERS this fiscal year. Both campuses will soon begin participating in all of the Base ERS consultation groups: Management Group, Requirements Committee, and Technical Advisory Group.
- Comments from the Requirements Committee on the consequences statement were discussed. Editorial revisions will take place, followed by a short turnaround review from the Management Group, before publishing the consequences statement.
- Discussed the proposed UCSD variation in effort report format (elimination of the Cost Sharing column) and agreed to continue the discussion in person at the October meeting because of the difficulty in understanding the reasoning for the proposed change.
- Discussed continuing the practice of “one ERS” in trying to accommodate desired “local” modifications through parameter-based customization within the Base ERS.

Project Status

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the September 13, 2007 Meeting
Revised October 11, 2007 Accepted October 11, 2007**

Steve Hunter reported on releases:

- Release 8.1 had been issued and addressed multiple co-PIs as well as other fixes and enhancements.
- Release 8.2, which will convey modifications to weight pay (item #1011), is targeted for release early in October. Top priority bug fixes will be included in this release
- Release 9.0 is planned for December and will include searching by organizational hierarchy as well as permissions in the organizational hierarchy context, and fixes to compliance monitoring reporting.

Jon Good added that a quarterly release schedule will be implemented beginning in September. In response to a question from Linda Lenox, Jon and Steve mentioned that the intent of the quarterly release schedule is to get to the point of only supporting the current and prior release versions.

Implementation Status

- Berkeley – Cynthia Kane reported that a new timeline for deployment has been developed and staff have been added to make the implementation happen. First quarter rollout to begin in November 1st, while second quarter, plus winter term rollout is to begin February 15th
- San Francisco – Erica Webber reported that certification for Spring 2007 cycle is currently underway with a due date of September 14. San Francisco is using R8.1 B010 and there have been no substantial issues associated with this upgrade. For the Fall 2006 cycle, 90% certification has been achieved with emphasis now on how to enforce compliance on campus.
- Los Angeles – Maurice Taylor reported that campus users are currently helping to test Release 8.1. So far there has been no negative feedback or cause for concern. Los Angeles is now trying to determine when to begin the Spring 2007 cycle. Because of current UCLA financial system limitations, certification the multiple PIs capability is not working for the campus. The Spring 2007 cycle will begin soon after modifications to the campus financial system have been completed.
- Davis – James Ringo reported that Davis is slowly creeping up on 97% certification (96% completion was reported on the last conference call). Davis has been waiting for the remedies to late pay processing before pushing to get the remainder of reports certified.

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the September 13, 2007 Meeting
Revised October 11, 2007 Accepted October 11, 2007**

- San Diego – [report received via email from Ashley Clipson following the conference call] - Pilot I: Reports were produced for six departments at the end of June for the January–March 2007 quarter; 20% of PARs are now electronic; Total Certified 71% (650 of 915). Pilot II: Reports will be produced an additional 11 departments early next week for the April-June 2007 quarter; 40% of PARS will now be electronic.

Enhancements Requests Review

- #582 – Overdue Reports Notification

This item requested automatic notification to PIs and ERS Coordinators who have uncertified effort reports that are past due. Steve mentioned that the notifications to PIs has been programmed, but not the notifications to coordinators. In the latter case, it is not possible to link a set of reports to a specific coordinator and issue a specific notification of a past due effort report. Implementing a notification to coordinators without the ability to specifically identify the effort reports in question will result in a significant number of unnecessary notifications generated. The question for the Requirements Committee is whether there is any value in generating generic notifications to coordinators.

Erica commented that notifications to coordinators that are not specific about which effort reports are overdue are of no real value. The group agreed.

- Should reviewers be allowed to re-open effort reports? (e.g., when the reviewer knows that some change to the effort report is necessary and re-certification is required.)

Cynthia questioned why would one want to do this rather than make the appropriate changes in payroll, which would trigger a re-certification. Guy Stocks responded with an example from UCLA’s Department of Medicine: when a the PI makes a mistake and improperly certifies an effort report. In the “post-review” performed by the department, the director of research administration wants to be able to re-open the effort report to have the PI make corrections. Specifically, when something such as cost sharing was changed on the effort report in error prior to the original certification and no payroll changes were necessary, no payroll changes will be necessary to correct the error. The UCLA Director of Research Admin wants to be able to re-open the ER to have the PI make corrections and re-certify Linda Lenox asked how often this would be necessary. Guy responded that the frequency was great enough for at least two of UCLAs largest departments. Erica and Buck expressed concern that this starts to do things for people without their free thought on what’s happened. Erica agreed that these

**Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the September 13, 2007 Meeting
Revised October 11, 2007 Accepted October 11, 2007**

situations do come up, but the implications from an audit perspective are such that it would be better to have the conversation with the PI and let the PI re-open the effort report, correct it, and then re-certify. After further discussion, it was clear that there was no consensus at this time for pursuing such an enhancement.

Other Topics

Debra Henn requested everyone take a look at the actual compliance monitoring reports available with Release 8 so that previously deferred enhancement requests can be discussed on the next conference call. Specific enhancement requests for discussion: 1035, 1039, and 1040.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, October 11, 2007** This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.