January 2022 Research Administration Forum Q&A

Contents

Research Policy and Compliance

Q1: How will 700 forms be generated with DocuSign?

A1: Just pull them from the RPC website: Form 700-U

Q2: Will we need to re-do 700U's that were signed with other electronic signatures, or scanned copies during the past two years?

A2: RPC is working on this project.

Q3: Will ORA reach out to Departments to collect DocuSigned 700s for forms that could not be wet signed during lockdowns? To clarify, will we be given a list?

A3: RPC is working on this project.

Q4: Will there be a deadline to submit already collected "wet ink" signatures that may await handling on unattended on-campus desks? Can we have assurances that this will broadcast widely?

A4: Don't know yet, but you will be informed in a timely manner.

Q5: Will OCGA be working to create a campus-wide Form 700U? Most departments are not tech savvy and will struggle with building out their own form, so there should just be a centralized form similar to the P-card office form.

A5: You do not need to build out a form. Just pull it from the RPC website: Form 700-U

Q6: Will Adobe digital signatures be allowed, like on the 740s? I reached out to circadmin@research.ucla.edu but have not heard back.

A6: Adobe digital signature will NOT be allowed. It is not verified.

Q7: Is this simply the new process to replace the PDF signing process?

A7: No.

Q8: Any chance we can get a copy of the form that needs the wet signature and we can just ask for the appropriate wet signatures on the same form?

A8: We are still working on our process for this.

Q9: How can the department administrator fill out 700U first then forward it to PI for signature in DocuSign?

A9: If the department administrator has the DocuSign account, then the completed form can be uploaded through DocuSign and the administrator can create an "Envelope", prepare the form, and then send the form to recipients for signature. However, the administrator should only fill out the top portion of the form. Not the financial interests part.

Contract and Grant Administration

Q1: Would it be beneficial to check "combine all PDFs into one file" instead if OCGA will require the certificate so we don't need to have 2 separate files?

A1: This check box is misleading as it doesn't actually include the Summary/Certificate of Completion form.

Q2: Are other electronic digital signature services like SignNow acceptable?

A2: No. UCLA is requiring use of the DocuSign system that is available to all faculty and staff.

Q3: If a DocuSign PDF is flattened, does it become invalid because it loses needed metadata?

A3: That is why we are asking for the certificate as well as the signed form.

Q4: Can you please provide some additional guidance regarding the supporting documentation requirement for foreign activities? Is this documentation submitted separately?

A4: It is attached to the Other Support Report submitted to NIH.

Q5: Will the certification to the biosketch make it unable to be exported to Word and edited?

A5: We have no additional info about the proposed NIH requirement to sign the biosketch at this time. Hopefully it won't be rolled out until after SciENcv is up and running and the signatures can be captured there.

Q6: Can you please provide some additional guidance regarding the supporting documentation requirement for foreign activities? Is this documentation submitted separately? To clarify...I'm referring to the Other Support Documentation requirements.

A6: The NIH policy requires, for each foreign appointment or foreign funding source reported, a copy of the grant, contract or other agreement that governs that foreign appointment or funding. If the agreement is not in English, NIH requires an English translation of the agreement. The copies of these agreements must be attached to the Other Support Report at the time it is submitted to NIH.

Q7: Doesn't reporting effort without salary = cost share?

A7: Yes, effort without salary is cost share. If such effort was committed in the proposal, it must be provided and reported.

Q8: Since project periods often don't align with UCLA fiscal year period, should reported C&P effort be prorated to fiscal year?

A8: Yes, if the effort is expected to change year-over-year. However, if the PI expects to expend the same effort every year then it shouldn't matter if it's project year or calendar year.

Q9: The Other Support tool generates the OS report with the Calibri font. Should we convert to Arial or Times New Roman?

A9: We checked and Calibri font is ok so no need to convert.

Q10: If we submit other support with a DocuSign signature to our reviewers and the reviewers come back with comments, do administrators have to make the changes to the original unsigned document and resend to the PI for signature again? Can we submit the other support without a signature to reviewers and obtain the signature after it is confirmed that everything looks good? This will keep PIs from needing to sign multiple times.

