Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, February 20, 2013,
Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 1-2pm (AZ, MT) / 3-4pm (ET)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Web Session: https://connect.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) **Feedback on Prior Agenda Items:** (0-5 minutes)
   Meeting minutes are posted in Confluence and attached to the email notice of this agenda.

2) **FC Update Renee Dolan (5 minutes)**
   a) **Virtual QA for KC 5.1 continues this week.**
   b) **Development Status Updates**
      i) **Kuali Coeus** is still on target for early- to mid-March release date. Subaward Boilerplate will be deferred. FE & UI issue are functionally complete. Significant list of performance items have been worked on (15 major discovered during Boston F2F of UI Wkg Group).
      ii) **Coeus** has issued a 4.5.1 patch release. There is no new functionality, but there are problems with Apple/Java and Coeus Premium that are still being addressed. There are 7-9 form revisions and new forms from NIH. We will support G.g forms to Coeus.
   c) **KCW – Newport Beach CA (April 16-19)** - Award Subcommittee meeting is Tuesday 4/16/13 1-5pm. Testing Tuesday – Thursday (4/16-4/18). Agenda topic suggestions? Help needed with specs for next release. Registration is $189 to cover food/beverages and meeting rooms. Hotel registration cutoff is March 17, 2013 for $155/night rate. Attendees are encouraged to bring laptops for testing and the Award Leads will be available to assist learning functionality as you test.
      Neil/UCB: Help writing specs – focused time is difficult to find at work. What specs need work?
      Susan/UA: will send the latest prioritized Functional Council list. We know we need to work on specs for KRACOEUS-6072: Subaward Boilerplate Forms and KCENHANC-116: Adding Transactions to Award.
      Kaci/BU: would like to help with Transactions spec
      Becky/ISU: Will be at the meeting Tuesday and can help with something.
   d) **UXG Working Group** – presented initial prototype work to the FC. UXG stands for “User eXperience Group” and basically refers to work on improving the KC User Interface.
   e) **“Route to Complete” Rice Functionality** Renee Dolan (5-10 minutes) - What is it, Why do we care, and Who’s interested?
      a) **What is it?** Rice functionality from MSU (part of KFS) in Rice 2.1. KC could use functionality, but there is set up to do to make it work.
      b) Only required fields must be completed, then it can be Ad Hoc routed to someone else to complete the rest of the fields required to submit.
      c) KC work hasn’t been done to make it useful; need work on permissions, bootstrap, etc.
      d) **Why do we care and who might be interested?** Institutions with separation of duties in Award could use this. Preaward and Postaward sections may be responsible for different data in the Award. Preaward may be concerned with Funding Proposals and classifications, but Postaward may be in charge of Reports and Terms.
      e) Renee/MSU: will bring this up at the All Leads meeting next Monday and would like to have an idea of how much interest there is in what document types.
      f) Kaci/BU: BU is very interested. Preaward/Postaward have separate duties/responsibilities in Award doc. The Award doc is most interesting, then T&M
      g) Rosemary/Coeus: MIT may be interested. Could this go to development? Renee/MSU: Subcommittee chairs will figure that out. Could be very useful in PD.
      h) Neil/UCB: UCB already has customized workflow to facilitate when an initiator can’t find a sponsor and SPS needs to add a new sponsor. Invested already in PD and would like this for Award/T&M.
      i) Kaci/BU: UCB already did something like this with PD? How? Is it a lot of work? Neil/UCB: Pieces are still missing to be used like Renee described. Neil doesn’t know how much work was involved to get it set up. Renee/MSU: Chitra (MSU developer) did some investigation and estimates it may require 3hrs per doc type to do the work to make “route to complete” functional.
      j) Rosemary/Coeus: Careful decisions have to be made about what workflow is appropriate for each doc type. KFS docs aren’t versioned, so there is added complexity with KC. Thoughtful
analysis is needed regarding routing rules etc that may be using various data. It could be a huge
benefit, especially when training new people.
k) Diane/CSU: CSU would also be interested.
l) Chris/Cornell: Cornell too.
m) Kaci/BU: What versions could this apply to? Renee/MSU: There are published compatibility
charts for Rice.
n) Becky/ISU: ISU thought about trying to do something like this, but would have to be able to
handle monthly award reporting if there were non-final Awards. Renee/MSU: depends on where
they report from – include or exclude those awards that are not final.
o) Rosemary/Coeus: That may be something there are processes around – when end of month is
near, finalize saved Awards.

4) User Interface Working Group “Quick Wins” Susan Mundt (5-10 minutes)- Prop Dev UI
changes (in order of PD priority). Some affect Award Subcommittee modules.
1. **KRACOEUS-6244** PI ‘certify’ button in Proposal Summary – Open/Unresolved for 5.1 S6.
   PD only
2. **KRACOEUS-6158** Special Review tab UI … horizontal scrollbars – Closed/Fixed for 5.1 S6.
   All modules. This is the latest attempt to fix what has always been a problem. The problem is as
   the screen expands, the add button is hidden from view off the right side of the screen. It is much
   better now and the fix applies to all modules.
3. **KRACOEUS-6170** Display Progress Indicator while loading KC pages – Open/Unresolved
   for 5.1 S6. All modules. Jessica Peck/UA discovered a quirk this morning that the indicator gets
   stuck if the user prints for Grants.gov. This may need testing in other modules.
4. **KRACOEUS-6127** Add warning dialogue to reload button in PD – Closed/Fixed for 5.1 S5.
   All modules. There was some confusion about the add button and reload message on add/save.
   Kaci will look at that again and make sure it’s OK. Kaci and Jen will look into it. Post meeting
   update – This comment actually related to KRACOEUS-5991; the Jira is still in progress and
   there are already plans to fix the message.
5. **KRACOEUS-6129** Hide & Default Document Overview Panel in PD – Closed/Fixed for 5.1
   S5. PD only
   Jennifer/Brown: thought that was going to be for all modules. Kaci: Maybe there was
discussion about future use. This will be PD only for KC 5.1.
   Renee/MSU: (Doc Overview) Description is a Rice required field, so hiding it doesn’t mean the
   requirement goes away. Description is a searchable field in the detailed doc search criteria
   labeled ‘Title.’
   Jennifer/Brown: will create a Jira for this type of enhancement for Award nodule doc types to
   create a parameter to hide it or populate with default data from the award similar to what PD did.
   Susan/UA: This is a nice way to do a detailed doc search and put together a chronological list of
   all documents for a given Award if the Description is populated consistently.
   Rosemary/Coeus: When the Jira is created, others can add information about how these fields
   can be useful. Coeus users may just not be aware of KC usage benefits.
6. **KRACOEUS-6168** PD budget violations should be listed on the screen … – Open/Unresolved
   for 5.1 S6. PD only; Award Budget already has a Data Validation panel. This might be
   something Award Budget can consider for consistency and ideas when it’s time to look at our UI.
7. **KRACOEUS-5991** Shared: Warning when user does not click add button… –
   Open/Unresolved. Award demo during Subcommittee call 1/16/13.
8. **KRAFDBCK-9256** PD Links and labels in the action list … – Not in KRACOEUS yet. PD
   only The UI Working Group has done a lot of good work to try to make the action list more
   informative and intuitive for PD users.

5) Jira Issues Susan Mundt (5 minutes)
a) **KRACOEUS-6072** Subaward Boilerplate Forms – Scope is large and KC spec is still being
drafted, so this will likely be deferred to the next release. Rosemary will
Susan/UA: is having trouble getting this spec written (due to limited time) and this functionality
still won’t work in the KC sandbox of Coeus 4.5. Geo Thomos (developer at MIT) will help look
into the trouble. The message looks like the issue may be a technical problem, but any
experienced users willing to assist would be appreciated. Chris Denne/KC Development
Manager can already tell that the scope of this is bigger than they originally thought, so it will
likely be pushed to the next release.
Neil/UCB: worked on this to begin with, so he can take a specific assignment if it will help.
Rosemary/Coeus: MIT tested in a dev instance and she had to set this up again in the Consortium instance. She’ll take a look at the KC instance if there is a login she can use.
Susan/UA: Just log in at ‘quickstart’ and the link is in the KC QA Home Page.
Jennifer/Brown: wouldn’t mind helping, but hasn’t seen it work. Is it really working in 4.5.1? Seems there’s a Jira still outstanding. It would be helpful to have a demo. Rosemary/Coeus: will try to set something up and try to include Susan too.

6) Specification Reviews Spec Champions (30 minutes)
   Jennifer/Brown will talk about the PD side, and Kyle/Princeton will talk about Award.
   a) **KCENHANC-103 PD & Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens** (Kyle B/Jennifer Q) This enhancement is to include object code in Proposal Development and Award. Users often use code value (code format has meaning at Brown) to make sure they select the correct object code. First place to add is when you select the Object code. Then need to display code and description in various other screens. Spec calls for a parameter so schools can decide what they want to display.
   Susan/UA: What options do we really want for the parameter values? Yes/No (instead of 0/1) to add code to display of description might be easier to understand? Jennifer/Brown: This is what is intended. Don’t necessarily need a third option to display only the code? No.
   Rosemary/Coeus: Coeus history was that Lite screens were developed without codes, but more frequent financial users know codes and want them displayed.
   Susan/UA: Single parameter for all? Jennifer/Brown: May want 2 parameters (1 per module – PD and Award). She’ll add that to the spec. Rosemary agrees.
   Becky/ISU: These are the same object codes you would have in Financials? Rosemary/Coeus: Financials may have more object codes than KC, but they do correspond.
   Jennifer/Brown: will update and send for final SC approval
   b) **KCENHANC-90 Prop Dev & Award Budget: Cost sharing detail** (Kyle B/Jennifer Q)
   Jennifer/Brown: want to be able to distinguish between totals (whether they include or exclude Cost Sharing). This spec is to clarify. Clarify ‘Total Sponsor Cost’ (does not include cost sharing) & add total for ‘Total Project Cost’ (Total Sponsor Cost + Total Cost Sharing). Screen shots identify what screens would be affected.
   Rosemary and Becky agree this is a good distinction, and nice to have consistency in labeling and placement.

7) Questions and Roll Call
   Membership Types: S=Sustaining, B=Basic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UA)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kaci Foster (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (Bus Liaison) (V), Jen Flach (QA Mgr) &amp; Mary Kate (Rosemary’s sister’s cat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Carmen Morales (V), Diane Rees, Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Becky Musselman (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Hawaii (UH)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jennifer Halaszyn (V), Darcie Yoshinaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustaining: Clemson, IU, MIT, Wayne State, UC Davis, Drexel, JHU, UMD B, UMD CP, UCSD, WVU, Basic: Vanderbilt, U Cincinnati, Cornell-Weill, Ed Dev Ctr, GMU, JAX, Kent State, MD Anderson, MS State, MUSC, NEU, Purdue, RIT, Rochester, Stevens, SUNY, TCMC, UMDNJ, Uniformed Svcs,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Feedback on Prior Agenda Items:** (5 minutes)
   Meeting minutes are posted in Confluence and attached to the email notice of this agenda.

2) **FC Update** Renee Dolan (5 minutes)
   a) Short meeting, on track for Feb, 2013 release of 5.1. Not much from Coeus dev update.
   b) Quick wins – UI Group having F2F.
   c) COI FE, PHS COI working group. Contact Ron S/CSU to join the working group.
   d) Letter went to Coeus regarding 18mos support.
   e) Share implementation info if you hear so

3) **KC 5.1 Enhancements - Top Ten Progress** Susan Mundt (10 minutes)
   *Indicates enhancements that apply to an Award Subcommittee module
   1. **KCENHANC-107/KRACOEUS-5892** Shared: Active/Inactive status for Sponsor – major, 5.1, resolved, fixed & ready for testing – still
      Please make sure to test enhancements you’re interested in using. Kuali testing resources are limited and it is in your best interest to try out what you intend to use before release.
   2. **KCENHANC-53/KRACOEUS-5998** Shared: Notes & Attachments - "Last Updated By" and "Created by" columns should be added... rested and closed for IRB & IACUC (Award not affected).
   3. **KCENHANC-76/KRACOEUS-5694** Prop Dev: Add proposal deadline time of day
   4. **KCENHANC-52/KRACOEUS-5991** Shared: Warning when user does not click add button... - Release 5.1. This was discussed at All Leads meeting and progress has been made with visual cues if an add row is not added.
      Susan/UA: Demonstrated red text and an orange splat/flower shape appear in the add row immediately if any data is entered to draw the user’s attention. Orange splat/flower is displayed at the left of the add row as well as on the panel heading so it is visible even if the panel is collapsed. There seems to be broad support of the cues being shown today and there is work in progress regarding a pop-up that requires user action even for a negative response if you try to leave the tab without resetting the add row or clicking add.
      Becky/ISU: Is the red color enough? What about color-blind users? Susan/UA: The folks developing the mock screen are consultants/experts and they make sure we’re considering accessibility. In this case, color is not the only visual cue. It is added for secondary emphasis and the splat shape can also be seen.
   5. **KCENHANC-18/KRACOEUS-6038** Grants.gov: … save to an xml file to be imported into a Grants.gov Adobe package
   6. **KCENHANC-33** Ability to submit system-to-system proposals to Research.gov
   7. **KCENHANC-35** Shared – E-Signature upload framework for .pdf correspondences
   8. **KCENHANC-54/KRACOEUS-6002** Shared: Preserve KC Notifications... - Major, 5.1 S3 for IRB/IACUC/COI/Negotiation.
   9. **KCENHANC-85/KRACOEUS-6090** Proposal/IP/Awd/IRB/IACUC: Add a 'Not yet applied' option in Special Review for Animal/Human Subjects when protocol linking parameters are enabled – major, 5.1 S4, fixed, tested and closed.
   10. **KCENHANC-69/KRACOEUS-** IRB/IACUC: Allow administrator & reviewers to easily identify which protocol sections were changed...

4) **Jira Issues** Susan Mundt (35 minutes)
   a) **KRAFDBCK-9151** Award Hierarchy Navigation between Award and T&M – This bug suggests clicking 'time & money' from an award in a hierarchy should open T&M with that being the active award. The reverse used to be true, that if you have an active award selected in T&M, then 'return to award' takes you back to the selected award. However, **KRACOEUS-5294** for 5.0 changed behavior so 'return to award' button returns to the award document from which the user entered T&M. This issue was not adequately specified when T&M was initially developed, but subcommittee should agree on consistent navigation logic. Should KC also open to a saved document when navigating from an Award or T&M document in edit mode as opposed to how an Award search opens to the last final award version?
Neil/UC Berkeley: At first, returning to the Award where you entered made sense. However, maybe in a large hierarchy it would be good to have the flexibility/control over where ‘return to award’ takes you. Rosemary/Coeus: If in node 59, then it should take you to 59. User should choose active node, and go there.

Becky/ISU: Who are using this? ISU will have Post Award accountants editing Awards/T&M.

Rosemary/Coeus: MIT has 1000-node hierarchies. A user may do a variety of T&M changes in many nodes; especially consortium awards. Might need to look at a selected award to make sure what I want to do in T&M.

Susan/UA: Remember, the Award Hierarchy locks when editing T&M, so you can view various award nodes, but not jump around to edit multiple Award docs.

Kaci/BU: Finalize before entering T&M, so that’s fine for user to decide where they navigate. When enter T&M, s

Resolutions: When entering T&M from a selected award, T&M should focus on that award. Agree: Rosemary, Kaci, Susan, Renee Disagree: none

‘Return to award’ from a selected node in T&M should return user to the node selected. Agree: Rosemary, Susan, Neil Disagree: none

Becky/ISU: Requested clarification…

Rosemary/Coeus: If I have selected the award node in T&M, I want to control where ‘return to award’ takes me. If I want to return to my point of origin, I can select it. This is a training issue to remember to finalize any edits in progress. I would prefer user control.

b) KRACOEUS-4695 Award: Initial T&M doc: History panel does not show dates and amounts like in Coeus if only using Award docs without T&M – We have 3 UI suggestions to consider for providing History from the Award document.

i) Single node hierarchies will allow dates/amounts edit in Award. History needs to pick up changes from award doc. Once a T&M doc is saved - lock the award and force them to use to use T&M? Lock Award for edit while T&M edit in progress. Agree: Rosemary, Kaci, Susan, Neil Disagree: none

ii) History will be available in Award too. 3 UI options to Subcommittee: Option 1 History could display in Award with a panel or sub-panel – Chuck sent a prototype like IRB Protocol History is in the ‘Actions’ tab, but that would remove it from the context of Details & Dates panel (T&M displayed there).

Kaci/BU: If always use T&M, History should not show repetitive dates and amounts. Agree Becky/ISU & Kaci/BU: Columns should be consistent in Awd rows and T&M (rows should include change amounts as well as cumulative totals). Agree: Susan, Neil, Renee, Christine/Cornell, CSU, Definitely need ‘change’ column in Awd & T&M rows.

Option 2 Boston U took history panel and made into another tab to right of Medusa – we have to try to keep number of tabs in control (we already have 10, we were instructed to limit to 10 max in KC 2.0). IACUC is a bit out of control & will likely have to be changed.

Option 3 Click a ‘history’ button in Details & Dates panel Time & Money sub-panel to open History in a new browser tab (similar to Award-AwardActions->HierarchyActions->OpenWindow appearance)?
Rosemary: Can it open in another browser window instead of browser tab? Is it an option? Neil: would prefer it be consistent with other award functionality (how ‘open window’ works). Rosemary concedes.


This ‘open window’ button…

 Opens a new browser tab with just the Award Hierarchy panel on a whole screen.

5) Specifications for review
   a) KCENHANC-103 PD & Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens
      – Draft spec is ready for review even though this will not make it into KC 5.1. Please submit comments ahead of time by email to the author so we can discuss next month.
   b) KCENHANC-90 Prop Dev & Award Budget: Cost sharing detail – Draft spec is ready for review even though this will not make it into KC 5.1. Please submit comments ahead of time by email to the author so we can discuss next month.

Susan/UA: Please review these short specs and send written comments to the authors (Kyle Burkhardt/Princeton and Jennifer Quinn/Brown) by the end of this month so we have an outline for next month’s review discussion. Each spec includes good mock screen pictures of the requested changes.

Both are shared with PD Budget and PD review status is unknown.

Rosemary/Coeus: requested that Susan email links with a reminder of the action due date.

6) Questions and Roll Call
   Christine Ashdown/Cornell advised Pam Plotkin can be removed from the roster.

   Membership Types: S=Sustaining, B=Basic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UA)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kaci Foster (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jeremy Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (Bus Liaison) (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Carmen Morales (V), Diane Rees, Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University (IU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Bethany Wuensch attended for Jean Mercer (IUPUI) (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Becky Musselman (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Hawaii (UH)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jennifer Halaszyn (V), Darcie Yoshinaga, Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustaining: Clemson, MIT, UC Davis, Drexel, JHU, UMD B, UMD CP, UCSD, WVU, Wayne State
Basic: Princeton, Vanderbilt, U Cincinnati, Cornell-Weill, Ed Dev Ctr, GMU, JAX, Kent State, MD Anderson, MS State, MUSC, NEU, Purdue, RIT, Rochester, Stevens, SUNY, TCMC, UMDNJ, Uniformed Svcs,
1) Feedback on Prior Agenda Items: (5 minutes)
Meeting minutes are posted in Confluence and attached to the email notice of this agenda.

2) FC Update Susan Mundt (5 minutes)
   a) Development Status: KC is still anticipated in February, 2013 timeframe with scope as previously approved by the Functional Council. Adding low development effort quick wins from the UI workgroup. Coeus 4.5 bugs have been coming in and fixed. There is one final bug that Coeus is having a problem reproducing, and a team of Coeus schools are still working on it.
   b) UI Workgroup: Kaci confirmed the workgroup is making progress, but focus is on Proposal and details don’t affect Award & Subaward modules (this Subcommittee).
   c) Financial Updates: There are no more schools still waiting to decide whether to continue with KC membership or not, so Susan will update the Award Subcommittee roster to remove schools with expired Kuali Coeus membership.

3) KC-KFS Integration Testing update Renee Dolan (5 minutes) – deferred (Renee couldn’t join call)

4) KC 5.1 Enhancements - Top Ten Progress Susan Mundt (10 minutes)
   *Indicates enhancements that apply to an Award Subcommittee module
   1. *KCENHANC-107/KRACOEUS-5892 Shared: Active/Inactive status for Sponsor – major, 5.1, resolved, fixed & ready for testing
   2. KCENHANC-53/KRACOEUS-5998 Shared: Notes & Attachments - "Last Updated By" and "Created by" columns should be added...
   3. KCENHANC-76/KRACOEUS-5994 Prop Dev: Add proposal deadline time of day
   4. *KCENHANC-52/KRACOEUS-5991 Shared: Warning when user does not click add button… - Release 5.1 S3, awaiting Project Board discussion regarding design concerns
   5. KCENHANC-18/KRACOEUS-6038 Grants.gov: … save to an xml file to be imported into a Grants.gov Adobe package
   6. KCENHANC-33 Ability to submit system-to-system proposals to Research.gov
   7. KCENHANC-35 Shared – E-Signature upload framework for .pdf correspondences
   8. KCENHANC-54/KRACOEUS-6002 Shared: Preserve KC Notifications… - Major, 5.1 S3 for IRB/IACUC/COI/Negotiation.
   9. *KCENHANC-85/KRACOEUS-6090 Proposal/IP/Awd/IRB/IACUC: Add a 'Not yet applied' option in Special Review for Animal/Human Subjects when protocol linking parameters are enabled – major, 5.1 S4, resolved, fixed and ready for testing
   10. KCENHANC-69/KRACOEUS- IRB/IACUC: Allow administrator & reviewers to easily identify which protocol sections were changed...
       Susan/UA: Please help test these new enhancements.

5) Jira Issues Susan Mundt (35 minutes)
   a) KRAFDBCK-9070 IP: KC allows user to add same person as Co-I and Key Person – Is there a need to change KC Award functionality to match?
      In proposal development, the functionality is needed to accommodate Proposal Hierarchy. When you combine many different proposals (as many as 50 at MIT) sometimes an individual will serve two roles in the same large project - typically one role for a period of time and another at a later time. It is also on the smaller projects to allow folks to build, and allow the aggregator to see who is being named on the project in the various roles and initiate conversations in cases where someone is listed in two different roles. (… better to allow the function, and question why when they are combined. Sometimes there is a solid reason for proceeding; other times it makes conversations happen …)
      Jennifer/Brown: Brown U has no business process need, but it may be a consistency issue if proposal and Award were different. Could it cause reporting problems?
      Rosemary/Coeus: Proposal allows the duplication, but it is not emphasized. There would be more problems in Award to have the same person listed as both PI and Key Person. It could be this is a proposal hierarchy issue, and by Award time, the duplication should be resolved and eliminated.
      Resolution: Susan will share the decision with absent members when minutes are distributed and comment in the IP Jira issue that the Award Subcommittee has decided no change to current KC functionality is necessary.
b) **KRAFDBCK-6268** Sponsor Template panel should be located prior to the Details & Dates panel—This is a UI design issue for input on desired resolution and priority because this may be resolved by KRACOEUS-5965 (scheduled for 5.1, open, unresolved).

