

EFFORT-REPORTING TASK FORCE 2/28/07 MEETING SUMMARY

Attendance: John Frederick (Provost)
Dawn Arnold (Engineering)
Mark Brenner (VPR)
Mary Dugan (NSHE)
Bill Follette (Psychology)
Tammy Freeman (Effort Reporting)
Charlene Hart (CABNR)
Jack Hayes (Biology)
Sharon Hernandez (PBA)
Guy Hoelzer (Faculty Senate)
Vince Johnson (UNSOM)
Gena Jones (HR)
Cindy Kiel (OSPA)
Tim McFarling (HR)
Ron Phaneuf (Physics)
Steve Rock (Education)
Barbara Scott (UNSOM)
Kathy Shively (COS)
Bruce Shively (PBA)
Michelle Smith (CABNR)
Greg Wilson (UNCE)

Discussion:

John Frederick asked Tammy Freeman to report on the status of the work on the electronic effort reporting system. Tammy provided a handout describing the data elements, system limitations, and reporting schedules planned. There was a discussion on the issues related to data merging, particularly the requirement that there be up-to-date payroll records in order to generate effort reports needing to be certified. The issue of training and how far down it will go was also discussed. Tammy and Cindy Kiel explained the training they had planned, the FAQs and examples they had posted on their website, and the need to identify hard dates for submission of overload contracts.

Bruce Shively provided a handout reporting the 2007 salaries and fringe for 100% grant-funded employees at the university. The total payroll and benefits for employees funded entirely from grants and contracts is more than \$15 million, not including the medical school. This document also reported the salary and fringe amounts for those employees who had served as a PI or Co-PI and an estimate of the amount needed for overload for university service of B Contract faculty. This subset totaled about \$4.2 million.

There was a discussion about the growing pains being experienced at the university as a result of the changing role and complexity of grant-funded faculty positions. The following was agreed to:

We are looking for solutions that preserve our reality but also follow the guidelines. Reconceptualizing the way F & A is handled on campus may also be needed.

Once we have settled upon a method and guidelines that work, then it becomes routine, accepted and simply the way we do business.

The group returned to the concept of the research scientist vs. research faculty or professor position. The group agreed it was important to examine titles and the impact of the faculty member in terms of their role, grant funding, etc.

The following draft of basic planning principles as this work will proceed was formulated by the group:

- Employee compensation will not be negatively impacted.
- Any solutions must satisfy sponsor and auditor requirements.
- Employees' effort certification and compensation sources should both reflect a reasonable estimate of their job duties.
- Employees should be encouraged to participate in non-grant-supported activities that benefit the university.
- Policies should aid in the recruitment and retention of faculty and the overall growth of research activity.
- Faculty role statements and effort certification reports should be consistent.
- The university must ultimately fashion a sustainable solution.
- Solutions should preserve the essence of the university's research mission.
- Solutions should take infrastructure into account, including personnel, training, software, etc.

The meeting ended with a discussion of necessary communications that needed to go to campus and the work of the various groups before the next meeting. It was also agreed that some members of the group would review the draft principles and refine them before sending them out to the campus.