A10: Yes - we can provide review comments before the electronic signature is applied.

Q11: What is the UEI number we use on Professional Profiles?

A11: UCLA employees = RN64EPNH8JC6. This information is also available on the OCGA website [UCLA Standard Information](#) page.

Q12: Regarding Cayuse Professional Profile updating, over 90% of our department's Professional Profiles were created by former staff and we don't have permission to edit. Can we request bulk access?

A12: Please feel free to contact us at erahelp@research.ucla.edu for assistance with obtaining permissions to Professional Profiles.

Q13: Not all KP are users. Is that correct?

A13: True. However, if a Key Person is a user we strongly recommend that they have access to their profile. Please feel free to contact us at erahelp@research.ucla.edu for assistance with obtaining permissions to Professional Profiles.

Q14: I've found that changing the browser magnification can create an offset between the logout icon and the other icons, and thus serves as a workaround for the issue you mentioned (it's CMD + or - in Mac, so I assume CTRL + or - would work in Windows). Have you found that to be a workaround?

A14: We have had some success with changing the magnification, but it doesn't seem to be consistent across all screens.

Extramural Fund Management

Q1: We should not expect any 'back-hand' UCPATH adjustment, e.g., whenever someone on campus decided to make adjustment for 'benefit' for 'vacation', we in the department would see effects on the ledger only After the Fact, which is not really helpful in managing accounts? Especially for those accounts which were closed long time ago.

A1: I agree that there should not be UCPath adjustments centrally processed without appropriate communication to campus. I also understand the challenges untimely adjustments create in managing accounts because all EFM accountants experience the same challenges as the campus.

For managing sponsored contract and grant funds, it is our responsibilities to ensure that only allowable and applicable expenses are charged to the projects. When UCPath errors caused overcharging the sponsored projects (for example, higher benefit was charged inaccurately than actual benefit of the employee on the project, vacation credit was not charged to the correct project, etc.), we need to correct those errors and return overpayment if any to stay in compliance with terms and conditions of the awards.

I could not agree more with that these adjustments should not occur for those accounts that were closed a long time ago. Many mass corrections processed during FY20-21 were to address historical errors made since September 2018 when UCPath went live. Although UC campuses had raised concerns on erroneous transactions from the beginning, UCPath Center was unable to investigate the issues properly and developed adequate solutions for most issues until FY20-21. Based on my understanding, this delay was due to that UCPC had to address other higher priorities directly related to employees' payrolls and benefits to ensure all UC employees get paid correctly and receive benefits. The issues affecting contract and grant funds are accounting issues, which were rated lower in UCPath Center's priority compared to getting employees accurately and timely compensated.

As most historical data affected by major system design defects were corrected and more go-forward resolutions for various issues were implemented in UCPath, my educated guess is that the magnitude and frequency of these mass corrections will decrease. At least, corrections will not be delayed for 1-2 years like what happened in FY20-21.

Q2: Is there a way that before they take any action, can we know in advance?

A2: CRU is leading the mass correction on campus and managing campus communication. You can subscribe to CRU newsletters to stay informed of issues and resolutions. If you have feedback to share, here's the CRU website where you can submit the feedback online. When EFM becomes aware of the campus-wide issues and their resolutions, we relay the message to the campus via ORA listserv including all PAMS users.

Q3: It is really a frustrating process to go back to make adjustment again when the funds were closed ago. Not an easy process, and who will cover the OD if department is in OD, campus?

A3: I agree and understand that it is a frustrating process to go back and make adjustments to the funds previously closed. As shared in the presentation, if the UCPath mass correction results in debit to the closed funds, EFM does not re-open funds. These additional costs are centrally covered. So there is no action for the department to take. If the UCPath mass correction resulted in debit to an open fund and created the overdraft, please bring the case to the EFM Manager.

Q4: Will there be or what are the fixes done to avoid GAEL charges on federal/federal flow through funds? Why is GAEL still getting assessed on the newer funding (we have this situation on the fund that was set up in 2021 - Oct.)