Susan/UA: I disagree that this is an issue of Functional Equivalence since what the system does is the same and only the UI design/how the functionality is accomplished is different. Sponsor Template will not necessarily be applied to all Awards, and fewer still will involve overlap of Prime Sponsor since not all Awards have a Prime Sponsor. KRACOEUS-5965 clarifies the prompt when an overlap occurs and is assigned to be fixed in 5.1. As a user of KC, I would prefer to leave the UI as it is.

Rosemary/Coeus: This is more of a training issue and a clear prompt should be sufficient.

Jennifer/Brown, Rosemary/Coeus and Kaci/BU agree they prefer to leave the UI the way it is and fix the prompts according to KRACOEUS-5965.

Resolution: KRAFDBCK-6268 will be closed as “won’t fix” with a comment to explain the decision.

c) **KRACOEUS-6072** Subaward Boilerplate Forms – Are there any Coeus schools using this functionality (in addition to MIT) who would like to have KC spec review/input?

Susan/UA: I’m writing the KC spec for this functionality and have a growing list of questions/clarifications as I work from the final Coeus work list and spec. It seems some requirements were not developed and the spec doesn’t include some detail about the new functionality. Are there schools with Coeus Subaward boilerplate forms experience/expertise that would like to be included in email/discussion for KC?

Jennifer: Brown isn’t using this yet, but intends to and would like to be included in discussions.

Rosemary/Coeus will be meeting with Wendy Barrigar/MIT Friday to discuss spec clarification and Coeus bugs.

Resolution: Rosemary will copy Susan and Jennifer with additional detail from her discussion with Wendy. Susan will share a list of questions with Rosemary, Wendy and Jennifer and try to include any additional Coeus detail in the KC spec.

d) **KCTEST-41** Create a New Time and Money Document –

The KC_AWD-Time & Money spec includes this requirement: “System shall allow user to create a new Time & Money document for the hierarchy of a selected award from the award lookup, an open award, or an open Time & Money window.” None of this is a Coeus Functional Equivalence issue and a direct "time & money" link from the Award lookup was not developed. Can the award lookup link part of the requirement be deleted? Especially schools in production with KC: Would complicating the Award results be worth the benefit to open a T&M doc directly from the lookup (would save only 1 mouse click) or do you open the award doc anyway, so it wouldn’t add value? Priority minor or trivial?

Susan/UA: demonstrated the Award lookup, showing where the link was intended to be located and the extra click currently required to get to Time & Money.

Jennifer/Brown: Beneficial to open the award before going to T&M.

Rosemary/Coeus: agrees. It is equivalent with Coeus to open the award first.

Kaci/BU: agrees, the user should open the award first. Kaci asked about the proposed enhancement to add the ability to edit T&M fields directly in the Award document (KCENHANC-116: Award: Adding transaction functionality to the award document) and when that might be developed.

Susan/UA: The KCENHANC-116 spec was drafted and there were technical questions for the Development Manager, but answers were not pursued because this enhancement would clearly not make the scope cutoff for KC 5.1. We can pick up again if it is prioritized for a future release and perhaps there will be more users at that time to provide spec input.

Resolution: This requirement will be removed from the QA KCTEST Jira.

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

Membership Types: S=Sustaining, B=Basic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UA)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kaci Foster (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn, Jeremy Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (Bus Liaison) (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Hawaii (UH)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jennifer Halaszyn (V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absent: Sustaining: Clemson, IU, ISU, MIT, MSU, Wayne State, UC Davis, Drexel, JHU, UMD B, UMD CP, UCSD, WVU, Basic: UC Berkeley, Princeton, Vanderbilt, U Cincinnati, Cornell-Weill, Ed Dev Ctr, GMU, JAX, Kent State, MD Anderson, MS State, MUSC, NEU, Purdue, RIT, Rochester, Stevens, SUNY, TCMC, UMDNJ, Uniformed Svcs,
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Agenda
Date: Wednesday, September 19, 2012,
Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Web Session: https://connect.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) **Feedback on Prior Agenda Items:** (0-5 minutes)
Meeting minutes are posted in Confluence and attached to the email notice of this agenda.

2) **FC Update** Renee Dolan (5 minutes) Last FC meeting was 9/12/12
   a) **Election results (Subcommittee & Project Board)** - Only 1 SC has a change: Jessica Peck/UA is the new Preaward Co-Chair joining Susan Sorensen/Drexel. Colleen Leslie/MIT is the Chair elect for FC, FC still seeking nominations for Chair position that will be vacant in October.
   b) **Staffing Plan** - There were no clear budget numbers available yet, but FC voted to proceed to hire BA & 2 developers.
   c) **User Experience Design working group** - Talk to your Functional Council rep to join.
   d) **Basic Member Engagement** – The vote on whether to add FC voting rights for Basic members was deferred to the F2F in October during Kuali Days.
   e) **Kuali Days reminder** - Early registration is over. Kuali Days is 10/14/12-10/16/12
      There were no additional questions about the FC update.

3) **KC-KFS Integration Testing update** Renee Dolan (5 minutes)
   Integration with Rice 2.01 (or 2.1?) has informally begun. We still don’t have shared environment. Preliminary testing has taken place. The “INTG” environment will be going to a daily build. There are only a few testers and we could use more. If you need guidance about how to get started, contact Renee Dolan and she’ll help bring you up to speed.

4) **Specifications for 5.1 Spec Champions** (40 minutes)
   Chris Denne, DM: I don't think any of the three KCENHANC Jiras below require a full blown spec.
   a) [KCENHANC-98](#) (Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments tab…)
   b) [KCENHANC-107](#) (Shared: Active/Inactive status for Sponsor) - There are already details in Jira.
   c) [KCENHANC-124](#) (PD/IP/Awd: Credit Split panel ‘default distribution’ button) – IU contribution. These 3 (above) are considered “Requirements Complete” and are ready to go to development with the detail already in Jira – Are there any objections/suggestions for change within scope? Susan: FYI: 9/14/12 Email from Dan Dwyer: We have added 2 new Prioritization status values; ‘Approved’ and ‘Requirements Complete’. This will help us keep track of what JIRAs we are working on in the KCENHANC project. Use them as follows:
      - **Approved** - FC didn't officially approve individual JIRAs, but instructed to start work on requirements for the highest ranked items in each committee. For those JIRAs that you are working on, please change the prioritization status to "Approved".
      - **Requirements Complete** - Once the requirement document has been written and reviewed by subcommittee(s), change the status to Requirements Complete to let the development managers know technical work can be initiated. Then DMs will move the JIRA into whatever work queue your module uses (KRACOEUS). Susan is maintaining Jira statuses, so you don’t need to worry about committing this to memory.
   d) [KCENHANC-108](#) HOLD Award Rosemary Hanlon/Wendy Barrigar – Comments due 9/19/12
      Rosemary: I haven’t received any additional comments on the Award On Hold spec 108. Adjustments were made based on Friday’s call. A Functional Requirement to permanently disable warnings on a rule was removed after the spec review and MIT was notified. There may be future KRMS development to allow that type of thing. The functionality didn’t exist in Coeus, so MIT didn’t lose anything.
      Rosemary is still waiting for Renee to send input on requirements to do with KC/KFS integration. Renee will get FRs to Rosemary ASAP. It’s next on her to-do list, but she needs to run a couple questions by Gayathri, the developer for KC-KFS integration.
      There was 1 email from someone about their business process. They were concerned a hard error could disrupt business process. There is flexibility, but the enhancement is specified as a (soft) warning. The school wanted to be able to copy an Award… There is always a workaround. Jennifer/UH was the one who asked. They’ll look at their process and will participate in testing.
   e) [KCENHANC-126](#) Upload NOA Forms Kyle Burkhardt/Neil Maxwell
Spec authors will give a walkthrough of functionality. Comments due next Monday, 9/24/12.

This is mostly technical - In particular, review Appendix B: Award Notice xsd; including fields that may be included in forms.

Please email written comments to Kyle Burkhardt by next Monday 9/24/12.

Kyle: This is largely technical, about uploading templates as an Application Admin. This expands that to the Award module Notice of Award. Current Coeus requires Kyle to ask for developer help to upload and then restart the server for each form iteration. It is also inconvenient when they have to restart the server to put a new NOA into production. It would also help to keep templates through application upgrades. This spec is based on what was built for KC Subaward templates. Spec also included the ability to save it as RTF & pdf. No need seen for this so it was removed.

Neil: Is there a Notice of Award screenshot included? Kyle: No. Neil intended to include an example. No reason not to include, but probably Ok without.

No additional questions.

f) Goals for Specs not started/in progress Susan Mundt

i) Susan will create a new Doodle poll to schedule spec review call(s) before next meeting.

Like last time, by responding to the poll & being considered in scheduling, you are committing to providing written spec feedback & actively participating in spec review calls.

October Award call is canceled because it would be during Kuali Days. Right now, while we’re waiting for more detailed instructions/decisions about how other subcommittees are consistently using Confluence, Google Docs and Jira. Post draft specs in Confluence because Confluence handles versioning and provides additional information about progress. The COEUSQA project ended up with many attachments and it gets difficult to distinguish between draft documents and FINAL specs, so we’ll put drafts and specs-in-progress in Confluence with a link in the Jira to the Confluence spec page and just attach the FINAL spec in Jira. So authors don’t need to worry about Jira vs Confluence, Susan will maintain cross-reference links (add Confluence link in Jira & post FINAL specs in Jira).

Renee demonstrated in Confluence how to use the Tools menu dropdown (top right corner of Confluence screens) to use:

- Favourite – clicking the star icon adds a direct link to that Confluence page in your Dashboard/home page when you enter Confluence (link will be at the bottom/left)
- Watching – clicking the envelope icon toggles on/off email notifications each time the Confluence page is edited so you can get email notices each time the Award spec grid page is edited (new spec posted, a new deadline or spec review call scheduled).

Susan will also send the usual email to the kc.award list when new specs are available or meetings are scheduled.

ii) KCENHANC-103 PDB/AB: Display Obj Code & Description Kyle Burkhardt

Post first draft in Confluence by 9/20/12. Please email written comments to Kyle Burkhardt. Jennifer Quinn is reviewing the draft for Kyle and should post in Confluence by tomorrow (Thursday, 9/20/12). Susan can help or do it if Jennifer has trouble.

iii) KCENHANC-132 Awd Rpt Tracking enhancements Jennifer Quinn

Post first draft in Confluence by Friday, 9/21/12. Email written comments to Jennifer Quinn.

Jennifer is working on this. Asked for feedback from those using Report Tracking.

iv) KCENHANC-116 Add Transctions to Award doc Susan Mundt

Post next draft in Confluence by next Wednesday, 9/26/12. We’ll schedule a spec review call before next meeting according to Doodle availability. Email written comments to Susan Mundt.

v) KCENHANC-85 Shared: ‘not yet applied’ Option Jessica Peck

There is a draft posted in Jira. Email comments to Jessica Peck.

KCENHANC-85 has been sent for BA review, but Joseph has been out. We’ll have a call to discuss this specifically, but go ahead and send functional comments to Jessica.

i) KCENHANC-90 PD/AB: Cost Sharing Detail Kyle Burkhardt
There is a draft spec posted in Confluence. Email written comments to Kyle Burkhardt.

ii) Neil: **KCENHANC-34 Shared: Consistent Error Messages** - We talked briefly last time about KC moving to KRAD (which would impact UI pain points, improving searches, breadcrumbs in UI, etc). KCENHANC-34 is a large enhancement and would be affected by KRAD. Will the Award Subcommittee submit something formally about UI concern details? Susan: We initially discussed collecting specific comments about the UI in the Award SC just to initiate collection of some details. Since then, the KC FC decided to move forward with a User Experience (UX) working group. Susan recommended Neil should get involved with that working group via his Functional Council representative (UCSD). It would also be great if someone who participates on the Award SC were in that group to let us know about progress and bring issues for discussion during SC calls as needed. Just today, I commented on **KRAFDBCK-8837** (Shared: Standardize On/Off Campus Field Name and Functionality Across Kuali Coeus Application) that the UX Working Group will likely be involved in Jiras like this suggesting UI changes and UI consistency issues.

2) **Jira Cleanup** Susan Mundt (5 minutes, time permitting)
   
a) **KRAFDBCK-8491 Project Start required for T&M Direct/F&A Funds Distribution panel**
   DM question: Does the effort for any of these possible resolutions mean they should really be enhancement ideas? Current choices:
   1) Create a parameter to designate Project Start required (validation error & asterisk in UI) or not without having to customize Data Dictionary.
   2) Data validation warning in Award that Project Start is required to open T&M.
   3) Add static text to Details & Dates panel that Project Start is required to open T&M.
   **Answer from Chris Denne 8/8/12:** All three of these are pretty small, #1 being the largest at maybe 16 hrs for a new business rule optionally triggered by a System parameter.
   **Vote taken:**
   UA/Susan: 2, 1, 3,
   UCSD/Neil from UC Berkeley: 2, 1, 3
   Coeus/Rosemary: 2 Doesn't want another parameter! Wants option 2 & nothing else!
   CSU/Carmen: 2, 1, 3 Agrees with Rosemary’s point.
   Cornell/Chris: 2, 1, 3.
   IU/Jim: 2, 3, 1 Jim B asked for clarification about current functionality. There is currently no error or warning when Award doc goes from saved to final. Correct. 2, 3, 1.
   MSU/Renee: 2 only
   UH/Jennifer: 2, 1, 3
   **Option 2 wins: 8 votes** (5 voters absent: BU, Clemson, ISU, MIT, Wayne State)
   Susan will get votes/comments from those absent during the call via email and post results in the Jira so it can move to development.

b) **KRAFDBCK-8392 Current & Pending Support; saved Awards not included**
   DM question: You may need to read arguments for this one... Coeus includes a similar gap where a project may not be included in the Current or Pending Support report. Coeus Awards are "final" as soon as they are saved, but some schools have decided on workflow business process that leaves a KC Award saved for an extended time period. Is it much more work to parameterize this (which Proposal and Award Statuses, and possibly KEW statuses should be included in Current report and Pending report)? Is it hard-coded which Award/Proposal statuses are included in Current vs Pending Report?
   **Answer from Chris Denne 8/8/12:** This little nugget may require a bit more investigation by me. I looked at our current "CurrentAndPendingReportService" & "CurrentAndPendingReportDao" where those reports are generated & I didn't see us using either the Award Status or the Award Workflow (KEW) status to identify which were current versus pending. So need to do more digging there. That said, given that we already have a Dao implementation for these reports, I expect we could do some sort of mapping to assure that we're getting all of the correct Award/IP data for each. One potential pitfall of mapping statuses to current/pending-ness outside of the Award status maintenance BO itself is that a (power) user could potentially unknowingly create a situation where there are unmapped statuses.
   Susan will follow up with Chris Denne on this one...

3) **Questions and Roll Call**
   Membership Types: S=Sustaining, B=Basic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UA)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn, Jeremy Cox, Emily Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (Bus Liaison) (V), Jen Flach (QA Mgr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Carmen Morales (V), Diane Rees, Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University (IU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Hawaii (UH)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jennifer Halaszyn (V), Darcie Yoshinaga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absent: Sustaining: BU, Clemson, ISU, MIT, Wayne State. Don't usually participate: Binghampton, UC Davis, Drexel, JHU, UMD B, UMD CP, UCSD, SUNY, SUNY-Buffalo, WVU.
Basic: Vanderbilt. Don't usually participate: AUC, ASU, Broad, U Cincinnati, Cornell-Weill, Dartmouth, Ed Dev Ctr, GMU, JAX, Kent State, U LA Lafayette, MD Anderson, UC Merced, MS State, MUSC, NEU, OK State, Purdue, RIT, Rochester, Rutgers, Stevens, TCMC, UMDNJ, UMMC, Uniformed Svcs, Whitehead Inst.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Votes</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Champion</th>
<th>Co-Champion(s)</th>
<th>Spec Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KCENHANC-98</td>
<td>Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments Tab to be able to attach generic attachments not tied to adding funds or invoices as well as a place to aggregate notes</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (MSU)</td>
<td>DM: Jira detail OK; Requirements Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KCENHANC-107</td>
<td>Shared: Add functionality to set Active/Inactive status on a Sponsor record and filter Sponsor searches by active/inactive/both</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>DM: Jira detail OK; Requirements Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KCENHANC-52</td>
<td>Cross Module Enhancement: Warning should be provided when user does not click the add button after enter specific information</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Claire King (Drexel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Design discussion in Confluence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCENHANC-103</td>
<td>PD &amp; Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post draft by 9/20/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCENHANC-108</td>
<td>Award: Add ability to prompt change of award status to HOLD based on configurable validation criteria</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Wendy Barrigar (MIT)</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (Coeus)</td>
<td>Comments due 9/19/12 Spec draft in Confluence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCENHANC-126</td>
<td>Award: provide a way to upload an xsl file for the Notice of Award (NOA) through the application</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell (UC Berkeley)</td>
<td>Comments due 9/24/12 Spec draft in Confluence – mostly technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-123</td>
<td>Awards: T&amp;M doc - No validation between Direct/F&amp;A amounts and award amounts</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (MSU)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed 8/8/12: fixed by KRACOEUS-5488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-131</td>
<td>Award Sync - Error syncing terms - misleading error message</td>
<td>Triv</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed 9/12/12: abandoned, not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-132</td>
<td>Award Report Tracking: Add functionality for responsibility, notifications and automatic updates to overdue status and report completion</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Reassigned to Jennifer Quinn (Brown)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post draft by 9/21/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-34</td>
<td>Consistent presentation of Error messages</td>
<td>Lg</td>
<td>Tyler Wilson (CSU, Preward)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA, Award)</td>
<td>Involves all modules &amp; UI – not started (FC UX work group?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-116</td>
<td>Award: Adding transaction functionality to the award document</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post update by 9/26/12 Spec draft in Confluence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-124</td>
<td>PD/IP/Awd: Add Credit Split panel 'default distribution' button to populate 100% to PI, Lead Unit &amp; first Unit in Co-Is/Key Person details</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td>Jim Becker (IU)</td>
<td>DM: Jira detail OK; Requirements Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-85</td>
<td>Proposal/IP/Awd/IRB: when IRB linking parameters are enabled in Proposal/IP it forces institutions to have protocols initiated for all proposals containing human subjects. Would be better to have a 'not yet applied' option along with lookup</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Jessica Peck (UA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Email comments to Jessica Draft in Jira – requested LBA review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-90</td>
<td>Prop Dev &amp; Award Budget: Cost sharing detail</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Email comments to Kyle Spec draft in Confluence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-99</td>
<td>Award Sponsor Template: sync to template action should be available only when applicable/allowable</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not started – may be too low priority?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Minutes

Date: Wednesday, August 15, 2012,
Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Web Session: [https://connect.msu.edu/awards/](https://connect.msu.edu/awards/) Enter as “guest”

1) **Feedback on Prior Agenda Items:** (0-5 minutes)
Meeting minutes are posted in Confluence and attached to the email notice of this agenda.

2) **FC Update** (8/8/12 meeting): Renee Dolan (5 minutes)
   a) **Kuali Days 2012:** Program is posted and registration is open. Hotel is full on Weds already. There is usually an overflow hotel.
   b) **Staffing Plan/Work Schedule Plan:** FC review work is ongoing. Staffing on hold for Kuali Foundation budget information. The work schedule plan being considered is 30% Current functionality, 70% Future (new) functionality. These FC documents are not final yet. KC 5.0.1 release is still planned for the end of August. All next week is informal virtual QA, so please try to *retest all resolved Jiras* and general system testing.
   c) **Update on Basic Member Engagement ideas:** Subcommittee voting is still being discussed.
   d) **KC Elections:** We will hold off retooling the Technical Subcommittee and nominating those chairs. We have nominees for each subcommittee except Pre-award. No one has more than 1 nominee – if you want choices, nominate others. FC Secretary has no nominees.
      *Deadline for nominations is extended to August 17, 2012.* Mail nominations to Lisa Oliva at malonel@ais.msu.edu. Lisa Oliva will send a reminder email.
   e) **KCENHANC-1** UI & usability - Mostly functional work to be done (not dev) and we need to see how KRAD can be used. **Anyone concerned about the KC UI needs to start documenting** specific problems and suggest corrections as a starting point.
      Neil/Berkeley: sent an email in response to complexity issue. KRAD conversion would help.
      Ken Geis has specific ideas (out until next week). ISU starting to build list. **Neil will send a list of KC UI specific issues Berkeley has documented** for Susan to share with the subcommittee.

3) **Specifications for 5.1** Spec Champions (40 minutes)
   Chris Denne, DM: I don't think any of the three KCENHANC Jiras below require a full blown spec.
   - **KCENHANC-98** (Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments tab…)
   - **KCENHANC-107** (Shared: Active/Inactive status for Sponsor) - There are already details in Jira.
   - **KCENHANC-124** (PD/IP/Awd: Credit Split panel ‘default distribution’ button) – This is an IU contribution.
      a) **Scope:** Champions should be prepared to ask/take questions about enhancement scope.
      b) **Due Dates:** We’ll set deadlines for Functional Requirements for Subcommittee review. We’ll start with focus on enhancements that will require lead time for development and QA (Shared, Med-Large size, complex, ranked in Top Ten: **KCENHANC-52, KCENHANC-108, KCENHANC-126, KCENHANC-132, KCENHANC-116, KCENHANC-85**)
   c) **Discuss availability for spec review** special meetings. Spec review calls may have to happen between monthly calls. Does Wednesday meeting time work for most weekly? Susan will send email with a link for a Doodle poll with some available times to meet for spec reviews. We will try to use Wednesday afternoons (same as our subcommittee time, with the exception of the KCC FC meeting week). **Please don’t respond to the poll if you won’t be able to put in the time to actually review the specs, ask questions and provide written feedback to the spec authors.** We can’t afford to work around your schedule without this level of commitment/participation.

5.1 Specs in Progress
   - **KCENHANC-52** Warning when user does not click ‘add’ button – In process, emails have gone out, affects all modules. Nothing more for us to do with this now.
   - **KCENHANC-108** Award: HOLD Awards based on configurable validation criteria
      Rosemary Hanlon/Coeus Consortium is working on this with Lori Barrigar/MIT – Rosemary will write up something more formal that the Jira description. Based on the enhancement MIT recently put in place, there are questions in Jira about Parameters vs Business Rules to accomplish this functionality. Rosemary will ask MIT if they feel this is an equivalence issue one way or another. It could be a combination of both. Coeus has this hard coded. **Rosemary will post a first spec draft in Confluence by Friday, 8/24/12** (authors can ask Susan or Renee for
help posting specs). Susan will email the group a reminder to review the spec draft and set up a Doodle poll to meet to review specs before the next monthly meeting.

