Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the February 14, 2008 Meeting
Accepted March 13, 2008

The meeting was convened as a conference call. Attendees: Adam Cohen (UCB), Cynthia Kane (UCB), Rose Katsus (UCB), Debra Henn (UCD), Buck Marcussen (UCD), James Ringo (UCD), Connie Brown (UCLA), Guy Stocks (UCLA), Gloria Su (UCLA), Maurice Taylor (UCLA), Tyler Clark (UCSB), Monica Dunne (UCSB), Connie Feeley (UCSB), Ashley Clipson (UCSD), Mark Cooper (UCSD), Bronwen Halacy (UCSD), Wendy Hom (UCSF), Linda Lenox (UCSF), Pixie Ogren (UCOP), Jane Meyer (UCOP), Steve Hunter (UCOP), and Jon Good (UCOP)

Introductions

Cynthia Kane introduced Compliance Manager Rose Katsus, who is leading the implementation of ERS on the the Berkeley campus.

Cynthia informed the committee that she will be leaving UC Berkeley in early March to take a position with Yale University. The committee congratulated Cynthia and wished her the best of luck.

Gloria Su, UCLA ERS Project Manager is a new appointee to the Requirements Committee. Gloria is part of the IT organization supporting ERS and bridges the functional and technical sides of the project.

Tyler Clark, Santa Barbara, is a new member of the campus ERS project team.

Review of 1/10/2008 Meeting Notes

The January 10, 2008, meeting notes were accepted as written.

Follow-ups from Previous Meetings

Management Group Report

Jon Good reviewed highlights of the Management Group meeting of 2/13/2008:

- The main topic of discussion among the Management Group was the "consequences" statement and the revisions to address a shift from the 45/30 days for report generation/certification to a more general 120 day time limit for completion of certification. The wording of the policy statement, now called "Timeliness of Effort Reporting Certification", is intended to make the policy achievable. Key points about the policy statement are:

- Certification must be completed within 120 days of the end of the reporting period. This is a hard limit.
- Within the 120 days, campuses can set their own milestones for generating the effort reports and requiring compliance.
- Certification which occurs after 120 days requires a sign-off by the Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR) acknowledging the late certification [the Management Group had discussed the notion of having tardiness reason and sign-off entered as a comment on the effort report as a practical way of maintaining an audit trail]
- Consequences and escalation paths are the same as in the earlier "consequences" statement.

The Management Group specifically wanted to hear from the Requirements Committee whether there was agreement with the proposed 120 day limit. After some discussion, **all campus representatives agreed that the 120 day limit was workable.**

Several questions were raised and discussed about the level of specificity that was apparently lacking in the policy statement. It was pointed out that as a policy statement, it is not prescriptive in any detail, which leaves it up to each campus to develop specific implementation practices. For example, in some instances the VCR might not have the oversight responsibility for research activities where effort reporting is delinquent. In that case, the appropriate individual with oversight responsibility should sign-off. That may vary from campus to campus, and the policy statement itself cannot spell that out in detail.

In addition, there was discussion about providing mechanisms within ERS to streamline the capture of approvals on late certifications, above and beyond simply entering comments into the effort report itself. After some discussion, it was clear that this is a concern to the Requirements Committee. However, it was suggested that such requirements would have to be based on reasonable need and justified accordingly. Discussion of potential enhancements will have to wait until this policy is finalized, and there has been some experience with implementation.

Jon asked everyone to talk with their Management Group member regarding the current version of the "Timeliness of Effort Reporting Certification" statement and to provide feedback directly to the Management Group member.

Project Status

2

Effort Reporting System
Requirements Group
Notes of the February 14, 2008 Meeting
Accepted March 13, 2008

Steve Hunter reported that Release 9.0 is being prepared for release any day now, and includes improvements to compliance monitoring reporting which will make the reports easier for everyone to use as well as cleaning up numerous bugs.

Implementation Status

The following table presents the status of reporting cycles by campus. Additional status details appear after this table.

- Berkeley – Cynthia Kane reported that, as of today, Berkeley's pilot cycle was 97% completed. The pilot included 5 research departments and helped to pilot access privileges. Berkeley now plans to go live campuswide on 2/28

- San Francisco – Wendy Hom reported that San Francisco progress was not significantly different from what was reported in January.

- San Diego – Bronwen Halacy reported that San Diego plans to have next quarters' reports (10/07-12/07) available for review and certification somethime in the second week of March

- Los Angeles – Connie Brown reported that Los Angeles is in the process of getting ready for the Fall 2007 cycle.

- Davis – Debra Henn reported that Davis was about 88% complete with the January 1 – September 30, 2007, cycle.

- Santa Barbara - Connie Feeley reported that Santa Barbara is in the process of signing contracts for hosting. Folks are anxiously waiting to get into system and become familiar with ERS.

Jon mentioned that on the last conference call, there was discussion about putting together a tabular representation of status by reporting cycle. Jon will put the reported status into worksheets and share with Requirements Committee representatives to validate/update the information. If everyone is agreeable with the format, the plan is to update the worksheet monthly, a few days before scheduled ERS Management Group and ERS Requirements Committee conference calls/meetings and to distribute in advance of those meetings.

Enhancements Requests Review

- **1147: do not require certification on lines that have zero percent effort** [when the line with zero percent had not been previously certified on the effort report] - This item generated a lot of discussion, but since it is tied to the multi-line certification item 1318, which will not be revisited until after June 2008, this will have to wait until then as well.

- **1115: Statistical report detail by department produced a negative value age for a report** – Davis had reported in bugzilla that this resulted from the calculation of age based on the "report date" (which is defined globally for the reporting cycle) and the certification date, which in one instance was on a date before the reporting cycle "report date". After discussion of whether the "report date" should be changeable once reports have been generated, it was agreed to defer action on this item until after the 120 days limit in policy is finalized.

   1033: Add select by org for compliance reporting– After some discussion there was agreement that this should be a future enhancement as a means of applying organizational hierarchy consistently within ERS.

   1446: provide wildcard for resource values in pe rmissions – Berkeley brought forward this issue and Davis would find the proposed enhancement useful and Los Angeles supports the enhancement request. San Diego and San Francisco do not need this particular enhancement. After a brief discussion, Adam will work on a more detailed statement of requirements for review with the Requirements Committee on the next conference call.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, March 13, 2008.** This meeting will be a conference call from 1:00pm-3:00pm.