A4: Based on the EFM's understanding, GAEL fix was placed during FY20-21 and it should not be charged to the federal or federal flow through fund set up in September 2021. It may be an incidental error rather than a systematic issue. For proper investigation, it needs to be reported to CRU. Can you please inform your EFM accountant of the fund number and submit a ticket to CRU to report the issue? Here is the CRU link to create a case.

Q5: One question related to these 'back-hand' operation: ERS... would throw the 'completed' ERS into some kind of turmoil.

A5: Effort reports are affected by UCPath issues and this does create additional work for the department and EFM. To mitigate administrative burden of the department as much as possible, EFM flagged all effort reports affected by one or more of UCPath mass corrections in the ERS and indicated applicable issues in the comment section of each affected effort report. And the instruction on how to review, adjust, and certify these affected effort reports is available on the EFM website including the recorded webinar as well as the ERS master exception list. If you have questions, please contact ERS helpdesk.

Q6: In the ERS system, do we expect those old flags "under review reports flags" to go away before we can review and certify? Will the system remove those flags when ready?

A6: There are four major issues affecting effort reports.

1. Pending Mass Leave Correction (MLC) entry
2. Missing payroll record(s) in effort report
3. Y-OTC or N-OTC indicator missing
4. Incorrect percent of effort for effort bearing payroll line

For the issues #1, 2, and 3, EFM will remove flagging in ERS when the issues are resolved. Please do not certify reports until they are unflagged. For the issue #4, please review the supplementary Excel file, adjust effort percent, and certify the report. The Excel file is sent to the ERS coordinator who has effort reports affected by this issue. More detailed description of issues and instructions can be found at EFM website.

Q7: Talking about 'loss', during the normal operation cycle, we covered the OD at the end of project, using PI's unrestricted fund.

A7: Yes it is correct. If the overdraft resulted from project operation (not as a result of UCPath mass correction), EFM requests the department to provide an unrestricted FAU to clear the overdraft as part of the process to close the fund at the end of the project.

Q8: When does UCLA expect UCPATH to stabilize? Because ASCEND is coming, it will run on the same 'platform' I guess.

A8: Based on EFM's understanding, UCPath center's focus is on the UCPath stabilization working with local payroll partnering offices across all UC campuses. UCPath will be integrated with Oracle when the project Ascend resumes.

Q9: Some of our fund managers have reported that upon review of the mass corrections, the adjustments did not resolve the original defects, and further adjustments are required to now both reconcile the Path defect, and reconcile the erroneous mass correction posted (this has been observed for both the MLC Direct Retros, and the Path Defect Journals). Is EFM reviewing the adjustments and performing an independent reconciliation to ensure the mass correction was actually correct before moving forward with these net credit/debit adjustments? If so, how?

A9: EFM participated in designing and testing solutions working with UCPath Center and UCLA GL Stabilization team led by CRU. Executing the solution is led by CRU, working with UCPath Center. Net credit/debit on the fund is the result of executing the mass corrections through Labor Ledger and/or General Ledger. UCPath mass corrections affected over 4,200 contract and grant funds. EFM did not perform independent reconciliation to validate if corrections were done accurately on 4,200 funds. When EFM becomes aware of the case where UCPath mass correction was not accurate, EFM facilitates a resolution working with the department and CRU.

Q10: How can Chancellor's funding be requested to cover the costs? Will it be through EFM? Or is it department level?

A10: There is no need for the department to request Chancellor's funding to cover the additional costs resulting from UCPath mass correction for the closed funds as EFM has already handled these cases.

Q11: The UCPath Journal Corrections website for downloading backup data only allows data search for corrections through FY2021, and doesn't list out all of the "PJ##" defect codes that we see on our ledgers. Is there a timeline that we can expect this will be updated? This directly impacts our ability to reconcile these journals efficiently.

A11: This is managed by Business and Finance Solutions (BFS). CRU-BFS communicates these updates through their newsletter and all announcements related to GL are available on the [CRU website](#). In the meantime, EFM will reach out to BFS to see if we can get an update.