**KCENHANC-126 Award: Upload xsl files for the Notice of Award (NOA)**

Neil/Berkeley – Neil approached this as similar to the XSL functionality of Subaward Forms. He used that spec doc as the starting point and updated the tables. The spec still needs to be updated to reference KC field names, terminology, etc. (every table that starts with OSP$Award). He will go back through the tables to make sure nothing is left out. There was a lot of detail (strikethrough style in the spec draft) that may not be useful to developers so he’ll remove it later.

We viewed a sample NOA from Berkeley. Nancy/Berkeley used BIRT to apply layouts etc. Berkeley uses comments pretty heavily to call out items of importance to main user groups.

Kyle’s enhancement description mentions she has to go to a developer for minor tweaks to the NOA with much iteration for a simple change. It would be nice for the KC Application Manager to be able to make small changes without bothering a developer. **Neil will post spec progress in Confluence by 8/24/12 too.**

- **Jennifer/Brown:** offered to help Kyle with this too and thought it was limited to simple upload capability. Great that it would be enhanced to allow modifications of the upload! Brown has to have Production Services stop production to do that. One way is custom forms uploaded to a dummy sponsor. Is there an easier way to do that? Can upload XSL forms by designating sponsor. Work has already started on Subaward upload forms. **Jennifer will show Neil how this works for Prop Dev Subawards** so Neil can incorporate something similar into the spec.
- **Q:** Kaci/BU: Looks like options are to add data from the Award table. **Is there also an option to add Budget data?**  Can it be configured to pull data from a Budget version or Time & Money?  BU is most concerned about including Award Budget information. Neil will add this to the spec. Non-award data is now just reference tables.
- **Q:** Kaci/BU: **How would this work in KC?**  Neil: The only uploading he is aware of is in the context of workflow (pretty straight-forward).

**KCENHANC-131 Award Sync - Error syncing terms - misleading error message**

Since this is Trivial, it can go forward to development as soon as we figure out what we want/need to do.

**KCENHANC-132 Awd Rpt Tracking: Responsibility, notifications & auto-updates…**

Jennifer/Brown will work on this with Kyle/Princeton, but Brown isn’t using Report Tracking in production. They will work on a gap analysis between Coeus and KC. Susan pointed out that some of the things listed in the enhancement may already be available in KC. Needs to be explored further in KC. **Jennifer will post progress by 8/31/12.**

**KCENHANC-34 Consistent presentation of Error messages –**

this is in limbo until all modules identify a Co-Champion. Waiting for Champion (Tyler/CSU) to initiate effort…

**KCENHANC-116 Award: Adding transaction functionality to the award document**

- **Q:** History link from Award –Details & Dates screen will include a link to open the Time & Money panel in display mode in another browser tab/window (like KC inquiry). **This requirement was part of the original T&M spec, but was not developed or intentionally omitted functionally.**

  Functionally, does it matter if the rest of the T&M doc framework is displayed as long as the History panel appears?

- **Q:** Kaci/BU: **Will the functionality in the award doc show the T&M info for just that node you are currently in?**  Susan thought probably yes because it might affect performance and be too confusing to include the entire hierarchy.

  - Kaci/BU: BU has a custom tab for award history including all nodes of the hierarchy. **Pro: all available in one place. Con: takes a long time to load.**
  - Monica/BU – History tab is easy to understand and useful. The pain is with big Hierarchies. 70-80 nodes take a long time, but you expect it.
  - Neil/Berkeley – Berkeley is already leaning toward showing the entire Hierarchy history. KC is already hard to navigate, but it would be harder to navigate repeatedly to find information for each node.
  - Rosemary/MIT – Agrees that users with giant awards know to expect a wait. It is better to expect a wait with large hierarchies than to get lost looking for the info.
• Kaci & Monica/BU will send Susan screenshots of BU customized History to be able to see the history screen from their award doc.
• Q: Becky/ISU: ISU has been looking at this too. Do you have to use T&M? Renee: Yes, because the T&M Dates/Amounts are only included in History if entered in T&M.
• Susan/UA: UA does an Award version with every T&M because fields like Modification ID & Attachments are only available in the Award doc.
• Renee/MSU: Should we consider adding Modification ID & Attachments to T&M?
• Monica/BU: BU uses T&M only as a doc to change amounts. Adding more than dollars would just be confusing (sometimes there is much turnover in awards staff).
• Rosemary/MIT – Having another place for attachments would confuse people – which location should be used for adding or finding an attachment?

KCENHANC-85 PD/IP/Awd/IRB: ‘not yet applied’ option when IRB linking enabled
We ran out of discussion time so this item is deferred.

4) Jira Cleanup Susan Mundt (5 minutes, time permitting) Discussion deferred – read updates.

a) KRAFDBCK-8491 Project Start required for T&M Direct/F&A Funds Distribution panel
DM question: Does the effort for any of these possible resolutions mean they should really be enhancement ideas? Current choices:
  1) Create a parameter to designate Project Start required (validation error & asterisk in UI) or not without having to customize Data Dictionary.
  2) Data validation warning in Award that Project Start is required to open T&M.
  3) Add static text to Details & Dates panel that Project Start is required to open T&M.
Answer from Chris Denne 8/8/12: All three of these are pretty small, #1 being the largest at maybe 16 hrs for a new business rule optionally triggered by a System parameter.

b) KRAFDBCK-8392 Current & Pending Support; saved Awards not included
DM question: You may need to read arguments for this one... Coeus includes a similar gap where a project may not be included in the Current or Pending Support report. Coeus Awards are "final" as soon as they are saved, but some schools have decided on workflow business process that leaves a KC Award saved for an extended time period. Is it much more work to parameterize this (which Proposal and Award Statuses, and possibly KEW statuses should be included in Current report and Pending report)? Is it hard-coded which Award/Proposal statuses are included in Current vs Pending Report?
Answer from Chris Denne 8/8/12: This little nugget may require a bit more investigation by me. I looked at our current "CurrentAndPendingReportService" & "CurrentAndPendingReportDao" where those reports are generated & I didn't see us using either the Award Status or the Award Workflow (KEW) status to identify which were current versus pending. So need to do more digging there. That said, given that we already have a Dao implementation for these reports, I expect we could do some sort of mapping to assure that we're getting ahold of all the correct Award/IP data for each. One potential pitfall of mapping statuses to current/pending-ness outside of the Award status maintenance BO itself is that a (power) user could potentially unknowingly create a situation where there are unmapped statuses.

5) Questions and Roll Call (5 minutes)
Membership Types: S=Sustaining, B=Basic,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Member 1</th>
<th>Member 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona (UA)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (V), Jessica Peck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Kaci Foster (V), Monica Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn, Jeremy Cox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC (Berkeley for UCSD)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (Coeus Bus Liaison attending for Lori Barrigar/MIT, spec Champion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Diane Rees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown (V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Becky Musselman (V), Don Paulsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Hawaii (UI)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Jennifer Halaszyn (V), Darcie Yoshinaga,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Jill McAfee, Sean Crayton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustaining Members: Clemson, IU, MIT, Binghamton, UC Davis, Drexel, JHU, UMD B, UMD CP, UCSD, SUNY, SUNY-Buffalo, WVU, Basic Members: Princeton, AUC, ASU, Broad, U Cincinnati, Cornell-Weill, Dartmouth, Ed Dev Ctr, GMU, JAX, Kent State, U LA Lafayette, MD Anderson, UC Merced, MS State, MUSC, NEU, OK State, Purdue, RIT, Rochester, Rutgers, Stevens, TCMC, UMDNJ, UMMC, Uniformed Svcs, Wayne State, Whitehead Inst,
## KCC Award 5.1 Enhancements: Specifications Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Votes</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Champion, Co-Champion</th>
<th>Due Dates</th>
<th>Spec Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12          | KCENHANC-98 | Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments Tab to be able to attach generic attachments not tied to adding funds or invoices as well as a place to aggregate notes | Sm   | Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)  
                          CC: Renee Dolan (MSU)   | OK as is                                      | DM: Jira detail OK; Ready for Dev         |
| 11          | KCENHANC-107 | Shared: Add functionality to set Active/Inactive status on a Sponsor record and filter Sponsor searches by active/inactive/both | Med  | Susan Mundt (UA)                     | OK as is                                      | DM: Jira detail OK; Ready for Dev         |
| 11          | KCENHANC-52  | Cross Module Enhancement: Warning should be provided when user does not click the add button after enter specific information | Med  | Claire King (Drexel)                    | In progress                                      | Email shared with kc.award re: options     |
| 10          | KCENHANC-103  | PD & Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens | Sm   | Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)  
                          |                                                                                      | Post formal draft by 8/24/12                     |
| 10          | KCENHANC-108  | Award: Add ability to prompt change of award status to HOLD based on configurable validation criteria | Med  | Wendy Barrigar (MIT)  
                          Rosemary Hanlon (Coeus)                    | Post progress by 8/24/12                                      |
| 10          | KCENHANC-126  | Award: provide a way to upload an xsl file for the Notice of Award (NOA) through the application | Med  | Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)  
                          Neil Maxwell (UC Berkeley)             | Post progress by 8/24/12                                      |
| 9           | KCENHANC-123  | Awards: T&M doc - No validation between Direct/F&A amounts and award amounts | Sm   | Renee Dolan (MSU)                     | Fixed                                      | Closed 8/8/12; fixed by KRACOEUS-5488     |
| 9           | KCENHANC-131  | Award Sync - Error syncing terms - misleading error message | Triv | Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)  
                          |                                                                                      | Post progress by 8/31/12                                 |
| 9           | KCENHANC-132  | Award Report Tracking: Add functionality for responsibility, notifications and automatic updates to overdue status and report completion | Med  | Tyler Wilson (CSU, Preaward)  
                          Jennifer Quinn (Brown)                  | Q's posted for reply by 8/17/12               |
| 9           | KCENHANC-34   | Consistent presentation of Error messages                                 | Lg   | Susan Mundt (UA)                     |                                                                                      | Shared by all modules. Waiting for lead to begin. Need other module Co-C's. |
| 8           | KCENHANC-116  | Award: Adding transaction functionality to the award document               | Med  | Susan Mundt (UA)                     | Q's posted for reply by 8/17/12               |                                                                                      |
| 8           | KCENHANC-124  | PD/IP/Awd: Add Credit Split panel 'default distribution' button to populate 100% to PI, Lead Unit & first Unit in Co-Is/Key Person details | Sm   | Susan Mundt (UA)                     | OK as is                                      | DM: Jira detail OK; Ready for Dev         |
| 8           | KCENHANC-85   | Proposal/IP/Awd/IRB: when IRB linking parameters are enabled in Proposal/IP it forces institutions to have protocols instituted for all proposals containing human subjects. Would be better to have a 'not yet applied' option along with lookup | Med  | Jessica Peck (UA)                    | Will try to post draft by: 8/17/12         | FR draft completion estimated in 1 week |
| 8           | KCENHANC-90  | Prop Dev & Award Budget: Cost sharing detail | Sm   | Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)  |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
| 8           | KCENHANC-99   | Award Sponsor Template: sync to template action should be available only when applicable/allowable | Sm   | Susan Mundt (UA)                     |                                                                                      |                                                                                      |
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Agenda

Date: Wednesday, July 18, 2012, Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Feedback on Prior Agenda Items: (0-5 minutes)
   Meeting minutes are posted in Confluence and attached to the email notice of this agenda.

2) FC Update Renee Dolan (10 minutes)
   a) Kuali Days 2012: Program should be available mid-August. Make hotel reservations EARLY!
      Program should be available in mid-August
      Pre-conferences are set now
      The conference hotel usually fills up and there is an overflow hotel, so reserve early.
   b) Staffing Plan/Work Schedule Plan: still being finalized by the Kuali Coeus Community
      Functional Council (KCC FC). These docs are linked to budget information, which is not yet final.
      Essential positions are still being voted on and finalized.
      Work Plan action item: Subcommittee chairs should proceed with specifications so they are
      ready for development as soon as the work plan is final.
   c) New KC Member Onboarding:
      Engagement of new members – Dan Dwyer (FC Chair) met with basic members. 6 people
      invited, 5 joined the call to discuss how better to develop services to meet their needs. He spoke
      to very active members with long-time involvement – maybe they used to be Coeus steering
      members who became KCC basic members. They recommended 5 items. Most would not
      require changes to Operating Procedures.
      1. Basic Members want to Vote in Subcommittees - Requires change to Op Procedures. They
         would like. Not voting on chairs etc, but regular business.
      2. Communication – We could have a mailing list for the entire paying community. Now we
         use lists for FC, subcommittees… Create a community mailing list and use it regularly for
         general communication with no limit on members. They could join themselves in this open
         list. Collaboration lists are open to non-members. We would use this for surveys and
         correspondence with all members.
      3. Improved Onboarding procedures – New members want someone to contact them with
         information about tools, where to find what…
      4. Member Services – identify services/contacts available to basic/sustaining members. One
         place to look to find appropriate contacts. A Member Support document is in progress which
         will also identify gaps that can be filled by Kuali Commercial Affiliates. KCAs will be
         allowed to join the Marketing & Outreach Subcommittee.
      5. Don’t forget Coeus schools – Even after 18 month period. A number of schools want a
         forum to discuss Coeus.

   FC Next Steps: Dan will document & August FC meeting will include a vote on change to Op
   Procedures to allow basic members to vote in subcommittees.

3) KC Elections Renee Dolan (10 minutes)
   a) Pending change to Operating Procedures: Take positions on Oct 1. Proposed change to: 2 Co-
      chairs, 2-year term and hold elections staggered annually to provide continuity. 1 year to become
      comfortable and effective. Existing chairs can act as mentors to help bring new leads up to speed.
      Most chairs serve more than 1 year anyway, so change would just be on paper, not to current
      practice. Subcommittees do a lot of work: triage bugs, presentations, onboarding. Lisa Oliva will
      draft the change for FC approval.
      The goal is to keep subcommittees active and provide for knowledge transfer. Self nomination is
      allowable as well as to nominate others. Retiring Co-Chairs: Preaward Lisa Oliva will step down.
      Award Susan Mundt, IRB Weiwen Sung, COI has an open position, Technical has 2 open
      positions & 1 would step down next year, Mktg & Ops has Sue Hobbs + open seat.
b) **Elections Timing**: FC Secretary will send email request for Nominations. 7/31 Nominations due, 8/1 begin voting by email, 8/31 votes due, 9/4 FC results by email. Action on results by FC 9/14 (accept or substitute), 10/1 begins new term in time for Kuali Days. Nominations also being accepted: Project Board Chair elect and secretary as well as Foundation Board positions. Nominations should go to Lisa Oliva (FC secretary, malonel@ais.msu.edu). She sent an email to the ke.award@kuali.org list on 7/17/12.

4) **Specifications for 5.1** Susan Mundt (5 minutes)

Neil Maxwell volunteered to help write specs. Jennifer at Brown is willing to review specs and provide feedback with her Coeus experience. Kaci Foster (Boston U) can help with specs. Neil & Kaci will email Susan Mundt (mundts@email.arizona.edu) with a list of specs they are interested in specifically and can be contacted for additional help.

As a side note, Jennifer from Brown **requested a KC Award demo**. It would also be helpful to know where to find requirements and other reference material. Susan might be able to provide a demo similar to what has been offered at various User Conferences and Kuali Days and invite the rest of the subcommittee.

Susan read a brief description of the top 50% of ranked enhancements so specs can be written

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Votes</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Champion</th>
<th>Co-Champion(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>KCENHANC-98</td>
<td>Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments Tab to be able to attach generic attachments not tied to adding funds or invoices as well as a place to aggregate notes</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (MSU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KCENHANC-107</td>
<td>Shared: Add functionality to set Active/Inactive status on a Sponsor record and filter Sponsor searches by active/inactive/both</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>KCENHANC-52</td>
<td>Cross Module Enhancement: Warning should be provided when user does not click the add button after enter specific information</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Claire King (Drexel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCENHANC-103</td>
<td>PD &amp; Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCENHANC-108</td>
<td>Award: Add ability to prompt change of award status to HOLD based on configurable validation criteria</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Wendy Barrigar (MIT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KCENHANC-126</td>
<td>Award: provide a way to upload an xsl file for the Notice of Award (NOA) through the application</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-123</td>
<td>Awards: T&amp;M doc - No validation between Direct/F&amp;A amounts and award amounts</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (MSU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-131</td>
<td>Award Sync - Error syncing terms - misleading error message</td>
<td>Triv</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-132</td>
<td>Award Report Tracking: Add functionality for responsibility, notifications and automatic updates to overdue status and report completion</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KCENHANC-34</td>
<td>Consistent presentation of Error messages</td>
<td>Lg</td>
<td>Tyler Wilson (CSU, Preaward)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA, Award)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-116</td>
<td>Award: Adding transaction functionality to the award document</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-124</td>
<td>PD/IP/Awd: Add Credit Split panel 'default distribution' button to populate 100% to PI, Lead Unit &amp; first Unit in Co-Is/Key Person details</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td>Jim Becker (IU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-85</td>
<td>Proposal/IP/Awd/IRB: when IRB linking parameters are enabled in Proposal/IP it forces institutions to have protocols initiated for all proposals containing human subjects. Would be better to have a 'not yet applied' option along with lookup</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Jessica Peck (UA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-90</td>
<td>Prop Dev &amp; Award Budget: Cost sharing detail</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (Princeton)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KCENHANC-99</td>
<td>Award Sponsor Template: sync to template action should be available only when applicable/allowable</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (UA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) **Jira Cleanup** Susan Mundt (5 minutes)

- It has been suggested that Jira be purged of issues more than a year old because they have not been/will not become high enough priority to be moved to development. A large number of them may no longer be valid (could have been incidentally fixed along the way).

- **Immediate Action item for all**: please review Jira items you reported and enter a comment if the issue is still valid and should not be purged. We don’t know when such a batch purge might happen.
• Renee did a Jira search last week. The Award subcommittee has about 200 open Jiras in KRAFDBCK that are minor or trivial priority. ¼ or more are Minor and are a few years old.

6) **KRAFDBCK-8491** Project Start required for T&M Direct/F&A Funds Distribution panel
Susan Mundt (10 minutes)
Coeus Effective Date (KC Project Start Date) is conditionally required to open the Anticipated Funding window (KC T&M doc Direct/F&A Funds Distribution panel). If that data is missing, Kuali Coeus displays a message appears when clicking ‘time & money’ button from Award that “Project Start Date is required when creating a Time And Money Document.” The user may have to create a new award version to add the missing data (a minor issue). Possible resolution:
1. Make only the Direct/F&A… panel unusable if the required field is missing – this is a large/complex fix that may affect TM performance.
2. Add a Data Validation warning in the Award doc that Project Start Date is required to open T&M.
3. Add a static explanation on the Details & Dates panel (like in PD Bgt Project Personnel)
4. Does it need to be fixed? If yes, how urgent is the priority?

Kyle Burkhardt (email): Would it be easier to make start date a required field to save the award? That would eliminate the problems with T&M downstream. If that’s not an option, then I like the idea of implementing both options 2 and 3.

Cheryl: Coming up because ISU will always do a TM doc. ISU will always require the field. Could there be a parameter? At least, would like a data validation warning.
Q – Renee to Cheryl: Do you have a lot of agreements that don’t have a project start? No. Isn’t there a way in Data Dictionary to make a field required? Yes, but then it’s a customization. It would be training issue for ISU. ISU could live with it. ISU would likely customize.

Becky Musselman: In what situations would Project Start NOT be entered?
Neil: There is no reason to omit Project Start. He likes the parameter idea, is OK with an Award validation warning and wouldn’t object to static text.
Diane: This won’t be an issue for CSU – they’re used to entering Project Start Date and there is a small group of users.

Cheryl: Quite a few ISU legacy awards are missing start dates (ie: MTAs and other non-funded agreements).
Neil: UC Berkeley does that too. They have and will continue to have awards with no start date. It could be useful to save Award docs with partial data.

Jill: Vanderbilt process requires Project Start Date.
Jennifer: Brown requires Project Start Date. If no date with an advance award, they use a dummy date.

Darcie: U Hawaii grad students help enter data. They have found that missing data locks the award.
Jennifer UH: If you forget Project Start, a bug prevents correcting the problem. Susan suggested this might actually be the subject of **KRAACOEUS-5228**: Award: Catch 22 between Award & TM date validations create docs that can't be edited/changed/saved (fix version 5.0) and **KRAFDBCK-8464**: Award: Catch 22 between Award & TM date validations - can't save corrections if you add a transaction instead of click save button (unresolved).

Q: Do dates and amounts populate from IP? Susan said they do not by design because award dates and amounts are rarely exactly the same as proposed. This is Coeus functional equivalence.

Kaci: Supports Option 2 award validation warning. Why is Project Start not editable in Time & Money? Susan explained this is because when the decision was made for Kuali Coeus to have a separate document type for Time & Money, the design/intent was only to include what was in the Coeus Money & End Dates tab. The initial functional concept was that all Dates and Amounts could be editable from either the Award or T&M document, but couldn’t be accomplished due to release timing and technical/functional resource limitations. Enhancement **KCENHANC-116** contains functionality that had to be deferred from the initial Time & Money release.

**No resolution:** We were unable to reach consensus of opinion for this (Minor) issue today. Susan will release minutes and request continued discussion and vote by email in the hope of reaching a decision before next month’s call.

7) **KRAFDBCK-7353** Restriction on upload file types
Neil Maxwell (5 minutes)
Coeus allowed upload of .pdf, .rtf, .doc, .xml, .xsl for Subcontract Invoices. Kuali Coeus does not restrict attachment file types in general. What are the arguments for/against adding restrictions? Are there any champions for this (shared) enhancement or should the Jira be closed?

Neil: This is probably not a major issue. More prevalent in the past when malicious attachments were an emerging technical threat. Increased flexibility would be a way to accommodate future file types.
Kyle (email comment): Princeton only uploads PDFs as subaward invoices so there’s no preference here for/against restricting subaward upload file types.

Renee, Susan, Neil, Jessica all voiced a preference to close the issue with no objections.

Resolution: Jira will be closed as ‘won’t fix’ for now. The issue isn’t high enough priority for subcommittee to create inconsistency between other modules and limit attachment flexibility.

Attachment storage doesn’t seem to be an issue and the risk of malicious system attacks using attachments isn’t perceived as high. Another Jira can be created in future if there are other reasons for action.

8) **KRAFDBCK-8392 Current & Pending Support; saved Awards not included** Cheryl Conover (5 minutes)

   Institutional Proposal status changes from pending to funded and the IP version is final as soon as the Funding Proposal is saved in the Award because the data feed to the Award is irreversible. Only final Awards are included in the Current Support report, but only pending Proposals are included in the Pending Support report. So, after the Award link is saved until the Award is final, the item will not hit either report. Jira priority should reflect frequency/impact of the issue. Another possible solution is to include saved active Awards in the Current report (making this an Award issue instead of shared).

   Kyle Burkhardt (email): That happens today in Coeus: if the award is “draft” status (probably some schools call it “pending”) it will not appear on either report. I asked around here about that and no one has ever complained that the award fell off the c&p, most likely because it’s not in draft status for too long. This sounds similar to if the award is in KC, active but saved status and not final status. Cheryl: workflow process at some schools may be longer. It impacts a faculty report. Can’t find saved awards in Award search (Award search only returns records with at least 1 final Award version or T&M doc).

   Jill described Vanderbilt process to avoid a problem in Coeus.

   Jennifer: Brown process is not to attach a proposal early on, to avoid this. Advance accounts are created

   Neil: Berkeley builds a 3-level Award Hierarchy right award with Funding Proposal linked.

   Diane prefers that it show up on Current as soon as the IP is linked.

   Cheryl: ASU used to not link the IP until the doc is ready to be final to avoid a problem.

   Neil: Fund Advances are like any other award at Berkeley. Proposal is linked as soon as created.

   Jennifer: Is it much more work to parameterize this? Is it hard-coded which Award/Proposal statuses are included in Current vs Pending Report? Susan will follow up with Development Manager for an answer.

   Cheryl: Award status is different from workflow status.

   Susan: UA doesn’t leave saved Awards for any length of time.

   Cheryl: ISU will do that (Award docs will be saved for extended time, several days).

   Jill: Vanderbilt is planning a procedural lag between Award creation and finalization too for internal reviews etc.

   Question: Are there frequent instances after IP changes to funded where it will not stay funded? Why wouldn’t it be appropriate to report saved Active awards in the Current report? General consensus was not unless there was an error made.

   Jessica: From a proposal perspective, I think it is more appropriate to include saved Active Awards in the Current report rather than Pending. Jennifer Q agrees.

   Cheryl suggested saved/active Awards should only be included in Current if there is a Funding Proposal linked.

   No resolution: There was not a clear consensus on the issue and the discussion had to be terminated because we already exceeded our scheduled meeting time. Susan will get input from Development and seek resolution by email.

9) Questions and Roll Call

   a) **Coeus 4.5.1 award jiras that need user testing**

   From: Jen Flach [mailto:jenflach@MIT.EDU], Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 9:44 AM

   To: Mundt, Susan; Dolan, Renee, Subject: Coeus 4.5.1 award jiras that need user testing

   Hi guys, Can you please share this with the Awards Subcommittee?

   The following Coeus 4.5.1 Award jiras are ready for user testing in the Consortium QA instance (https://coeus-cons.mit.edu/) If possible, we would like to get these tested by July 27.

   **COEUSOA-3718** Unknown error when saving award with one report

   **COEUSOA-3630** Award Doc routing should show new status of user who didn’t approve on the stop

   **COEUSOA-3629** Error viewing previous award document routings

   **COEUSOA-3627** Trying to Route a Delta Report on Awards first sequence should show error msg
COEUSOA-3808 CLONE - Award creating duplicated transaction IDs
COEUSOA-3643 Issues with My Awards in Lite

Thanks! Jen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UA)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt (V), Jessica Peck,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>Kaci Foster (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn, Jeremy Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>Diane Rees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU)</td>
<td>Becky Musselman (V), Cheryl Conover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt (sent email comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Hawaii (UH)</td>
<td>Jennifer Halaszyn (V), Darcie Yoshinaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>Jill McAfee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absent Coeus Consortium

Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2012, Time: 9am-12pm (ET)
KC User Conference - Atlanta, GA

1) **Welcome** to Members and Non-Members: Roll call/Introductions
   a) See the bottom of these minutes for an attendee list

2) **Member Benefits Discussion**
   a) Implementation Lessons Learned at Boston University (Kaci Foster): It would have been nice for Boston University if they had joined as a member earlier. Collaboration lists are helpful, time permitting, but subcommittee involvement & documentation would have been good.

   b) **Implementation Strategy:**
      i) Boston University chose to use a lot of the more complex Award areas (Award Hierarchy and Award Budget) and is integrated with their SAP Financial System.

      ii) University of Arizona started very simple, using only single-node awards without Time & Money in KC 2.0, then upgraded to 3.0.1 and is using Time & Money with single-node awards (no hierarchies) and no plan to use Award Budget until they can integrate with KFS (not available until KC 3.1.1). Until then, using Award Budget would be duplication of effort if you have to build separate budgets in KC and KFS.

      iii) As institutions implement, please learn to create Jiras for bugs you find so they can be fixed in base KC. University of Arizona practice is to verify a bug in a Foundation test instance to make sure it is not a local implementation problem, then duplicate the bug in KC Jira with any identified workarounds to help anyone else who encounters the same thing.

3) **Subcommittee Responsibilities:** A Subcommittee Operations Document is available if anyone would like to read it for more detailed information. Email Susan Mundt or Renee Dolan to request a copy. Subcommittees are responsible for:
   a) Functionality
   b) Enhancements
   c) Compliance
   d) Maintenance

4) **Tasks** – KC Award Subcommittee agendas to date have included questions from development that the Co-Leads need consensus/input to answer and specification requirements for review/discussion. Since our meetings are also a forum for sharing information and experiences, members can also suggest agenda topics by contacting the Co-Leads.

   a) **Features Document** – Commonly referred to as the “Huron/RFP Document,” this is a list of requirements to keep up to date to provide for those who request an RFP. Renee could use help updating this document. Experienced Coeus user review would be valuable and this would be a good way for new members to become familiar with what KC currently does and does not do.

   b) **Upcoming Tasks**
      i) **Enhancement voting** – Due May 9th (late votes will not be accepted). We will go through our voting ballot to make sure we understand what is being proposed and discuss questions and share opinions about the ballot items.

      ii) **Member list updates** and email list clean-up is coming soon when Kuali Foundation agreement renewals are complete

5) **Questions and Additional Discussion Topics:**

   a) **Subaward module:** In addition to the Award module, our subcommittee is responsible for the Subaward module; new as of KC 4.0. The module is not in production anywhere yet and could use testing from experienced Coeus users like MIT and Princeton (for example, because they are in the room).
i) Neil: Is anyone testing or using the Subaward module? Not really. Development is complete except for the invoicing piece (a separate type of Kuali Maintenance document to take advantage of KEW (Kuali Enterprise Workflow).

b) **Award Budget:** This is another area of our subcommittee responsibility that is complex and could use more testing.

c) **Implementation Stories**

i) Kaci Foster: BU had 2 preaward offices (medical and main campus, 2 OSPs w/separate databases). Postaward used the legacy Financial System. They restructured and consolidated into 1 OSP office using KC with SAP financial system.
   - The BU Project Team was made up of a technical lead, functional lead,... Huron helped with project management and rSmart helped technically.
   - The project went well in that it was on time. That was the project goal.
   - In retrospect, users are questioning the vision. SAP and KC are big, complex systems. BU is using Award Hierarchy for all awards and event-driven web services interface. Users are reacting to that. Looking at the design decisions that were made. Now they are in a stabilization phase.
   - Training: users are only the Pre- & Post-award offices. Made quick reference guides.
   - SAP implementation was going on at the same time. With initial KC implementation, BU did in-person classes – went to departments. Now they use Service Now; an automated ticketing system.
   - Looking at complexities. Another approach could have been to keep it simple and get more complex as necessary. BU had a vision to match the complexity of SAP in KC. There is a cost, but also benefits like detailed reporting.
   - What were the pros/cons in the decisions? A separate team designed SAP Grants Mgmt. Some decisions were inherited. KC met every week with Pre & Post award users.
   - Lesson learned: Implementers need to be clear about the goals of the process. Reducing set up time was not a goal – BU wanted reporting detail. So now users are reacting to long set-up times – the cost of getting that reporting detail.

ii) Neil at Berkeley was surprised by user behaviors that used to be under control in their old system.
   - Berkeley customized workflow.
   - The Subaward team does its own data entry and invoicing. The question now is do we expose the Award module to campus? Can we make it simple enough with the components we’re using?

iii) MIT: had a data entry team forever, because we use hierarchy. All accounts were entered in Coeus with a nightly feed to SAP. Because users didn’t understand how the feed happened, they began to see problems. MIT has just begun a pilot where Admins are learning the process all the way through. MIT touches awards 10,000 times a year. Data team sets up complex hierarchies, RTC set-ups and set up in SAP. Now Contract Admins are entering awards so they know the system better. They’ll be better able to suggest changes for the future. The recommendation to other schools is to figure out what is essential, what is nice to have and what can wait. Start with what is essential.

iv) MSU doing something similar. Process changes are also being analyzed. Renee went out to sit with user groups to document current processes, now they are analyzing and planning future processes.
   - Process mapping – there is a big difference between the KC model and other systems. Analysts know what they need to end up with for financials. Maybe Research Admins will generate the award, then kick it to the fund accountants for completion.

v) MIT: For example, with an NCE, what are the questions to ask (do you need prior approval?, ...). It is good career development to train Contract Admins and they get to follow those decisions all the way through.

vi) UCB Common, simple transactions don’t need

vii) MIT brought up resources. Hiring a BA is a good idea because they know how to ask the right process/system questions, and now SMEs are learning to think that way too. Renee at MSU will share copies of her process flow documentation if anyone is interested.
viii) BU: recreated old processes in the new system and may have missed an opportunity to redefine and question their processes.
ix) MIT: Always ask WHY and question what you do now in case the status quo doesn’t make sense any more.
x) MSU OSP was a combined Pre- & Post-, now they’re not. Other OSP offices are across the board. Some are Pre and Post as all the same people, some have separate people that do those functions in the same office, still others have different Pre- and Post- in separate locations.
xi) How complex should you go with your implementation is a very important question.
6) KC Enhancements Discussion:
• **KCENHANC-34: Consistent Presentation of Error Messages** – Field errors should be displayed at the top of the panel where the field is located. Some appear at the bottom of the tab in KC.
• **KCENHANC-52: Cross Module Enhancement: Warning should be provided when user does not click the add button after enter specific information** – Those used to Kuali products are less prone to forget to click the add button, but mistakes still happen.
• **KCENHANC-54: Cross Module Enhancement: Preserve KC Notifications for audit/regulatory needs** – Would be nice to parameterize this by module so we’re not storing notifications we don’t need.
• **KCENHANC-85: Proposal/IP/Awd: when IRB linking parameters are enabled in Proposal/IP it forces institutions to have protocols initiated for all proposals containing human subjects. Would be better to have a 'not yet applied' option along with lookup** - There is a workaround in that you could allow a protocol status of not yet applied or pending, but there has to be a protocol created with this status (either create a new protocol for every proposed project that may never move beyond not yet applied/pending status, or one placeholder/dummy protocol).
• **KCENHANC-104: Shared: add previous/next option for Search Results/Retrieved List** - This really is a functional equivalence item and Coeus schools say this feature is used a lot. Award module has this in certain panels, but this issue refers to the function from a main menu lookup list of results (like displaying a particular award panel and looking at the same panel for each award in the Award results list). 4/30/12: Request sent to Development Manager to move this to KRAFDBCK as a Functional Equivalence bug.
• **KCENHANC-105: Subaward: customize Notifications for Invoice Approval** - Wondering if KFS has some of this functionality? Stevens Inst is finding Auto POs (<$5K) don’t even route to OSP. Had to retrain campus that there is a checkbox that requires prior approval.
• **KCENHANC-107: Shared: Add functionality to set Active/Inactive status on a Sponsor record and filter Sponsor searches by active/inactive/both** - There were no discussions/questions about this item.
• **KCENHANC-108: Award: Add ability to prompt change of award status to HOLD based on configurable validation criteria** – You can override the hold, but it is a manual change to remove/change the hold status back to active.
• **KCENHANC-116: Award: Adding transaction functionality to the award document** – There were no discussions/questions about this item.
• **KCENHANC-126: Award: provide a way to upload an xsl file for the Notice of Award (NOA) through the application** - There were no discussions/questions about this item.
• **KCENHANC-132: Award Report Tracking: Add functionality for responsibility, notifications and automatic updates to overdue status and report completion** - There were no discussions/questions about this item.
• **KCENHANC-37: Cross Module Enhancement: Special Review Configurability** – This enhancement would add the ability to associate Special Review types with specific modules as appropriate. Some Special Review types are only relevant in specific modules/documents and not in others, so this would remove irrelevant choices from the Special Review dropdown.
• **KCENHANC-57: This appears to be a bug that was copied from Coeus and should be a bug, not an enhancement. It should already be in Coeus 5.0 and KC 5.0. 4/27/12: This was removed from the Enhancement list as it is really a Coeus Functional Equivalence bug (KRAFDBCK-8111).
- **KCENHANC-90**: Prop Dev & Award Budget: Cost sharing detail – This is a label change to clarify that what is now labeled “Total Cost” is “Total Cost to Sponsor” and adds a field for “Total Cost of Project” (Total Cost to Sponsor + Cost Sharing).

- **KCENHANC-91**: KC FE testing: % charged and % effort fields are switched in KC compared to Coeus – This item just proposes a KC User Interface change in the order that % Effort and % Charged fields are displayed left to right in both Prop Dev Budget (and Award Budget). Coeus users are used to seeing it the other way around.

- **KCENHANC-98**: Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments Tab to be able to attach generic attachments not tied to adding funds or invoices as well as a place to aggregate notes - There were no discussions/questions about this item.

- **KCENHANC-99**: Award Sponsor Template: sync to template action should be available only when applicable/allowable - There were no discussions/questions about this item.

- **KCENHANC-100**: T&M: if not using the Direct/F&A Funds Distribution panel, need parameter to turn off the warning about T&M Anticipated Funds not equal to Award - This should be removed from the enhancement list. It is already parameterized – using the “AWARD_FNA_DISTRIBUTION” parameter – This should be an FE bug. It’s just existing functionality that isn’t working correctly, not an enhancement. 4/30/12 KCENHANC-100 was closed as a duplicate of KRAFDBCK-8085 to add the missing parameter to KC for Functional Equivalence.

- **KCENHANC-102**: Award & PD Budget: Increase size of comments box in Budget Overview screen – Screens were displayed and there were no further discussions/questions about this item.

- **KCENHANC-103**: PD & Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens - Needs clarification about whether printouts are part of this behavior change. It is suggested that it should be, but the description is not that specific.

- **KCENHANC-106**: Subaward: Change Requisitioner Unit label to ??? (since it doesn't have to be requisitioner's HOME unit) – This is a request for a user interface label change, but not all agree “Requisitioner Award Unit” is any more clear than the current “Requisitioner Unit” label. If this is voted to proceed as a label that is unclear and important to fix, we can discuss label suggestions as a subcommittee.

- **KCENHANC-109**: Subaward: Add “All My Subawards” link on Unit & Central Admin tabs for automatic Requisitioner search for user logged in to KC – In the Unit and Central Admin main menu tabs, the only other module that has "All My..." is Negotiation. The "All My..." links otherwise are limited to the Researcher tab for investigators who are accustomed to Coeus Lite. This would save Department and Central Administrators only one step of entering their username in the Requisitioner search criteria, but would add rows to the UI and make it so they may have to scroll to get to links for other modules as the KC main menu grows.

- **KCENHANC-110**: Award, Payment & Invoices: Add show/hide buttons to sub-panels – It was really a design oversight not to include show/hide buttons for these subpanels. They get large/long very quickly and then the user has to scroll up/down to get past them and it would be useful to be able to collapse/hide them.

- **KCENHANC-113**: Inst Prop: Award warning message appears for missing investigator certification in a funding proposal on Awards generated via Proposal Log > Institutional Proposal >Award – The current Award warning is working as designed and is parameterized (can be turned off). The enhancement is for schools who want to use this warning message to be able to enter investigator certification information/answers in the Institutional Proposal module for proposals routed outside KC.

- **KCENHANC-114**: Award Sync Descendants: Automatically refresh Sync Descendants status – When Sync Descendants was developed for KC, we had insufficient time to code and test a more elegant way to update the user about progress as large hierarchy sync jobs take place. The temporary fix was to give the user a “refresh” button on the Sync Descendants panel. This enhancement would update progress on Sync Descendants jobs automatically.

- **KCENHANC-115**: Award: Add project title to award sync function – The ability to synchronize project title changes from parent to child is a long-time Berkeley customization of Coeus that is used frequently.

- **KCENHANC-122**: New Document status or message to inform the user that they are in either View or Edit Mode – In KC, a user can tell if they are in a document in edit mode if there is a box around
the fields and they can type in them. This request is for an additional visual indicator (like text at the top of the document or screen color) for users (and their help desks) to be able to tell if they are editing or just viewing a document.

- **KCENHANC-123**: Awards: T&M doc - No validation between Direct/F&A amounts and award amounts – This is an enhancement for those who will use the Direct/F&A Distribution panel in the KC Time & Money document (equivalent to Coeus “Ant. Funding”/Anticipated Funding Distribution screen). It proposes adding validation messages if the user enters data in this panel that exceeds the total Anticipated Award amount.

- **KCENHANC-124**: PD/IP/Awd: Add Credit Split panel 'default distribution' button to populate 100% to PI, Lead Unit & first Unit in Co-Is/Key Person details – For those who use Credit Split, this proposes the addition of a time-saving button to reset credit split values to 100% for PI/Lead Unit and the first unit listed for all Co-Is/Key Persons.

- **KCENHANC-125**: Institutional Rates Maintenance Document - Add 'Both' option for On/Off Campus – This is a time-saving feature to be able to create both the on- and off-campus rates (if % is the same for both) at once instead of having to do 2 maintenance documents.

- **KCENHANC-131**: Award Sync - Error syncing terms - misleading error message – This was copied over from COEUSQA and proposes there needs to be a better error message than “Cannot delete and Sync the only clause for this term.” However, isn't the KC message wording. KC behaves as follows: KC let me delete all Equipment Approval terms and save the document without warning or error messages. I saved, exited, returned and turned on validation. The following validation error appeared: "There must be at least one Equipment Approval Terms defined." This is a trivial item that will cost no enhancement voting points if we decide the current language needs improvement. We can discuss the language in a subcommittee call if we agree an improvement is still needed in KC.

### Attendance: 27 Attendees from 22 institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University/Institution</th>
<th>Attendee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>Kaci Foster,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>Chris Carsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Jean Mercer (IUPUI), Tracey Levy, Steve Martin, Terry White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU)</td>
<td>Becky Musselman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Inst of Tech’y (MIT)</td>
<td>Colleen Leslie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>Danielle VandenBos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Maryland, College Park</td>
<td>Sally Egloff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UofA)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Attendees

- Clemson University: Bindu Rangaraju, Bettie McGowan-Hudson, Educational Development Center, Inc.: Carrie Traub,
- Medical University of South Carolina: Robbie Lee,
- Mississippi State University: Penny French,
- Stevens Institute of Technology: Barbara DeHaven, David Schultz,
- Tulane University: Shane Aubrey,
- University of Hawai’i: Andrew Tefft, Jennifer Halaszyn,
- U Rochester: Lori Hume,
- University of Southern California: Candy Poolman,
- Washington University: Joe Gindhart

### Absent

- Binghamton, Brown, Coeus Cons, Dartmouth, Drexel, IU, Jackson Lab, JHU, JPPH, Kent St, MMC, MD Anderson, OK State, RIT, Rutgers, UC Davis, UC Irvine, UC Merced, UCSD, U Cin, UM Baltimore, UVA, Vanderbilt, Wayne St, WVA, Yale
1) QA Update: Jen Flach (5 minutes)
   a) Testing Status: Nothing much to update – many testers are preparing for KC User Conference so preparation of demos is resulting in some testing as a bonus.

2) KCC Award Enhancements: Susan Mundt (45 minutes)
   a) Diane Rees/CSU: When is the voting taking place?
      i) Renee Dolan: Target voting due date at this time is 5/9/12.
      ii) Susan Mundt: Expect email with subcommittee worksheets as early as today.
   b) Neil Maxwell/UC Berkeley:
      i) KCENHANC-54: Cross Module Enhancement: Preserve KC Notifications for audit/regulatory needs - Jen Flach provided some Coeus background. Currently in Coeus (and KC) the notification actions go to certain users and are triggered outside the system. There is no historical log of the notifications. This enhancement is to address that issue. Sabari didn’t want to go down this road because of storage issues and how to retrieve the information meaningfully.
      Susan Mundt: This was originally KC Enhancement IR-09 Log e-mails Sent about Protocol and provide Template - The statement of enhancement says “When e-mails are sent from system for a specific protocol there should be an audit trail of what was sent, who it was sent to and when it was sent. Also there should be ability create templates for common e-mail notifications"
      ii) KCENHANC-52: Cross Module Enhancement: Warning should be provided when user does not click the add button after enter specific information – Neil really likes this one, especially when users are new to the system and not accustomed to separate add and save actions. Even experienced users (like Neil) make this mistake at times.
      Susan Mundt: Screens that are particularly wide and require use of a left-right scroll bar at some resolutions (like Special Review) are especially vulnerable.
      iii) KCENHANC-114: Award Sync Descendants: Automatically refresh Sync Descendants status – Neil really likes this one after doing much testing of Sync Descendants.
      iv) KCENHANC-115: Award: Add project title to award sync function – this has been a long-time Coeus customization at Berkeley that Neil find very useful. Kyle Burkhardt and Renee Dolan also see the value in this one.
      v) KCENHANC-123: Awards: T&M doc - No validation between Direct/F&A amounts and award amounts –
      vi) KCENHANC-125: Institutional Rates Maintenance Document - Add 'Both' option for On/Off Campus – This would save a lot of duplicative work for every school when adding new rates.
      vii) KCENHANC-126: Award: provide a way to upload an xsl file for the Notice of Award (NOA) through the application – Neil says Berkeley would find this really useful as customizing Notice of Award is something many schools want to do.
   c) Diane Rees/CSU: CSU really likes 4 – Piloting us or Jira Labels to keep track of those most important to CSU. The 4 labeled “CSU #1” are listed below.
      i) CSU was going to try out Labels in Jira and let others know how it works. CSU is still using the customization and really like it. It is an FC discussion/decision whether other schools should use these labels.
      ii) KCENHANC-107: Shared: Add functionality to set Active/Inactive status on a Sponsor record and filter Sponsor searches by active/inactive/both - CSU experienced that recently & it causes problems. Neil agrees – changing descriptions to include “DO NOT USE” for Sponsors that become inactive is not ideal.
      iii) KCENHANC-85: Proposal/IRB/Awd: when IRB linking parameters are enabled in Proposal/IP it forces institutions to have protocols initiated for all proposals containing human subjects. Would be better to have a 'not yet applied' option along with lookup -
Proposing to add 'Not yet applied' as an alternative to selecting an existing Protocol. Current functionality may require schools to change business processes. UofA doesn’t require protocols be created at the time of proposal submission, but we would want to capture that Human Subjects will be involved if the proposal is funded. Neil agrees with this too.

iv) **KCENHANC-100**: T&M: if not using the Direct/F&A Funds Distribution panel, need parameter to turn off the warning about T&M Anticipated Funds not equal to Award – Susan explained that this panel populates with default award years based on the Project Start and End Dates as a head start for those who will use the panel. However, if the user doesn’t enter any amounts in the panel, the warning message appears. The rows can be deleted to clear the warning when you try to submit, but they are repopulated with every new Time & Money document and you have to go through the same process. There is a lot of effort for this workaround if you’re not even using the panel. Neil also likes this one.

v) **KCENHANC-103**: PD & Award Budget: Include object code, not just description in budget screens – Susan pointed out this sounds good at first, but both object code and description are already shown in the panels where line items are selected/added. Only some other screens (like the summary) display only the description. Susan will comment on the Jira to detail which screens do or do not display – that may make this enhancement more or less appealing to some.

d) Susan Mundt/UofA:

i) **KCENHANC-131**: Award Sync - Error syncing terms - misleading error message – Susan pointed out this was just copied over from the COEUSQA Jira project. Both the screen shots are from Coeus and this may not even be a message in KC. Also, the wording of the improved message, as proposed, doesn’t refer to KC screen labels; the items added in the Terms panel are “terms for a class of terms” not “clauses for a term.” Neil will test and post a comment to verify this is really a legitimate KC enhancement.

ii) **KCENHANC-106**: Subaward: Change Requisitioner Unit label to ??? (since it doesn’t have to be requisitioner’s HOME unit) – Susan thinks the proposed solution of changing the label from “Requisitioner Unit” to “Requisitioner Award Unit” doesn’t really provide clarification. The label is not “Requisitioner Home Unit” and the field already defaults to the Requisitioner’s Home Unit, but can be changed to another unit as needed as was the subject of the original Coeus enhancement [COEUSQA-1522](mailto:COEUSQA-1522). This one might need to be discussed further in subcommittee if it is chosen for development.

e) Renee Dolan/MSU:

i) **KCENHANC-98**: Subaward: Add a Notes and Attachments Tab to be able to attach generic attachments not tied to adding funds or invoices as well as a place to aggregate notes – Renee explained this is an enhancement to add generic Attachments in the Subaward doc. MSU attaches A-133 docs that are not specific to the Financial tab or Invoices. The current Coeus workaround is to add a penny to get the attachment row in the Financial Information screen. Susan asked if schools would have to attach something like an A-133 report to every single subaward for that Organization and if there is a better place to do that (like the Organization record). Renee says yes the attachments would have to be added to every subaward individually. Organization is a maintenance document and the Attachments are only visible in that document – Notes & Attachments from the old document/version are gone if a new change version is created or Organization is viewed via inquiry screen. In the current MSU system, if there is a generic attachment to the Organization record, it can be viewed in any Subaward where that organization is the Subrecipient but that isn’t part of this initial request.

f) For your information: The Award modules are highly integrated with other modules and very complex. As you implement KC, please make sure to report any bugs you find in the Foundation Jira. **We’re very limited in our testing resources and we can only fix bugs and make our product better if you tell us about bugs when you find them!**

3) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>Jeremy Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>Diane Rees, Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Jen Flach (QA Mgr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UofA)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Binghamton, Boston U, Dartmouth, Drexel, IU, ISU, Jackson Lab, JHU, JPPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent St, MMC, MIT, MD Anderson, MSU, OK State, Princeton, RIT, Rutgers, UC Davis, UC Merced, UCSD, U Cin, UH, U MD CP, UMBaltimore, UVA, Vanderbilt, Wayne St, WVA, Yale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2011, Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Feedback on Prior Agenda Items: (0-5 minutes)
   Minutes from the last meeting have been posted to KC Confluence, Coeus wiki and attached with the email of this agenda.
   No questions/comments

2) Coeus 4.5 QA – testers needed for enhancements ready for: Ron Schultz (5 minutes)
   b) “Code Table PD Appointment Types & Period Types” https://jira.kuali.org/browse/COEUSQA-2036?page=com.atlassian.jira.plugin.system.issuetabpanels:all-tabpanel
   c) ‘Award Notice includes totals for payments’ https://jira.kuali.org/browse/COEUSQA-1723?page=com.atlassian.jira.plugin.system.issuetabpanels:all-tabpanel
   d) ‘Award Templates with User ID and Timestamp’ https://jira.kuali.org/browse/COEUSQA-1456?page=com.atlassian.jira.plugin.system.issuetabpanels:all-tabpanel
   e) Subcontract Sub-Module: Site Investigator’ https://jira.kuali.org/browse/COEUSQA-1563?page=com.atlassian.jira.plugin.system.issuetabpanels:all-tabpanel

   Ron: will be testing the jiras as they come thru and then assigning to specific users that use the associated functionality based on surveys, in future we might append this to the end of the agenda so not to take so much room. 2B will be deleted (wrong subcommittee).
   Kyle Burkhardt: willing to test whatever you need
   Neil: accessing award module via coeus lite, couldn’t find this link or functionality, but in purpose of documenting subcontract functionality is this not in Coeus Lite?
   Kyle: at Princeton they use Coeus Lite for subcontract invoice approval, Coeus Lite inbox when requisitioner clicks on this they can see the invoice screen that gives ability to reject/approve.
   Ron: believes this functionality is more thru Notifications but you might want to get with Kyle as to how they utilize CoeusLite for Subawards.
   Rosemary: believes this might be a local customization at Princeton not out of the box functionality.

   1) Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts: Ron Schultz (0 minutes)
      Neil: still working on this and working with Sabri on functionality needs to get it documented as Susan requested.
      Ron: if anyone else wants to be added to above please let Ron know
      Neil: please add Nancy Han to this list
      Don Paulson: please add him to the list

   2) KC 4.0 Development Schedule: Susan Mundt (5 minutes)
      Sprint 1 (8/15-9/16): Negotiation mostly done, Subaward (offshore team: wire frame & DB work)
      Sprint 2 (9/19-10/21): Report Tracking (review at 9/14/11 SC meeting)
      QA: ongoing with regression testing after Sprint 3 Planned release date: 12/16/11
      Neil: end date sprint 1 seems soon since still reviewing spec for subawards, not realistic?
      Renee: started on the preliminary building but it might be pushed out to other sprints also
   Renee: Probably won’t start testing new functionality until after sprint 2 but will know more as testing schedule is released by Jen.

   3) KC Spec Reviews: Susan Mundt (45 minutes) – Please read the Jiras for updated history
a) **KC_Shared: Notifications** – No discussion points have been received to date regarding the Notifications spec. Does that mean everyone approves of the document as is? Please provide comments by email to mundts@email.arizona.edu by Friday, 9/16/11.

b) **KRAFUNC-416 Award: Subaward module** - Subaward spec is drafted and not yet reviewed. Send comments and questions for discussion to mundts@email.arizona.edu. If you would like to use the Subaward module in KC, make sure to have someone on the call who can discuss functionality and the needs of daily users.

Item 6, “should there be a link to the subaward lookup for the researcher…”?

1. Susan spoke w/Sabri and in Neil’s opinion Researcher should have view access at least.
2. Rosemary: MIT starts with purchase req so this name is often person that initiated the financial doc…requisitioner could be a dept financial officer (not PI)…dept does not maintain anything only subaward office does, so not many people use the subaward module for information in departments
3. Renee: are there roles for view in subaward?
4. Rosemary: there is a ‘view subcontract’ right, most Coeus users only view they don’t update, only a few people in subcontract office actually edit the docs.

Item 18: There are not more subawards to display….

1. Recommendation in spec makes sense to all

Item 25: Subaward Panel

1. Subawardee it coming from Organization table (rosemary confirms)

Item 40: if cumulative oblig/ant amounts = zero?...

1. Neil/all: should be allowed only throw validation warning, no error

Item 43: Invoice date validations….

1. Rosemary: be careful with this validation, need flexibility, would suggest maybe a warning but not a hard error.
2. All agree

Item 44: Unique requirement for invoice IDs?

1. Neil: shouldn’t be a problem to have the same number for invoice IDs
2. Kyle: if PI tries to approve invoice that has the same invoice number gives error, might have something to do with email notifications/Coeus bug, the way around it is to create unique ids
3. Rosemary: when you add a line for an invoice it requires unique invoice #….maybe, for financial system integration or approval ability they added this validation?
4. Renee: if I have two invoices with same number I would find that confusing, but maybe it’s because she’s an accountant.
5. Neil: for functional equivalence should we leave as is in KC or remove this validation?
6. If an invoice needs to be revised, would this impact that ability if this validation exists?
7. Rosemary: just tested in Consortium Test Instance can enter same invoice number in Coeus…might be customization at Princeton that is throwing this validation, need to test
8. Neil: will test this more thoroughly with Susan/Renee to document functionality

Item 58: Rejecting of an invoice

1. Neil: is this Princeton specific or Coeus wide?
2. Kyle: email notifications is custom, updateable table shows who should get the email notifications and is Princeton specific – they have 3 emails, Approval, Rejection, and Approved.
3. Neil: will also test this one further to get actual functionality, will work offline with Susan/Renee on how to test.

Item 60

1. Neil/all: prefer warning

Item 61: released amount $/b $/ to subaward oblg amt – cum amnt released

1. Neil: would want an error unless we’re missing something?
2. Rosemary: should be an error to force good business process

Item 62

1. Neil/all: in agreement should run this validation

Item 66: Subaward contact search

1. Kyle: item 65 and 66 should always be Sponsor table not Organization, but in the search it has both available…
2. Kyle: Coeus displaying both
3. Neil: should add a line for sponsor to be consistent

Item 72: subaward follow up parameter
(1) Neil: leaning towards day
(2) Kyle: Coeus using 6 week default
(3) Neil/all: leave it weeks
m) Item 79: Form templates
   (1) Neil: I’m writing
n) Section 5.2 item 1
   (1) Neil: doc status to look like? Susan put together a mock screen, does everyone like?
   (2) Kyle: standard across other screens in KC, in Coeus they’re used to seeing unit name and unit number
   (3) Renee: will check to make sure – it does only display the unit.
 o) Section 5.2, item 2
   (1) Neil, Rosemary and Renee like Closeout panel on the subaward tab, below contacts panel
   (2) Suggestion to rename Amounts Info tab to Financial by Neil, Rosemary and Renee ok with this
p) Figure 17: Princeton Coeus 4.2
   (1) First 3 fields are no longer used at Princeton – they leave them blank
q) Figure 19: Coeus 4.4.4.1, Print Subcontract Forms window
   (1) Kyle sending list of forms
r) 9.2.1 – Open Issues
   (1) Rosemary: added fields in 4.5 to take care of some/most f tis issue. Part of it is listed in the
      above jira COEUSQA-1563. Rosemary will send the other jira numbers. Neil will mark this
      issues as closed.
s) Kyle’s concerns that she noted:
   (1) Requisitioner unit: summarized in COEUSQA-1522 and scheduled for 4.5. This would allow
      the subaward maintainer to change the unit for the subaward. Currently the field is not editable in
      Coeus and often a subaward is linked to the awarding unit, not the requisitioner’s home unit (such
      as the case of an award being managed by a center or program). Thinking about it, this would
      impact the “design requirements” section of the spec, row 1, which says “requisitioner unit”? Maybe
      the wording there should be different? Like “award unit” or “awarding unit”?
   (2) Email notifications:
      (a) We have three types of sub emails at Princeton: “waiting for approval”, “approved” and
          “rejected”. The three emails have customized text and are sent to the awarding unit, not the
          requisitioner home unit (to get around the issue in point 1 above).
      (b) Ability to specify other people who should receive the email—we have an updatable table
          where I can specify who receives sub email and which types/for which units they receive it.
          This is our customization and is sent to dept folks to get their PIs to approve invoices and to
          be aware of when PIs have approved or rejected them. Email is also sent to ORPA so the
          subaward administrator, initiator and others are aware of waiting for
          approval/approvals/rejections.
      (c) The “waiting for approval” mail the PI receives has the URL to Lite in it so they can go in
          and approve it. The others who receive the email do not have the URL. This is to get around
          a Coeus bug where whoever has the link to the invoice in lite can approve it regardless of if
          they are the requisitioner or not. In vanilla Coeus, email is sent to PI only with default text
          from the Coeus consortium.
      (d) We send reminder emails after 15 days for invoices that are still waiting for approval.
          Definitively a Princeton customization.
   (3) PI view of invoice to be approved: PIs go into lite and approve the invoice in lite. They only see
      the invoice and invoicing summary and sub summary in Lite—they don’t see all of their invoices
      (summary or PDF) ever for that sub. The concern is that if the PI can view everything in the sub
      module, it will be confusing for them and hard to get them to approve/reject the invoice in
      question.

c) KRAFUNC-417 Award Report Tracking – Rpt Tracking spec is being drafted and is not yet reviewed.
   Send comments and questions for future discussion to mundts@email.arizona.edu. If you plan to use this
   functionality, please identify which requirements are either misstated (just wrong), overstated (Coeus
   doesn’t do as much as the requirement says) or potential deal-breakers (must-haves for your school to
   even consider using it).
Renee: We will be reviewing this spec on 9/28 during the regular award subcommittee meeting time –
3:00-4:00 ET.

4) KCC Subcommittee Operating Procedures – Susan Mundt (Update: 5 minutes)
No discussion points have been received to date. Leads will proceed to get input from FC and QA, and then finalize the document.

a) Operating Procedures were revised at the last All Leads meeting in response to comments from the Preaward Subcommittee:

b) FYI: KC Project Board decided not to hold elections for subcommittee chairs this year because it might put the Functional Equivalence project at risk.

c) **Resourcing** for positions like ‘QA Mgr’ will be discussed at Functional Council F2F at Kuali Days.

d) We probably need to add something about orienting **new subcommittee members** (including an introduction to Jira, etc). At this point, we won’t add anything specific to the Subcommittee Operating Procedures because we don’t know what resources will be available and responsible for providing this introduction.

e) What if **Subcommittee leadership** terminates or institution membership level changes (ie: chair is from a sustaining member school that becomes a basic member and no longer has a vote)? Examples and suggestions?

f) Subcommittee chairs hold a non-voting seat on the FC, so is it problematic if someone from a non-sustaining member school is the only candidate for the position? Leads added a statement that FC can **grant an exemption** from the requirement that a chair must be from a sustaining member school.

g) Subcommittee Leadership – Before nominations, the subcommittee can decide if they need a chair or co-chairs. **Leads removed any specific number of co-leads.**

h) Leads removed the requirement that a candidate for subcommittee chair be ‘active’ because it would be too hard to define. If someone is ‘active’, then those are the people who will be known and nominated.

i) Leads removed the requirement that nominations be sent only to voting members of the subcommittee. Entire subcommittee can be aware of who is nominated, but only a single vote per institution will be accepted.

5) **Questions and Roll Call**

a) **Future Business:** We will review proposed enhancements for post-equivalency development in the next couple months. If you have any great ideas, create Jiras to describe them (by the end of October?) Also, would be helpful to review old outstanding jiras to see if still broken/relevant….if you have time please try to close outdated ones.

b) **Kuali Days 2011:** Is anyone from the subcommittee attending Kuali Days? We have all day and space for a Face-2-Face meeting Monday, November 14, 2011 in Indianapolis. Will we have a quorum to start ruling out enhancement ideas that lack adequate support and get ready for post-equivalency. Please make suggestions for Agenda topics at Kuali Days meeting:

    Neil, Jessica, Susan, Renee and Don for sure attending KD, Diane will know in a couple of weeks.

    Please send Renee email when specific plans known or if any others are coming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</th>
<th>Diane Rees, Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University (ISU)</td>
<td>Don Paulsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ (JHU)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan, Chris Kropelnycyj, Brian Rafferty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Kyle Burkhardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UofA)</td>
<td>Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Absent  | Binghamton, Boston U, Brown, Cornell, Dartmouth, Drexel, IU, Jackson Lab, JPPH, Kent St, MMC, MIT, MD Anderson, OK State, RIT, Rutgers, UC Davis, UC Merced, UCSD, U Cin, U MD CP, UMDNJ, UMBaltimore, UVA, Vanderbilt, Wayne St, WVA, Yale |
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Agenda
Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2011, Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Feedback on Prior Agenda Items: (0-5 minutes)
Minutes from the last meeting have been posted to KC Confluence, Coeus wiki and attached with the email of this agenda. Actually, the minutes were accidentally omitted from the email with this month’s agenda. Minutes were attached to the 2 wikis. No comments or changes to the minutes were voiced.

2) Coeus 4.5 QA: Susan Mundt (5 minutes) – Coeus 4.5 QA will occur during late July, early August. Ron Schultz will be contacting both original JIRA requestors and functionality users (per 2011 award survey responses) for focused testing of specific cases. Volunteers are always welcome... email rschult7@jhu.edu to volunteer.

3) Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts: (5 minutes)
Early 4.5 test instance will not include JIRA 1412. It is in development based on Subcommittee approved functional spec plus UMB's customization (posted on JIRA 1412). Due to broad interest AND complexity added after approval of the spec, we will request that Jen coordinate a webinar/demo of pre-released functionality when it is available for testing. Demo Invitees: Antoinette Lawson, Carol Wood, Cheryl Conover, Dennis Paffrath, Donna Johnson, Doug Bowser, Edward Castagna, Jennifer Quinn, Ketaiki Mhaisekar, Kyle Burkhardt, Lena Fullem, Loretta Lynch-Reichert, Neil Maxwell, Peggy Pobst, Renee Dolan, Ron Schultz, Susan Mundt, Sven Davisson, Vonnie Perkins, Charlene Komers, Diane Rees, Wendy Barrigar. Jen Flach has agreed to coordinate the demo when functionality is ready to be introduced and tested.

4) KC Spec Reviews: Susan Mundt (35 minutes) – Please read the Jiras for updated history
a) KRAFDBCK-5005 Award search criteria Q - We can add 5 or less search criteria fields to the doc search when doc Type='AwardDocument' is selected. Continuation from 3/9/11 discussion:
   i) Standard Doc Search criteria: (Document) Type, Initiator, Document/Notification Id, Date Created From, Date Created To, Name this search (optional).
   ii) Should additional fields be the same for all Award doc types? AwardDocument, AwardBudgetDocument and TimeAndMoneyDocument Consistency is a good place to start.
   iii) Suggestions for searchable fields to begin discussion: Award ID, Account ID, Award Title, Investigator, Lead Unit (or any Unit?), Sponsor
      (1) Dawn: Do away with Award Title if one must be cut.
      (2) Neil agrees that would be OK for Berkeley because they will have to do some customization anyway. The first round of Berkeley users had trouble with searches.
      (3) Rosemary thinks Sponsor could be eliminated from the list.
      (4) Kaci agrees with Rosemary. BU users (they recently went live) tend to search using title a lot. Unit and Sponsor are among the most used search criteria. Award and Account ID are extensively used by unit users.
      (5) Consensus is to eliminate Sponsor if we must eliminate 1 of the suggested criteria.
   iv) Susan: Lead Unit or any Unit? Consensus is for Lead Unit.

b) KRACOEUS-4349: Uncertified Key Personnel can be added to Award without creating a hold. - Should adding an uncertified investigator mean the award can't be submitted or that the award status is set to hold? Or that a validation error prevents submitting unless the award status is hold?
   i) Rosemary: Coeus has a parameterized warning with COI, and suggested a similar approach to Key Personnel who haven’t completed Prop Dev certification questions.
   ii) The group agreed this would provide a flag for action and flexibility to act according to institutional business policies/practice.

c) KRACOEUS-4333: Project Personnel are not listed alphabetically - Fixing this would create inconsistency between proposal budget and award budget.
   The order in PD project personnel budget is: 1) Personnel appear first in the order that they appear on the Key personnel tab (since they default in from that tab.) 2) Personnel added appear in the order they were added – we do not sort alphabetically.
The requirements specified were not part of the original specification. Preaward didn’t feel the alpha sort was necessary since most will default in from Key Personnel.

I don’t know what was specified in the award budget specs. Inconsistency between the modules is fine as long as there is a business reason for the difference.

i) Rosemary/MIT: leave it alone and keep the order in which Key Personnel were added – in the Units, PIs feel very strongly about this issue. Berkeley agrees. Author ordering is VERY important to Units. In the meantime, we will NOT fix this bug or introduce inconsistency between modules (PD and Award).

ii) Possible future enhancement might be to add sort features in the award doc if someone feels strongly enough about being able to reorder/sort the list.

d) **Award Versioning Refactor** – Technical limitations, Functional Requirements and database structure are creating bugs in current Award Versioning design while handling canceled versions.

   i. New versions of an Award after a canceled version retain the canceled version’s sequence number. This creates Award BO's in the database with same Award Number and Sequence Number
   
   ii. Current Version History Table doesn’t store Document number or unique identifier for Award. Award Number & Sequence Number do not guarantee unique Award with the possibility of canceled versions.

   2 Options:
   
   1. Add New unique identifier column to Version History table - **Pros**: No functional impact. Current implementation of canceled Award docs won’t change. **Cons**: Code changes as well as DB update. Version History table is shared with other modules. Refactoring could impact code base. Is there impact for implementing institutions?
   
   2. Allow canceled versions to maintain their own unique version number – **Pros**: Straightforward development. No impact on other modules or DB schema. **Cons**: Functional impact; could cause user confusion with possibility of gaps in version sequence.

   i) Rosemary and Neil: Leave the canceled doc in the system with its unique version number.
   
   ii) Jennifer would prefer to see canceled docs in the award history.
   
   iii) Jessica: If a user accidentally hits edit, there can be a LOT of cancelled docs (holes in the version history).
   
   iv) Susan: KC development was originally to have the system automatically create and save new award versions for a user with appropriate permissions. We saw the error of our ways right away and added view mode to award doc types with an edit button.
   
   v) As long as versions are in increasing numerical number, subcommittee thought gaps could be easily explained and would not cause a problem. Group thinks users will be able to overlook gaps in sequence due to canceled docs. As long as the doc still exists and the only reason for missing versions in the historical sequence is canceled docs, this should be an easy enough training issue.

c) **KRACOEUS-4384 Approved Eqmt**: Warning, Budget Exceeds Approvals – We talked about a warning if Budget Limits exceed Approvals. This probably won’t be developed until after functional equivalence, but what do we want?

   i) Rosemary: It sounds like a good idea, but also sounds like business rules applied to the document. This could open a whole range of other desired validations based on business rules. We will wait and address the more general issue after the Business Rules engine works. Perhaps the requirements will already be satisfied by the Business Rules functionality.

f) **KC_Shared**: Notifications – [Notifications spec](#) was drafted and not yet reviewed. Send comments and questions for future discussion to mundts@email.arizona.edu. COEUS USERS – Please identify which requirements are either misstated (just wrong), overstated (Coeus doesn’t do as much as the requirement says) or potential deal-breakers (must-haves for your school to even consider using KC Award).

   i) Rosemary: There are a couple discrepancies in this spec. There may be confusion about what Coeus does and Rosemary will contact the spec author directly.

5) **Additional Agenda Items?**

   a) **Questions from COI Subcommittee** – Very few responses were received. Susan will forward responses to COI subcommittee this week. If you have one that has not been submitted, do so quickly.

   Rosemary: In talking with Sabari, the questions seemed to be based on the old Coeus implementation of COI. A new COI process that is a combination of MIT and Dartmouth models is currently being addressed by COI subcommittee, so the questions may change.

   b) **Specifications for our next release** include Subawards and Report Tracking for our subcommittee. Are there volunteers to help write these specifications? Neil’s offer to help with Subaward specs still stands.
## 6) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Representative(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston University (BU)</td>
<td>Kaci Foster,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University (Brown)</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</td>
<td>Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University (Cornell)</td>
<td>Christine Ashdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UofA)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Binghamton, Dartmouth, Drexel, IU, ISU, Jackson Lab, JHU, JPPH, Kent St, MMC, MIT, MD Anderson, OK State, Princeton, RIT, Rutgers, UC Davis, UC Merced, UCSD, UCIN, U MD CP, UM Baltimore, UVA, Vanderbilt, Wayne St, WVA, Yale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Agenda

Date: Wednesday, June 8, 2011, Time: 12-1pm (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) **Feedback on Prior Agenda Items**: (0-5 minutes)
   Minutes from the last meeting have been posted to KC Confluence and the Coeus wiki.

2) **KC 3.1 Bug Prioritization**: Susan Mundt (45 minutes) –
   KC 3.1 QA is wrapping up and we may not have time/resources to fix all known bugs (spreadsheet provided by email). Respond to mundts@email.arizona.edu with explanation if you feel some of these can be deferred to a future release OR if you think a bug fix must not be deferred. We can discuss specific questions/comments during our conference call.

   - **KRACOEUS-4470** Award Data Entry: Copied Award becomes read only after first save (user has to close and reopen to continue editing) - Neil suggested these frequent annoyances will become major due to volume.
   - **KRACOEUS-4747** Award Time & Money: expanded/collapsed view in T&M Award Hierarchy panel should persist while working in Transactions panel - Neil thinks this should be fixed so as not to annoy award maintainers. Dawn agrees.
   - **KRACOEUS-4357** Award Closeout: Need static Closeout Report for Invoice (separate from Financial Report) - OK to defer.
   - **KRACOEUS-4509** Award: F&A Rates: Fiscal Year Start Date and End Date populating incorrectly from Funding Proposal - Neil agrees this could be deferred (won’t impact Berkeley immediately). Carmen and Dawn would like this fixed.
   - **KRACOEUS-4383** Award: Hierarchy Lock Timeout Parameter - Neil wonders how this is affects lengthy operations in large hierarchies. Comments on **KRACOEUS-4811** (Kauli Transactional Document Postprocessing Page loads multiple times before returning user to Award Actions panel) are more important than having another parameter. Susan will close **KRACOEUS-4383**.
   - **KRACOEUS-4358** Awards - Commitments - Preaward Authorizations panel missing help text icon - OK to defer.
   - **KRACOEUS-4377** Awards: T&M doc - Award Hierarchy panel - Go To box doesn't display as a dropdown with the hierarchy nodes - Rosemary agrees this could definitely be deferred.
   - **KRACOEUS-4382** Awards, T&M, Direct/F&A Funds Distribution: Warning message needed when break in budget periods occurs - OK to defer.
   - **KRACOEUS-4342** KC Award, Award Actions, Hierarchy: Node status indicator for HOLD is supposed to be Blue not Yellow - OK to defer Rosemary agrees the larger issue Cheryl Conover has yet to report [UoF Code 7 in the Award Status table also shows up as "undefined" instead of showing a colored icon in the Hierarchy Actions panel. Cheryl added a code to the KC sandbox of Coeus already. It shows up in hierarchy views as a red flag icon and Coeus doesn't provide tool-tip text when user hovers over the icon with the mouse. Further, the tool-tip text must be hard-coded because UA Award Status code 4 = "Hold" and the icon is red with tool-tip text that says "Terminated" (Code 4 out of the box)].
   - **KRACOEUS-4305** Medusa supposed to be accessible from Hierarchy Actions - Rosemary, Neil and Dawn would like to see this fixed.
   - **KRACOEUS-4346** Medusa: Prop Dev Summary: sponsor and prime sponsor should display code AND name - OK to defer.
   - **KRACOEUS-4360** Medusa: should keep selected summary open when changing Medusa view - OK to defer.
   - **KRACOEUS-4612** Submitted proposal dev document route log indicates it is awaiting OSP workgroup action but it isn't appearing in members action list - Should be fixed if it affects Award too.
   - **KRACOEUS-4188** Award Contacts: Project Role description box underneath dropdown appears & disappears (but is always there when needed) - OK to defer.
KRACOEUS-4332 Award Details & Dates / Award Status dropdown values do not match spec document - OK to defer; prefer to fix bigger problems with Award Status (Hierarchy icon behavior) than this. Schools usually set up this table for themselves during implementation. Out-of-the-box values are not a big deal.

SME Tab ‘Must haves’ for Neil/Berkeley

KRACOEUS-4351 All Modules: tab order skipping action buttons and icons
KRACOEUS-4798 Award Actions, Route Log/Workflow: Standard workflow functionality for award should place document in user's Outbox upon submit action
KRACOEUS-4796 Award Budget: budget F&A rates panel not updating when rates are changed on award Commitments panel
KRACOEUS-4367 Award: Commitments: Rates not validated with MIT.IDC.VALIDATION.ENABLED parameter value 3 (single rate validation)
KRACOEUS-4392 Award: Sponsor Template: Allow user to enter Sponsor Template code directly without having to do lookup - Nice to have and should be simple to do
KRACOEUS-4464 Award Hierarchy Actions panel - when the action window to create children/copy an award is opened, the title and project start dates are showing at 0.00 instead of the values that should be showing
KRACOEUS-4506 Awards: When award doc is finalized and new T&M doc is created, it's not pulling any amounts into the T&M doc
KRACOEUS-4319 Berkeley users had a lot of trouble with searches in general, so they would like the searches to be working as well as possible, but this probably isn’t a deal-breaker if it isn’t fixed for this release

3) COI Integration: Susan Mundt (10 minutes) –
One of the final areas to be addressed before KC COI begins development is integration with other modules. KC COI will use project and investigator information from the Award module to populate event-based COI disclosures. Coeus decided to include a checkbox indicator that COI is approved or managed for a project (or maybe for each investigator). The KC COI subcommittee would like to determine what COI information is appropriate to display in an award document. Users with appropriate permissions could also click a link to view/edit COI disclosures. Review the attached mock screen and send responses to COI questions to mundts@email.arizona.edu.

We will allow 2 weeks for responses to COI questions (until June 24, 2011). Coeus functionality is not finalized yet. How MIT uses COI may be the basis for Coeus 4.5 functionality. Sponsors require that COI is managed when the award is made. Coeus is moving toward functionality defined by KC COI subcommittee. In Coeus, an investigator does get notice that an award cannot be in an active state until COI is resolved. There is also annual update of COI disclosures. Questionnaire reminds PI to complete disclosure in Proposal Development.

4) Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts: Ron Schultz (0 minutes)

5) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</th>
<th>Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ (JHU)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Inst of Tech’y (MIT)</td>
<td>Wendy Barrigar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UoA)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Binghamton, Brown, Cornell, Dartmouth, Drexel, IU, ISU, Jackson Lab, JPPH, Kent St, MMC, MD Anderson, OK State, Princeton, RIT, Rutgers, UC Davis, UC Merced, UCSD, U Cin, U MD CP, UM Baltimore, UVA, Vanderbilt, Wayne St, WVA, Yale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will allow 2 weeks for responses to COI questions (until June 24, 2011). Coeus functionality is not finalized yet. How MIT uses COI may be the basis for Coeus 4.5 functionality. Sponsors require that COI is managed when the award is made. Coeus is moving toward functionality defined by KC COI subcommittee. In Coeus, an investigator does get notice that an award cannot be in an active state until COI is resolved. There is also annual update of COI disclosures. Questionnaire reminds PI to complete disclosure in Proposal Development.

4) Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts: Ron Schultz (0 minutes)

5) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colorado State Univ (CSU)</th>
<th>Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins Univ (JHU)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Inst of Tech’y (MIT)</td>
<td>Wendy Barrigar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State Univ (MSU)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Arizona (UoA)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Binghamton, Brown, Cornell, Dartmouth, Drexel, IU, ISU, Jackson Lab, JPPH, Kent St, MMC, MD Anderson, OK State, Princeton, RIT, Rutgers, UC Davis, UC Merced, UCSD, U Cin, U MD CP, UM Baltimore, UVA, Vanderbilt, Wayne St, WVA, Yale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Feedback on Prior Agenda Items:** (0-5 minutes)
   Minutes from the last meeting have been posted to KC Confluence, Coeus wiki and attached with the
   email of this agenda. Ron Schultz also compiled survey results of Coeus Award functionality use that
   was emailed with this agenda.

2) **Coeus Award Use Survey:** Ron will send the survey as an Adobe document so it is searchable
   because it may be more useful that way.

3) **Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts:** Ron Schultz (0 minutes)
   Demo TBA, Invitees: Antoinette Lawson, Carol Wood, Cheryl Conover, Dennis Paffrath, Donna Johnson,
   Doug Bowser, Edward Castagna, Jennifer Quinn, Ketaki Mhaisekar, Kyle Burkhardt, Lena Fullem, Loretta
   Lynch-Reichert, Neil Maxwell, Peggy Pobst, Renee Dolan, Ron Schultz, Susan Mundt, Sven Davisson, Vonnie
   Perkins, Charlene Komers, Diane Rees.
   Ron: There is no real update on this demo, but it will remain on the agenda going forward so it is not forgotten.

4) **KC Spec Reviews:** Susan Mundt (25 minutes) – Please read the Jiras for updated history
   a) **KC_Shared: Notifications** – Notations spec was drafted and not yet reviewed. Document was
      also attached to the email for this agenda. Send comments and questions for future discussion to
      mundts@email.arizona.edu. COEUS USERS – Please identify which requirements are either
      misstated (just wrong), overstated (Coeus doesn’t do as much as the requirement says) or
      potential deal-breakers (must-haves for your school to even consider using KC Award).
      Susan confirmed that subcommittee members received or can access the document. Sabari has
      commented on the spec, but those updates have not been added to this version of the spec.
      Rosemary will look it over from the Coeus perspective and submit comments as needed. Others
      are encouraged to do the same. Using the hyperlink in this agenda above, use your Jira
      login/password to view and download the document if you prefer that to the attachment that came
      with this agenda.
   b) **KRAFDBCK-5005 Award search criteria Q** - We can add 5 or less search criteria fields to the
doc search when doc Type="AwardDocument" is selected.
   Note- This is not an issue of Coeus Functional Equivalence because Coeus does not allow the
   user to search for an individual Award Version. This is already beyond the standard module
   search for an Award.
   Continuation from 3/9/11 discussion:
   i) Should additional fields be the same for all Award doc types (AwardDocument, AwardBudgetDocument, TimeAndMoneyDocument)?
   ii) Standard Doc Search criteria are: (Document) Type, Initiator, Document/Notification Id, Date Created
      From, Date Created To, Name this search (optional).
   iii) Suggestions for some of ‘the best’ searchable fields to begin discussion: Award ID, Account ID,
       Award Title, Investigator, Lead Unit, Sponsor Name?
   iv) People would prefer to address this issue by email so they have time to consider fields to suggest.
      Susan will follow the meeting with an email containing relevant information. We can choose from any
      field included in the applicable document type, but we need to limit ourselves to about 5 fields as
      additional search criteria for each document type. This is useful for finding awards where version 1
      has not yet been finalized (the regular award search from the Unit or Central Admin tabs only returns
      results for awards that have at least one finalized award version). We must reach consensus soon as
      this has been an outstanding question from development for a couple months.
   c) **KRAFDBCK-6117 Award Budget: Workflow Questions** –
      Issue 10 from KC_AWD-Create an Award Budget spec (KC2.0): Jira includes past comments to questions.
      i) Does Coeus Award Budget workflow allow an Award Budget Approver to make corrections to the
         budget before approving or is it strictly read-only and rejected for small changes?
      ii) If changes are allowed, does the submitter receive notice that a change has been made?
      iii) Does (or should) notification occur only for "material" changes? or all changes?
iv) Make changes to an Award Budget before approving - System shall allow a user with (red) Approve Award Budget role to make changes to the Budget without having to begin workflow all over again.

v) Award Budget, Budget Versions tab was showed via breeze. The goal is to confirm that standard Kuali Workflow is sufficient for an Award Budget document.

vi) The Approve Award Budget role is actually now a (yellow) dept-level role in Coeus instead of (red) Central role. Thank you, Ron, for pointing that out!

vii) Renee – Does this work the same in MIT vs Princeton Budget?

viii) Rosemary – Princeton detailed bgt is the only one that has workflow. So just don’t create extended nodes in the workflow of the AB doc. Just associate detailed workflow with Award versions to accomplish functional equivalence with Coeus MIT budget.

5) KCC Subcommittee Operating Procedures – Susan Mundt (5 minutes)

Draft was attached to the email with this agenda. No discussion points have been received to date. Does that mean everyone approves of the document as is? Please provide comments by email to mundts@email.arizona.edu by 4/20/11.

The current draft has already undergone some review. It was initiated by the Preaward Subcommittee, then reviewed by all module leads. It is now awaiting subcommittee reviews. Submit any comments/questions by 4/20/11. If the comment period will end sooner than that, Susan will notify everyone by email.

6) KC Demonstration: Award Budget Introduction – Renee Dolan (time permitting 30 minutes)

a) Award Budget – Ready for Prime Time? Discuss the pros and cons of current functionality and how it may fit your institution’s needs.

b) We (Renee and Susan) thought it would be useful to demonstrate award budget and see if there was anything hampering implementers. We are trying to work through Award Budget and find any bugs to get it working well for KC 3.1. We could use any help we can get!

c) Diane: Stacy Folot noticed something with Rate Type changes not being saved; not sure under what circumstances. Diane will look into that and bug as needed.

d) Budget Overview panel Obligated Total should really be Obligated Distributable Total for that node of the Award Hierarchy.

e) Rosemary: PD budget has a parameter setting that controls the default Job Code. That should also apply to KC AB. This came to be in Coeus around the time that Non-employees were allowed to be added in a budget. Non-employees don’t have HR job codes, so the parameter gives a default code to fill the blank for Non-employees. Susan will check to see if the PD Budget parameter affects Award Budget, or if a separate parameter was added for AB. Contour requirement should be updated to be sure this is tested properly.

f) Renee demonstrated how AB line items could be added and the Budget Overview panel would update after each save to include new line items.

g) Susan described planned development of editable manual overrides for calculation of Employee Benefits and/or F&A Costs on the Summary panel.

h) Rosemary: Tip for using Award Budget, create a cost element that doesn’t incur overhead for adjustment of rounding errors.

i) Dawn got around the rounding errors by adding a misc expense and turning off the application of F&A rate to that amount.

j) Susan is working on requirements around the Budget Limits panel, and described functional requirements:

1. Budget Limits panel should be editable by the Award creator/modifier.
   1a. When the Award document is read only, the Budget Limits panel is not editable.
   1b. Since the Award creator/modifier will likely enter budget limits when the award is created or modified, the panel must be present BEFORE a Budget Version is created.

2. Budget Limits panel is designed like the Award Budget Summary tab with the addition of the editable Budget Limits column.

3. Budget Limits panel should have UI action buttons to ‘expand all’ and ‘collapse all’ like the AB Summary panel.

4. After an AB version exists, then maybe additional line item detail will display under each appropriate cost pool header with show/hide UI actions

5. Minimum Editable Budget Limits fields for initial development include Total Direct Costs and Total F&A Costs (with possible parameterized breakdown of F&A Costs into On-Campus and Off-Campus components - See KRACOEUS-US-4418).

5a. There will need to be validation messages about math that doesn't work in the editable fields.

6. Editable Budget Limits fields: It was originally envisioned that Budget Limits functionality could eventually grow to the point that specific cost pools could be 'locked down' by the OSP Admin who modifies the award from the Budget Limits panel.
Definitely not in scope for KC3.1: Future consideration for the idea of locking down Budget Limits by line item/cost element. This was discussed as a path for the future, but would require a way to select and add Cost Elements before a budget exists.

k) Rosemary: Business Rules are still being developed. Note that in Proposal Development, I can create Bus Rules and apply them to the PD Budget. That would be one way to affect specific Cost Elements for every budget. They can be applied for a selected Unit etc. Keep that in mind as KC BIRT (the business rules engine) is developed. Example: For certain NIH awards, approval required for >25% change to any cost category. Warnings/errors could be generated if those business rules were violated by a budget (or an award budget) upon submission.

7) Future Business: Suggest future agenda topics to one of your Subcommittee Co-Leads
8) Questions and Roll Call (11 participants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA (University of Arizona)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Emily Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane Rees, Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Bess Jensen (Weill Med College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon (MIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU (Johns Hopkins Univ)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Wendy Barrigar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU (Michigan State Univ)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Shelley Sprandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Boston U, Iowa State U, Indiana U, Jackson Laboratory, Princeton U, U Med &amp; Dentistry New Jersey, U Cincinnati, U Rochester, UC Davis, U MD (College Park or Baltimore), Vanderbilt U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1) Welcome & Overview:
   a) **Structure and history** of the Coeus Post-Award Subcommittee and the Kuali Coeus Awards SME group.
      i) **Award** isn’t as much of a moving target with external forces in developing new functionality as much as Preaward.
      ii) **Coeus survey** – Ron conducted a survey of who is using what Coeus modules.
      iii) **Bug Tracking** – a difference between Coeus and KC, bugs overwhelm development staff.
   b) **Participation** - How to participate and why it’s a good idea!
      i) For KC development, we need Coeus experienced users to make sure our developing application is as good as Coeus and we haven’t missed anything important.

2) Open Forum Discussion: Creative Solutions using Coeus/ KC
   Be prepared with your own questions and stories!
   a) **Award Hierarchy** – “To Use or Not to Use”, that is the question. Other questions include when and how.
      i) **U Cincinnati** constructs history with Award Hierarchy. Each action becomes a child level. Only report out of root for summary information. A mod that changes the sponsor admin ofcr, gets a child award (not correspondence emails, but numbered award actions). They budget at every level (just assign TDC & F&A amounts). Do you track Ant/Obl both at root level? No integration with financial system. Occasional grandchild accounts if Grad student gets a pot of money to run a project etc. Third tier is just informational for OSP.
      ii) **Berkeley Model** genesis was because Budget Periods were their ‘units of organization’
      iii) **Boston University** – root will be general info and lowest tier would have 1:1 correspondence to financial accounts. Interim tiers have
   b) **Data Entry** –
      i) **U Cincinnati** – Can you give permission to upload attachments without letting those users modify the rest of the award? No
      ii) **U MD College Park** - True post-award accounting shop. Were ecstatic to have attachments in award.
      iii) **Berkeley** – Records Mgmt team 2-4 people over time (experienced veterans) entering and maintaining award data and doing custom reports.
      iv) **Johns Hopkins U** – View award is a universal role, so everyone can see award and all attachments. View Dept Award is constrained by dept.
      v) **Michigan State U** – Pre and Post OSP recently split into 2 offices. Now we have 3-4 Account set-up people.
      vi) **UC Davis** – About 30 analysts can do award set-up.
      vii) **Weill Cornell** – Pressure to hire temps for data entry and training will be an issue.
   c) **U Cincinnati** – uses **Subcontract module**. At what level do others link Subawards (considering FFATA reporting etc)?
   d) **Award Budget** – Ready for Prime Time? Discuss the pros and cons of current functionality and how it may fit your institution’s needs.
   e) **Permissions and Workflow** – Does your institution do something interesting with system Roles or Approval maps that might be interesting for others to hear? Do you have a unique problem you need help thinking through?
f) **Parameters and Table set-up during Implementation** – Tell your ‘war stories’ and save someone some heartache…

g) **Custom Data solutions** – Does your institution have a great Custom Data field to solve a problem our application doesn’t handle ‘out-of-the-box?’

h) **Periodic Reporting** - How does your institution use Coeus/KC data for periodic reports of award? What obstacles need to be overcome? What are the different ways schools report; Anticipated or Obligated?

i) **Templates** – Heavy maintenance burden swayed Berkeley from using templates. They have gone to one template to refer users to the award document. They track tech reports and patent report due dates, but nothing else. For the same reason, they do not use Rolodex. Maintaining templates is definitely a central office function.
   i) MIT has a huge list of templates. They don’t inactivate them, they add “!” to the beginning to float the current active templates to the top of the dropdown list.

3) **Demo of RIT Coeus Award Workflow** – Anthony Capobianco –
   a) Essentially it routes Coeus info from OSP to Accountants to set up account & back to OSP when done.
   b) Replaced a couple fields on Award Detail tab with links (via Coeus Personalization engine) to ‘Validate’ and ‘Validate and Submit’ action options that kick off this
   c) OSP creates new award sequence and sends award data to Acctg, who sets up account and modifies award with some additional data (correct mode), then returns to OSP

4) **Work In Progress: Enhancements coming in Coeus 4.5/Kuali Coeus 3.1**
   a) What changes are coming in the next release and how were they designed to be used?
   b) Think ahead about how your institution may use the newest bells and whistles.

5) **Looking Ahead with Great Ideas:**
   a) **What do users want for the future of KC?** - This is your chance to brainstorm and gain support for all your brilliant ideas for future KC enhancements!

6) **Future Development Procedures: How will future development be completed?**
   a) How can we get our specifications written and thoroughly reviewed with greatest efficiency?
   b) Is there a good way to share the work?
   c) Quality Assurance – invest the time to test!

7) **KCC Subcommittee Operating Procedures** – The current draft of the referenced document will be provided to subcommittee members before the 3/30/11 F2F meeting. Please provide comments by email to mundts@email.arizona.edu before 3/30/11 or attend the meeting to present your comments in person during this discussion.

8) **Calling all Hands!** – There is plenty of specification work and testing to be done if anyone can lend a hand the rest of the day. Bring a laptop with a good battery, stick around and participate. You just might learn something!

**Agenda items not covered in this meeting may be added to future conference call agendas.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA (University of Arizona)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Kaci Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Jon Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Bess Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU (Johns Hopkins Univ)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU (Michigan State Univ)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan, Bob Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Cincinnati</td>
<td>Chris Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Rochester</td>
<td>Anthony Capobianco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith Young, Kathy Nolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U MD College Park</td>
<td>Laura Scalers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, March 9, 2011, Time: 12am-1pm (PT) / 1-2pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (ET)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Coeus User Conference Planning: Ron Schultz (5 minutes)
   a) Award SC Agenda for Weds, 3/30/11 has been submitted to the Conference Planning Committee.
      Ron emailed the agenda earlier today (3/9/11). It is open to amendment on that day and is not anticipated to go
      longer than half a day.
      Neil: Would like to request call-in access for those who cannot attend. Renee may be able to use her Skype to
      dial people in if nothing else (with limited volume etc). Ron will relay the request to Conference Planners.

2) Feedback on Prior Agenda Items: Ron Schultz (5 minutes)
   a) Update on Award SC meeting time – We were asked last month to adjust our regular meeting
      time to accommodate a change to the Functional Council meeting. What happened with that?
      Initial attempts have failed to move our meeting. We will wait for instructions from Dennis Paffrath (FC Chair)
      to proceed with an open survey to move our meeting time. Functional Council will have to take the next move.

3) Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts: Ron Schultz (1min)
   Demo TBA, Invitees: Antoinette Lawson, Carol Wood, Cheryl Conover, Dennis Paffrath, Donna
   Johnson, Doug Bowser, Edward Castagna, Jennifer Quinn, Ketaki Mhaisekar, Kyle Burkhardt, Lena
   Fullem, Loretta Lynch-Reichert, Neil Maxwell, Peggy Pobst, Renee Dolan, Ron Schultz, Susan
   Mundt, Sven Davisson, Vonnie Perkins, Charlene Komers, Diane Rees.
   Ron: No update. There was much interest in U Maryland use of Coeus to gather data for a ‘Subcontract
   Boilerplates’ process outside of Coeus. Jen Flach says the Coeus development team is busy and has not gotten
   around to this demo. It is still on the development agenda. We’ll let everyone know when there is movement
   on this item.

4) KC Spec Reviews: Susan Mundt (20 minutes)
   Please read the Jiras for updated history before the meeting.
   a) KRAFDBCK-5005 Award search criteria Q - We can choose 5 or less search criteria fields to
      add to a doc search when the user selects a Document Type for an Award.
      1. Example: Standard Doc Search criteria are: (Document) Type, Initiator, Document/Notification Id, Date
         Created From, Date Created To, Name this search (optional). When Document Type is
         ‘ProposalDevelopment,’ the following 7 search criteria are added: Aggregator, Budget Creator, Narrative
         Writer, Viewer, Document Status, Status Transition Date From, Status Transition Date To.
      2. Should these additional fields be the same for all Award doc types (AwardDocument,
         AwardBudgetDocument, TimeAndMoneyDocument)?
      3. Suggestions for some of ‘the best’ searchable fields to begin discussion: Award ID, Account ID, Award
         Title, Investigator, Lead Unit, Sponsor Name?
         Neil: Prop Dev has 7 additional criteria. Is there a reason we’re limited to 5?
         Neil: For Functional Equivalence, PI, Sponsor (code AND name) and Unit (code AND name of any unit in
         Coeus) are no-brainers. Also useful are Award Status, Award Title, OSP Admin.
         Jennifer: Sponsor Award ID (FE with Coeus Award search). Brown uses this quite often.
         Award ID
         Account ID
         Award Title (wildcard string search)
         Investigator (PI, CoI or KP, wildcard string search)
         Unit (Lead or any Unit in the award, drill down to Unit search including code or name as criteria)
         Sponsor (drill down to Unit search including code or name as criteria)
         Award Status
         Sponsor Award ID (wildcard string search)
         OSP Admin
         Neil: UC Berkeley added hierarchy tier to their custom search criteria, but that doesn’t work well with
         more than about 3 tiers in a hierarchy.
         Ken: UC Berkeley uses Dfafs # as account because they didn’t initially understand what Account field was.
         Dawn: CSU uses Account ID extensively.
Participants could not eliminate any of the proposed criteria or prioritize any that were less important that could be eliminated from the list. Email discussion may have to follow after this is presented to the Development Manager for Award.

b) **KRAFDBCK-5470 KC_Shared-Cost Sharing Period Flexibility** (Susan) – DM Question: Currently we auto-populate Cost Share and Unrecovered F&A periods we calculate default values. Will it still make sense to calculate the defaults once we remove the Fiscal Year and leave those fields blank?

   1. We reviewed spec changes made in response to Preaward spec review comments. There were no additional suggestions. The spec will go back to Preaward subcommittee for final review. The revised spec will be posted to the Jira if anyone would like to review in greater detail.

c) **KRAFDBCK-6173 Award: Details & Dates: KC missing Begin Date as compared to Coeus?** (Susan) – See table below.

   1. Susan: KC2.0 included one missing field (called Begin Date in Coeus) and one field that was mapped incorrectly in the database (KC Project Start Date was mapped to award.begindate but should have been mapped to award.effectiveDate).

   2. Now that we have the database mapping figured out, should we change the UI label in KC for “Begin Date” (our missing field) since it has always been a point of confusion in Coeus? Yes, participants like “Modification Date”.

   3. Where should the missing ‘Modification Date’ field be added? Everyone agreed the field should be added in the blank space on the Details & Dates panel in the right column below Obligation End Date and above Obligated Amount. This will keep all the dates together and be a simple solution for the developers.

5) **Future Business:**

   a) **Daylight Savings time begins 3/13/11** – Make sure to adjust your calendar for the next meeting time for all those not on East Coast Daylight Savings Time!!

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA (University of Arizona)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Jennifer Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU (Johns Hopkins Univ)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU (Michigan State Univ)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell, Nancy Han, Shelley Sprandel, Ken Geis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Iowa State U, Indiana U, Jackson Laboratory, MIT, Princeton U, U MD College Park, Vanderbilt U, U Med &amp; Dentistry New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus UI Label</td>
<td>Coeus DB fieldname</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>osp$award.award_effective_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Date</td>
<td>osp$award.begin_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution Date</td>
<td>osp$award.award_execution_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation Effective Date</td>
<td>Osp$award_amount_info.current_fund_effective_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation Expiration Date</td>
<td>Osp$award_amount_info.obligation_expiration_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Expiration Date</td>
<td>Osp$award_amount_info.final_expiration_date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Award Effective Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Award Subcommittee Agenda
Date: Wednesday, February 9, 2011, Time: 12am-1pm (PT) / 1-2pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Coeus, Approve Minutes from last meeting: Ron Schultz (5 minutes)
   Last meeting was 9/8/2011: this will no longer be standing agenda item. Minutes will be posted or emailed to
   the member list(s), and any comments should be communicated to the Subcommittee leads.

2) Coeus User Conference Planning: Update Ron Schultz (10 minutes)
   Renee sent email with 4 general Agenda items determined by joint subcommittee leads. We’ll have time for
   additional items. Additional items suggested:
   Bug tracking: Consortium now leaves it to the reporter to keep a bug on track. No formal SC mechanism
   exists.
   Any additional suggestions? No response from attendees. No one mentioned intent to attend User Conf mtg.

3) Feedback on Prior Agenda Items: (FYI-not discussion, 0 minutes)
   a) Update on Subcommittee merge: Susan Mundt will update ke.award@kuali.org
   list with Consortium members as soon as Ron Schultz sends an updated Coeus Consortium member list. Update will follow at
   next meeting.
   b) Ron is finishing his survey of Coeus Award module use.

4) KC Spec Reviews: Susan Mundt (45 minutes) – Please read the Jiras for updated history
   a) KRACOEUS-4307 Desired search/results criteria for Award Budget Versions?
   Long list resulted in “Period” pulldown of Award Budget Versions search criteria. We will default to
   Coeus Functional Equivalence use of ordinal number of Period (remove dates). No objections
   b) KRAFDBCK-5005 Award search criteria Q – DM Question: Would we change any other behavior?
   Ie: we currently only bring back active award versions – would this change bring back other versions as
   well if there was a hit on the Doc status? Or multiple versions of the same Award b/c of multiple hits for
   Final doc status? Maybe we shouldn’t be searching on doc status, but version status (active, pending,
   cancelled, archived)? Would that accomplish the same thing?
   Renee: Terry’s suggestion makes sense at first
   Susan: I don’t think that solves the described problem – Need to find in process or canceled docs related to
   an Award. Doc search only searches by doc#, Award search criteria have more specific Award search
   criteria.
   Diane R/CSU: Need more time to research an answer.
   No one else needs time to respond except Renee.
   Post comments to the Jira in the next week. Decision will move forward next Weds if no response.
   c) KRACOEUS-4364 Awd Hierarchy, complex navigation & multiple docs open
   Susan Mundt: Like Coeus, the user should be able to close documents and retrace the path they took to get
   where they were as well as jump around that path (multiple windows open).
   DM: I think this is going to be a challenge to implement the same way that Coeus does. I was thinking that
   perhaps we could have a page that we display after the user closes a document using the close button that
   shows other documents they were recently working on. This would allow a user to quickly get back to
   anything in their recent history but wouldn't require a bunch of new infrastructure to build out. Also this
   will play well with web browsers. What do you think?
   Renee & Susan explained the direction we are headed with this solution and no objections were expressed.
   d) KRACOEUS-4303 T&M doc: add Transaction panel back into single-node hierarchy UI?
   Diane would like to see it added back. It would be easier for reporting. Susan pointed out the UI shouldn’t
   affect back-end reporting.
   Nancy: UC Berkeley likes to be able to enter change amount. Susan agrees that is Coeus equivalence.
   Diane: Notice Date will be tied to the change amount for reporting? Susan: Yes, just as it is now.
   KRACOEUS-4303 Jira is not yet assigned to a 3.1 Sprint.
   Jeff Covey had the idea to parameterize the display of the panel, because some schools feel strongly
   Working a similar T&M bug KRACOEUS-887- There are problems with data coming from different
   document types. There may be similar problems raised by data entry in multiple places in the UI.
   There was a side-discussion about History panel and what is and isn’t included in the History panel from
   Award vs. Time & Money doc types.
c) **KRACOEUS-4322** Should Award Notice section headings print even if no data is present? Renee thinks it would be useful to be able to tell if there was no data present in a section by printing the heading. Diane agrees and no one else expressed any objection.

f) **KRAFDBCK-5470** KC_Shared-Cost Sharing Period Flexibility – DM Question: Currently we auto-populate Cost Share and Unrecovered F&A periods we calculate default values. Will it still make sense to calculate the defaults once we remove the Fiscal Year and leave those fields blank? Carmen & Diane/CSU needs more time to consider the issue. They would like input from their database person, Tyler Wilson. They will post comments as needed to the Jira before next Wednesday.

g) **KRAFDBCK-5465** KC_AWD-Award Credit Split Qs from Development – FYI: Data choices when adding a Funding Proposal with no Credit Split or split identical to existing award are disabled. Instructions regarding shared Custom Data elements and Comments are also added. Just letting members know changes have been made. If the changes present problems for anyone, they need to comment on the Jira soon since this has been developed and is being tested.

5) **Future Business:**
   a) A request has been made to move the Functional Council meeting to 1 hour later to accommodate Hawaii attendees. The Award Subcommittee meeting directly follows the FC meeting and would present a conflict for some attendees of both. Ron will request conference call availability information from Rosemary and email members for preferences soon. We’ll try to move our meeting to 1 hour later. If that doesn’t work, we’ll explore a different Wednesday of the month at the current meeting time.
   b) FYI: Jira Elevation Process document will be finalized following suggestions from the Functional Council. Renee will distribute that document to all subcommittee members when it is complete.

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact Person(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA (University of Arizona)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane Rees, Carmen Morales, Ed Kissam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Laboratory</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU (Johns Hopkins Univ)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT (Mass Inst of Tech)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU (Michigan State Univ)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Nancy Han, Shelley Sprandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Maryland College Park</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt Univ Med Ctr</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Med and Dentistry NJ</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes

Date: Wednesday, September 08, 2010, Time: 11-12am (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) **Coeus, Approve Minutes for August 11, 2010:** Ron Schultz (5 minutes, Email attachment)
   a) No objections or comments. Minutes adopted.

2) **Coeus Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts:** Ron Schultz (5mins)

3) **KCC Subcommittee Governance Documents:** Susan Mundt (15 minutes, discussion)
   a) Operating Procedures (& Strategic Plan?)
   b) Meeting took this place this morning with subcommittee members. They will meet again Sept 29.
   c) Susan will email draft documents from Pre-award Subcommittee to Awards list for comment.
   d) Susan will collect comments from our group; send them to mundts@email.arizona.edu.
   e) Renee provided some background on this document. She said their conversation today centered on what the document would be used for. It is designed for sustainment mode, not development mode.
   f) Renee provided an overview of the different Articles in the document.
      i) Article I, Section 2 lists the different Subcommittees and what areas they are responsible for.
      ii) Article II discusses Subcommittee Chairs (or Co-chairs).
      iii) Article III - Meeting guidelines.
      iv) Article IV – Enhancement section has been cut down. Instructions to be given by Functional Council.
      v) Article VI- QA Testing responsibilities
      vi) Article VII – Subcommittee Resources
      vii) Article VIII – Data & Reporting placeholder
      viii) Article IX – Governing Document Revisions
   g) In summary, Renee asked if we are okay with using the generic document for the Awards Subcommittee, or if we would like something more specific.
      i) Susan would like this to stay general. She thinks that the Functional Council should give the desired outcome, and we should decide how to achieve that outcome.
      ii) Renee, Neil, Ron, and Tammy all agree with Susan. These should be kept general.
   h) Neil will compare this document to the document for the Functional Council Operating Procedures for overlap. He will forward to Susan by Sept 16th what he has, and she will take it over from there if needed.
   i) There is also a Strategic Plan for the consortium’s preaward group that will be sent around with the most current Awards draft (Op Procedures will include comments from MSU, Ron and Susan).
   j) Ron will talk to Jen Flach about this document. He is not sure she gave it much of a review. It looks like this document may be giving the KCC QA Manager more
responsibility than they will reasonably be able to take on (for example managing all test resources).

k) Email any additional feedback to Susan Mundt by Sept 27/28. She will include date in the email.

4) **KC COI Integration**: (FYI- not discussion, 10 minutes)

   a) Susan and Renee discussed Integration with COI group. They are still waiting for additional notes the COI group (Amber) was supposed to send them after their meeting.

5) **KC Spec Reviews**: Susan Mundt (25 minutes)

   a) **KRAFDBCK-5462 KC_AWD-Sync Descendants** *(Susan Mundt)* – Spec issues/comments emailed to Susan by end of business Sept 7.

   b) Susan received comments from MSU and CSU.

   c) In Coeus there are sync actions for each applicable data item, where user can make changes and sync on the spot.

   d) In KC, it is more like a record action. User then gets a summary of what changed and what didn’t and may need to make additional manual updates.

   e) Neil asked if Title can be syncned. Rosemary answered that it was not part of the base product as used by MIT. It is also not included in the planned (functionally equivalent) KC functionality.

   f) CSU Question: Are the following the only values that will be available for synching (Spec item #10 under Design Notes); Sponsor, Award Status, Key Personnel, Unit, Report, Recipient, Terms, Comments)? Yes, it will be functionally equivalent with Coeus.

   g) Discussion of Use Case:

      i) Use case includes note to developers with suggestions of how user could initiate Sync Descendants validation: either by submitting parent doc or action button on Sync Descendants panel.

      ii) Question posed to Development Manager (DM): asked if user could receive system notification when asynchronous validation process was complete (as opposed to having to remember to check back later)

      iii) The ability to change the order of recorded sync actions may not be technically feasible (or functionally desirable), so that may not make it to the final product.

      iv) It may not be technically possible/feasible to allow user to cancel the sync action in the middle of validation or sync in process.

      v) Sync ‘record mode’ must be consciously ‘turned on and off” by the user per DM.

      vi) If the user fixes errors prior to completing sync, then only workflow of parent applies (because someone with this high permission level will probably have permission to blanket approve anyway). User should not be required to fix awards in order because of validation dependencies.

      vii) What if there is an uncommitted Time & Money doc in the hierarchy? I don’t think it matters because nothing that can be changed with Sync Descendants is affected by Time & Money changes. Award Budget would also not be affected by Sync Descendants. For future, though, Reporting Requirements could be affected by Sync Descendants. MSU agrees. Rosemary Hanlon adds: Changing PI or Lead Unit could impact workflow rules. Perhaps F&M workflow rules in effect at the time the document is submitted should be honored rather than prohibiting use of the Sync Descendants function for uncommitted T&M docs.

   h) Discussion of Functional Requirements, Questions/Issues. Susan made notes in spec document as items were discussed.
i) **FR 3a: Basic Rules for Synchronization, Modified Data Item** – If an item is modified in the source and then synchronized in the targets, the final state of the selected descendant targets must include an identical data item.

*Functional Issues:*
- If the modified data item does not exist in the child, the assumption is that it will be added. Is that the desired behavior in all cases? Confirmed by Subcommittee review.
- K Hensley: How should we distinguish in the specification between data that is in a related list where each list item has a unique identifier and data that is filed in the Award record? Subcommittee didn’t understand this question, so couldn’t address it.

ii) **FR 3b: Basic Rules for Synchronization, New (Added) Data Item** – If a new data item is added and then synchronized with the target awards, the target awards should receive an identical item.

*Functional Issue:* If a data item already exists in the child with the same “key” value, our assumption is that it will be overwritten. Is that true in all cases? Rosemary thinks if, for instance, a term already exists in the child, no change needed. If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.

iii) **FR 3c: Basic Rules for Synchronization, Delete Data Items** – When a data item is deleted from the source award, the data item must also be removed from the target award(s).

*Issue:* Deleting certain data items, for example, could cause validations in the target to fail? How should this be handled? One option is to execute the sync and then report the issues that occurred. This may be problematic if there are many errors. Another option is to run a validation routine that would report back errors that might occur – a sort of synchronization preview. Subcommittee: The answer depends on the data item, and is dealt with below in each context, but in general, the second approach (advance validation) is more appealing.

iv) **FR 10a: Synchronize newly added Award Investigator Unit:** The system shall synchronize a unit added to an existing investigator (PI, Co-I or Key Person) then add the same unit to the same investigator (without duplication) if they exist in selected descendants.

*What if the investigator doesn’t exist* in the descendant for an add Unit change in parent? Add investigator AND unit or abort that transaction for that descendant and include on exception list? Terry prefers to abort. Subcommittee agrees to Option 2 (abort and include as exception).

v) **FR 10b: Delete and Sync an Award Investigator Unit:** The system shall allow the user to delete an investigator (PI, Co-I or Key Person) unit then delete the same unit if it exists in selected descendants.

*What effect will unit changes have on the Credit Split? Suggestions:*
1) In the parent, can the system display/expand a descendant credit split panel so user can make corrections to satisfy validation requirements as needed? Subcommittee response: too much development effort.

2) The system would ignore Credit Split validation errors until next time the descendant is modified directly. Could that transaction appear on an exception list so the user must change those descendants manually? This could mean calculations in reports or as part of some outside process the results would be incorrect.

One idea for the design might be to have a validation panel that simply produces a list of the issues that the synchronization might create when it is run. The user could then modify the synchronize action list and/or run it and check and correct each of the Awards in the list for the issue after the sync completes.
Do we need some way for the user to reorder the list of actions so that they can take care of order of operations issues? For instance, deleting a PI before adding the new one.

Terry is still thinking about this one.

FYI: MIT does not use Credit Split. If Sync Descendants change affects credit split, then manual change is required in Coeus. **Option 2 is more functionally equivalent with Coeus development.**

vi) **FR 11b: Synchronize Sponsor Contacts: Synchronize Modified Sponsor Contact:** When the user modifies an existing Sponsor Contact, that may or many not be present in all the selected descendants, the system shall ensure that the sponsor contact information for the modified contact is added and? Identical in all the descendants selected for synchronization.

Susan will Check Coeus. It may be that descendants are only modified for those where contact is already present.

vii) **FR 11c: Synchronize Sponsor Contacts: Synchronize Contact Deletion:** When a user deletes a Sponsor Contact, the system shall provide the option to delete the same Sponsor Contact if it exists in any of the selected descendants.

**Issues:**

- If a sponsor contact on a target is the only sponsor contact, this could result in an Award that should have a sponsor contact with no contact. Do we need a validation for this? Susan will test in Coeus – Validation exception OR sync won’t delete last contact in a descendant?
- If a Sponsor Contact is deleted, does the system automatically check for and delete that sponsor contact if they are also listed as a report recipient? Susan will check in Coeus - Yes. May not because Report may point to Rolodex ID (one-time population of link, not a perm link to Sp Contacts list for Award)
- If so, and the deleted sponsor contact was the only recipient for a report, this could leave a report with no recipients. Must we provide a warning/validation for this? Subcommittee: No, recipients are not required for Award Reports.

viii) **FR 13b: Synchronize Deleted Award Term:** The system shall allow the user to delete a Term from the source Award and synchronize to delete the same Term if it exists in selected descendants.

(1) MSU: Shouldn’t there be a validation requirement here to check for no terms, similar to the reports listed above? Susan will validate in Coeus.

ix) **FR 14: Sync Descendants for Award Comments:** The system shall allow the user to modify Award Comments and provide the option to append the modified parent comments to the corresponding Comments in selected descendants with the sync descendants function.

According to Steve, this feature is being removed from Coeus because it was causing problems with unwanted information in Comments.

Rosemary says Coeus DOES sync Comments. It doesn’t overwrite or delete previous comments, it just adds new comment to descendant without history/sequencing.

Susan will Validate in Coeus.

x) **FR 18:** FYI discussion of versioning descendants. All selected descendants will be versioned, even if some of them did not receive changes. This is technically easier for development.

xi) **FR: Prevent deletion of Lead Unit from Descendant(s):** The system shall not delete an Award Investigator Unit from a selected descendant if that unit is the Lead Unit of the descendant award. Exception shall be noted in the parent award document where the sync descendants action was initiated.

Susan will validate in Coeus.
FR: Disregard validation error if the last term in any term class is deleted by Sync Descendants: The system shall commit changes to the descendant node even if the last Award Term for a given Term Class is removed by the sync descendant’s action. The user will have to make corrections to satisfy the validation errors (select “no clause” Term for the appropriate Term Class) next time that award is modified by a user.

Issue: Still Needs work. Need to review all validations and implications for design/technical.

Terry asks: Is this still a functional requirement (rather than technical limitation)? In general, should system still require one term per class in order to submit or was this a Coeus coding limitation that KC misinterpreted as a functional requirement?

Rosemary says: If a school is using Terms functionality, then there is a functional reason for wanting this requirement; don’t want to be silent. No clause is different than blank terms class. There may have been a technical reason, but there also is a management requirement.

Susan will Validate in Coeus.

CSU Question: Will the synchronization allow for a user to make a change to a 2nd tier child record and synch with other 2nd tier records under the same parent award? CSU is considering a hierarchy structure that would have a parent award with very minimal project information (e.g., total anticipated amount and title) and account detail information stored at the 2nd tier. No, current functionality (equivalent with Coeus) is designed to push data/changes from a parent (at whatever tier of the hierarchy) down to lower level descendants in the hierarchy, not to peers at the same level of the hierarchy.

6) Resolution of Issues from KC 2.0: Susan Mundt (time permitting)

a) Award Budget Duplicate Cost Elements

Non-personnel panel, duplicate line items with same object code & total base cost should be allowed?

Lisa Oliva (KCPD SME Co-Lead) 2/23/10: Duplicate line items for PD Non-Personnel items should absolutely be allowed - duplicates only trigger errors under very specific circumstances for Personnel items. Proposal Dev allows it and if we are pushing budgets from prop dev to awards, awards has to allow it as well.

From: Susan Mundt Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 - It wasn’t an intentional difference and I had it marked in the spec as being “same” as PD/B. It was actually same as Coeus because Coeus Award Budget does NOT allow duplicate Cost Elements. I’ll ask Coeus help if this is an acceptable difference from Coeus.

From: Susan Mundt, Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 To: help@coeus.org
Kuali Coeus is modifying Proposal Development Budget for use as the Award Budget module. Coeus Award Budget (budget at a cost pool level) does NOT allow duplicate Cost Element entries.

Kuali Coeus Proposal Development Budget does allow duplicate entries (defined as a line item with the same Cost Element and Base Cost) for Non-Personnel line items. This accommodates, for example, the need to list multiple detailed equipment line items with the same base cost. Further, Prop Dev Budgets will feed the Award Budget so it would create an automatic error if the PD budget had duplicates that Award Budget didn’t allow.

Can you think of any reason Award Budget should differ from Proposal Budget and prohibit duplicate Cost Element/Base Cost entries?

a) KC_AWD-Create an Award – Should HOLD status awards be included in C&P Support?
1) **Award Status** - System shall allow Award status to be changed to one of the following “Out of the Box” options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Name</th>
<th>FS Budget Feed</th>
<th>Allow FS Expenses</th>
<th>Billable (new expenses)</th>
<th>Include in C&amp;P Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Advance</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y – Deferred to KC3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOLD**: This temporary award status is used to give time to research award errors without creating financial system entries or other instances where the account should purposely not be fed. There will be no budget feed to the financial system and expenditures to the financial account will not be allowed. The sponsor will not be invoiced for new expenses. **This award should or should not be included as Current Support in the Current & Pending Support Report?**

If an Institutional Proposal is linked to an Award through the Award module as a Funding Proposal, then the status of the Institutional Proposal is changed to ‘Funded’ at the time the Funding Proposal link is created. However, if the Award status is ‘Hold’ (used for when the OSP Admin needs to research an Award issue prior to making it ‘Active’ and feeding to the financial system), then the project does not appear on the Current OR Pending parts of the report. It is unreported even though it should be included on one side or the other.

This Coeus limitation is carried forward to KC2.0 to allow time for analysis and informed decision. Note: An improvement has been logged to change this functionality *in a future release*. **KRAFDBCK-3087** was logged and should be discussed in both the Awards and Proposal Development subcommittees.

2) **Future Business:**

a) **KC_Shared-Person Mass Change** spec review (Susan Mundt)

3) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA (University of Arizona)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck, Tara Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn Sharkey, Diane Rees, Carmen Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Tammy Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Laboratory</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU (Johns Hopkins Univ)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT (Mass Inst of Tech)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU (Michigan State Univ)</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Maryland College Park</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt Univ Med Ctr</td>
<td>Charlene Komers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Med and Dentistry NJ</td>
<td>Ed Castagna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus Consortium</td>
<td>Rosemary Hanlon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Award SME Minutes
Date: Wednesday, August 11, 2010, Time: 11-12am (PT) / 12-1pm (AZ) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048
Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Approve Minutes for July 14, 2010: Ron Schultz (5 minutes, see Email attachment)
   Sent out minutes, no amendments so they’re adopted.

2) Feedback on Prior Business: (FYI-not discussion, 10 minutes)
   a) Coeus, resolution of ‘View Award Budget’ role/right: Ron Schultz
      7/23/10 email describing the formal resolution and it has now gone to development.
   b) Coeus, Functional Spec, COEUSQA-1412 Boilerplate forms for Subcontracts: Ron Schultz
      Demo TBA, Invitees will be: Antoinette Lawson, Carol Wood, Cheryl Conover, Dennis Paffrath, Donna Johnson,
      Doug Bowser, Edward Castagna, Jennifer Quinn, Ketaki Mhaisekar, Kyle Burkhardt, Lena Fullem, Loretta Lynch-
      Reichert, Neil Maxwell, Peggy Pobst, Renee Dolan, Ron Schultz, Susan Mundt, Sven Davisson, Vonnie Perkins,
      Charlene Komers, Diane Rees.
      If anyone else wants to attend and you’re not on the above list, contact Ron Schultz
   c) Coeus Bug Fix prioritization, final report on comments received Ron Schultz
      Final list attached to EM from Ron dated 8/10/10
      Sent email out yesterday morning of 21 of 38 bugs ranked….some fixed, others no opinions….so rank list
      submitted.

3) Coeus-KC Convergence: Update: Susan Mundt (5 minutes)
   a) Decisions have yet to be made on SME governance and consistency standards, so we’ll proceed with
      separate wikis, email lists until more information is available.
      KC group using sakai, contour, confluence…..and we’ll be moving to google groups to be consistent with
      Coeus (which we’re unfamiliar with)….we will eventually be all on the same tools but in the interim they
      will be posted in both places.

4) KC Spec Reviews: Susan Mundt (20 minutes)
   a) KRAFDBCK-5470 KC_Shared-Cost Sharing Period Flexibility (Susan Mundt)
      • DM Questions: Currently we auto-populate Cost Share and Unrecovered F&A periods we calculate default values.
        Will it still make sense to calculate the defaults once we remove the Fiscal Year and leave those fields blank?
      • How is Coeus developing this functionality?
        Susan Mundt/UA: 5-year projects aren’t uncommon, & that’s a LOT of required dates to enter manually. I suggest we
        continue to assume 12-month years and allow each school to select the base date for auto-population calculation:
        1) Fiscal Year is currently based on Fiscal Year Start Date,
        2) Project Period would be based on Obligation Start Date, and
        3) Custom Labels don’t have to auto-populate.
        Neil/dawn agrees with Susan, no objections from group….Susan will suggest it to Terry as described.
   b) KRAFDBCK-5465 KC_AWD-Award Credit Split (Susan Mundt)
      DM Question: Design Requirement 1 - How about a drop-down rather than the separate buttons? (I saw the discussion
      on Issue 2 - my opinion only, but I think this will still be confusing for users; If we didn't do the direct entry I'd suggest
      having an intermediary page with the options, but that won't work with the direct input)
      • dropdown… I suggest ‘no change’ as the default. Jessica Peck/UA
      • I am in complete agreement with Jessica. Dawn Sharkey/CSU
      • Same here. Neil Maxwell/UC Berkeley
      • Regarding the Credit Split actions for data handling from IP record to Award: Will those drop-down options be
        fixed or editable via code table? I’m not advocating for an editable list, but Coeus schools often look to
        customize language in many system actions. I’m just suggesting that the permanent or transient settings of this
        pick-list should be defined in this design stage so users don’t automatically assume they can add or alter selections
        to the argument values. Rosemary Hanlon/Coeus Consortium
      • Rosemary makes a good point. Most drop-down choices are driven by code tables. This would be an exception to
        that general rule. I’m still kind of fond of the 3 action buttons instead of extra clicks for a drop-down that
        provides no additional information. I don’t see how a drop-down would make this any less confusing, but I could
        live with either choice. Susan Mundt/UA
• We prefer a pull down menu rather than radio buttons. Jean Mercer/IU
• I looked around briefly in the KC Award module for any other example where a drop-down was used to trigger an event but didn’t find anything. In my dealings with the proposal-budget SME, we were constantly reminded to remain as consistent as possible across the application. That was the other reason I raised the point about this value-list. Rosemary Hanlon/Coeus Consortium
• The drop-down wouldn’t cause the action, just set the behavior (more like where we have different options for PI/Co-I/Key People – but it’s all controlled through the one drop-down). Terry Durkin/KC DM
Agree that we’ll use the dropdown with default of No Change, get with terry to make that happen

5) Future Business:
   a) KRAFDBCK-5462 KC Spec Review: KC_AWD-Sync Descendants (Susan Mundt)
      Rewrite in progress responding to DM issues. Next steps are to request review from Coeus Development, then send for SME confirmation. Finalization target is the September SME meeting.
      Next spec for review, please begin reading and providing comments. If you don’t have access to view please let Susan Mundt know and she’ll email it to you directly. After reviewed by Coeus Help it will be circulated for comment a couple weeks before our next meeting.

6) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA (University of Arizona)</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Jessica Peck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn Sharkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Laboratory</td>
<td>Sven Davisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU (Johns Hopkins Univ)</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT (Mass Inst of Tech)</td>
<td>Noelle Donahue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU (Michigan State Univ)</td>
<td>Wendy Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Maryland College Park</td>
<td>Christy McGough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt Univ Med Ctr</td>
<td>Peggy Pobst, Charlene Komers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards & Consortium Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2010, Time: 11-12am (PT) / 12am-1pm (MT) / 3-4pm (EDT)
Phone Number: 888-830-8920, Code: 6172538048 (Coeus Consortium Conference Line)

Last Minute Change! Breeze Session: http://breeze.msu.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Coeus-KC Convergence: First joint meeting of PASC and KC Awards SME (5 minutes)
   a) Open discussion (5 minutes) of format and process to be led by Co-chairs
   b) Group Title Suggestions: Any comments on a proposed unofficial title for this combined committee? Can also send an email to Susan/Renee/Ron/Rosemary
   c) We can decide who can take the minutes for the groups? Tara will continue to take minutes

2) Coeus, Approve Minutes for June 2, 2010: Ron Schultz (5 minutes)
   a) https://wikis.mit.edu/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=23003587 (Email attachment)
   b) Minutes adopted for Postaward Subcommittee.

3) Coeus, should ‘View Award Budget’ function be modified?: Rob Yetter (10 minutes).
   a) Would like to break out the rights within the role View Award, View Award Documents, View Budget would be 3 separate rights. Will allow Institutions to further refine what can be viewed.
   b) Suggestion to make View Award Budget right explicit and separate to accommodate custom roles.
   c) New View Award Budget right will be bundled where the implicit right is present now at both the institutional and budget levels.
   d) Why not have separate right and role for View Award and View Award Budget so current Institutions won’t have to make changes to maintain status quo?
   e) In 4.4.1 you could not view attachments unless you had view attachments role. View award role did not give the user the right to see the attachments.
      i) This is the same thing we are going for with the budgets.
   f) Want to keep rights as granular as possible and allow schools to bundle in roles as they see fit. There is already a stand-alone View Award Budget role, but not a View Dept Budget Role.
   g) We now need the View Award Budget as a stand-alone right.
      i) We need to decide how to package/bundle to right.
   h) Ron will send out an affirmative statement via email and asks that individual responders send their opinions to Rob/Ron/Rosemary/Susan/Renee as we are short on time and need to move forward in the agenda.

4) KC Spec Reviews: Susan Mundt (35 minutes)
   a) KRAFDBCK-5465 KC_AWD-Award Credit Split (Susan Mundt) – 2 issues remain
      Issue 1: Clarify Coeus Intent – Coeus input required to answer questions in the KC spec (highlighted in red)
      i) Clarify intent: Create Award from open Proposal
         FYI: KC user interface is different from Coeus in that Funding Proposals panel is inside the new Award so Institutional Proposal search is not automatic before entering the new Award.
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Was the intent of Coeus to allow user to initiate creation of an Award from inside an open Proposal record (PD or IP or both?) instead of from the main menu or was the intent that first prop linked to the Award automatically feeds credit split data (see KC spec Functional Requirement 1).

Does FR 1 correctly communicate how this works?
Does anyone object to how this is written (FR 1)?
Per Rosemary, this seems most consistent with how Coeus actually works.

b. Verify effect on Key Personnel & Units not changed by null Credit Split
Verify system still adds new PIs as Co-Is and add investigator Units (all without duplication) if Funding Proposal Credit Split is null (current Coeus functionality)?
Correct

c. Verify effect of Merge on Person Details
Faculty – Adding a Funding Proposal does NOT change the existing state (checked or unchecked, yes or no) of the Faculty field for existing key personnel?
Person updating award should be verifying these fields.

d. Effort Fields (Total, Academic, Summer, Calendar) – Merging a new Funding Proposal with an Award adds the values in the corresponding effort fields?
In Coeus this is intended to be the effort over the life of the project (not year by year). This is an estimate.

Issue 2: Design issues require SME/Tech input
Please provide feedback on attached spec questions in red. We will likely need SME input regarding UI preferences.
If Developers allow us to give a preference, Susan would like to be prepared to provide them with the group’s preference.
Do we want to see action buttons (merge, replace, no change) or do we want an add button?
The action buttons result in fewer clicks for the users. Since most users would be in administrative offices they should be familiar enough with what these mean. The separate action buttons will be our suggestion to the Developers.
Is there supposed to be a multi-select? NO.

b) KRAFDBCK-5470 KC. Shared-Cost Sharing Period Flexibility (Susan Mundt) – Discuss any review comments emailed to Susan (mundts@email.arizona.edu).
   a. Translation to Coeus spec that Kyle wrote. Susan did not receive any comments.
   Susan needs comments by this Friday because Development will be starting on these soon.

5) Coeus Bug Fix prioritization, questions? Ron Schultz (5 minutes)
   a) Review Email “Award Bug List” sent to Post Award Subcommittee on July 8th.
   b) We have a list of bugs not yet fixed
      i) People need to review these in their own time
      ii) Ron will design a spreadsheet for people to rank prioritization
      iii) He will assume that those who do not reply agree with the majority
      iv) This needs to be done by mid-August
   c) Will we have to do a separate ranking for KC?
      i) Rosemary said these may not even be issues in KC. They may not impact KC. KC folks don’t need to look at these right away.

6) Future Business:
   a) Coeus, Bug Fix prioritization: Ron Schultz
   Demo to be announced: notice will be sent to those who have indicated interest. Email Ron (rschult7@jhu.edu) to be added to this list: Antoinette Lawson, Carol Wood, Cheryl

i) This will not be part of one of our monthly meetings.

c) KC Spec Review: KC_AWD-Sync Descendants

7) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron, Kyle, Rosemary, Rob Yetter, Peggy (from Vanderbilt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Carmen, Dawn, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Kristy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are Permissions issues with some KC Awards SME opening some of the Coeus QA JIRA’s – Susan doesn’t have an answer for this but will see what she can do. Rosemary may be able to help out with this, but she needs a list of the Users that need the View access – she suggests involving Jenn and Rob. Also may be issues with viewing some other documents.
1) **QA Update** – Wendy -

2) **Data Dictionary WRAPUP!**: Diane
   
   a) Not any new items – just hanging issues that we had not made final decisions on.
   
   b) Institutional Proposal Version
      
      i) Diane never heard back from Keith Young regarding Proposal Data Dictionary.
      
      ii) Really this just pulls in a link from Funding Proposal to Institutional Proposal; documents which version on Inst. Proposal is responsible for data feed.
   
   c) Route Node
      
      i) Any way to not use term in definition?
      
      ii) Suggestions:
          
          (1) A place in the workflow where a user involved takes an action on the proposal
          
          (2) Refer to different levels of review: The route that a document takes through the different levels of review (may be too generic as we are referring to a specific screen).
      
      iii) Let’s take a look at the mock for inspiration.
          
          (1) Barbara in Hawaii is testing workflow.
          
          (2) Diane to contact Barbara to explain exactly what this term is as it appears in the Route Log to have to do with a status or step in work flow.
          
          (3) Suggestion from Renee – Diane could check with KFS to see if they have defined it.
      
      iv) For now, remove reference to ad-hoc routing. Diane to find out more.
   
   d) Medusa/Proposal Development (section)
      
      i) Diane sent Keith an email for review but never got a response. Do we want to go ahead and accept these?
      
      ii) Proposal No. is not date logic in Dev. Proposals – is sequential.
      
      iii) These are probably fine; we will wait longer for Keith’s approval. At the point these have to be finalized we will go ahead and approve if Keith has not replied.
   
   e) Award Budget/Dist & Income…Cost Share & Unrecovered F & A, and Project Income
      
      i) Leave our work here, but document this won’t be in Release 2.

3) **Issues**: Bring any items you wish to discuss
   
   a)

4) **KC Glossary?**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

5) **Future Meetings**: Susan
   
   a) Wednesday, March 3, 2010 – Virtual Testing F2F, Commit SME meeting time to local testing efforts next week

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, January 27, 2010, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (219) 509-8020 Participant PIN: 5090301# New number
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) QA Update –Wendy -
2) Issues:
   a) Susan - Contacts / Unit and Central Admin Contacts – update
   b) Susan or Cheryl - KRAFDBCK-3421 KC Award, Budget Versions, Budget Document: Header information for budget version indicates Document Number "Doc Nbr" for Award document instead of Budget document.
      i) This is considered an enhancement only because it was not called out as a FR in the spec. Terry is having us label this an enhancement because it was not in the spec; if it was called out more specifically in the spec, it would have been included. Proposal made a decision to have a difference from Coeus, and developers assumed that Awards was doing it the same way as Proposal. In essence this is just missed functionality for Coeus equivalence.
      ii) We can recode it as missed functionality – but this will not make it with release 2.
   c) Neil or Renee - KRAFDBCK-3514 Award: T&M document - Movement of money from one child to another child fails in Time and Money and KRAFDBCK-3655 T&M History panel does not look like screen mock
      i) In Time & Money submitted/finalized transactions can be seen in History. However, once submitted in transaction screen they disappear from this screen.
         (1) Is it good enough for Release 2.0 if at least one screen works to see detailed transactions in a batch after you submit/finalize? Susan to talk to Terry, we would like to see more than what is in History
      ii) Some interrelated bugs that need to be closed related to AWD-TA-215
   d) Renee - KRAFDBCK-3545 Award: Details & Dates: Current Actions: relates to AWD-TA-221
3) Data Dictionary: Diane
   Award Actions / Route Log
      a) Are Field Level Help Prompts for Awards Actions / Route Log the same as Budget Actions / Route Log?
         i) Diane thought they would be the same, wants SME to confirm?
         ii) These look fine to SME, except for Route Node.
         iii) We will come back to Route Node later.
4) KC Glossary? : Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
5) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: Wednesday, January 13, 2010, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (219) 509-8020 Participant PIN: 5090301# New number
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) QA Update – Wendy –
   a) Testing as usual
   b) Looking for comments
   c) Percentage of scripts being tested to total scripts available could be higher in some areas
      i) Budget has 9 testers and over 200 scripts, so Wendy says this may take them some
         time. 3 of 9 testers for this group have tested this week so far.

2) Issues: Susan
   Contacts / Unit and Central Admin Contacts –
   a) Neil likes the idea of adding AOR
      i) Had to do for Proposal
   b) Unit Administrator default values, and multiple entries Y/N
      i) Can add multiple OSP Administrators
      ii) No changes suggested
      iii) Table can be changed by Institution at implementation

3) Data Dictionary: Diane
   Award Actions / Print
   a) Most of the fields we will review are check boxes.
   b) For multiple entries (checkboxes) make change to:
      i) If checked, ______ data will be included in the system generated Award Notice.
   c) Award Notice: System-generated summary report of an award document containing key
      elements of an award such as Investigator(s), sponsor, start and end dates, and dollar
      amounts.
   d) Signature Required
      i) Administrative (typo)
      ii) ‘and’ not ‘or’
      iii) At the end: …will appear on the system-generated Award notice.
   e) Time & Money History
      i) Report of Time & Money activity over the life of the award.
   f) Transaction Detail
      i) Report of all Time & Money changes made with a selected transaction.
      ii) Susan to look into missed functionality of User being able to specify transaction.

4) Updates from Functional Council? – Susan
   a) Graham’s technical update
      i) Wrapping up development of Award module
         (1) Limited activity over holiday break.
(2) Are keeping development team together to address bugs through the end of January.
   (a) If we still have a lot of unresolved bugs at the end of January, we are crossing our fingers they will keep them on longer.
   ii) Finishing Awards rates and permissions
b) Numerous bugs in Award Hierarchy and Time & Money.
c) Wendy has several areas in budget that aren’t able to be tested.

5) **KC Glossary** : Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
   a) Applicable Rate
      i) add “may be” part of the institution’s…
      ii) Second sentence: F&A or Fringe Benefits may be limited by sponsor.
   b) Authorized Amount
      i) …prior to the project start date
   c) Award Notice
      i) Have 2 entries? One for official Award Notice, and one for system generated.
      ii) Award Notice (System generated) – use entry from data dictionary
      iii) Award Notice (Sponsor generated) – Legal Document notifying the institution of the award, and may contain terms and conditions.
   d) Obligated/Obligation Total – The amount authorized by the sponsor for spending under an award, not including cost share. The Obligated Total, must be equal to or less than the Anticipated Total.
   e) Payment Type – Use Data Dictionary entry.
   f) Period – Omit.
   g) Proposed Total Cost – Omit. (Prop Dev may add later)

6) **Kuali Application Integration (KAI) update?** – Renee, nothing til later in January

7) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: Wednesday, December 16, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
New number after 12/31/09

Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/
Enter as “guest”

1) New conference call number after 12/31/09 – Susan
   Check the weekly agenda for conference call information, number will change beginning 01/06/10.
   Conference Number: 219-509-8020, Code: 5090301#

2) QA Update –Wendy –
   a) Script writing is winding down; 550+ scripts
   b) Except for budget, majority of testers returning
   c) QA Teams are starting up again
   d) No scripts for workflow testing

3) Outstanding Issues: Susan
   From last week: Award Attachment Type maintenance table.
   After talking with our SPO director and a few others, here is what UCB came up with. (Suggested list from Neil)
   Sponsor Document
   Institutional Policy Document
   Institutional Commitment Document
   Other Institutional Document
   Subrecipient Document (change to Subaward for consistency)
   Third Party Document

   "Other" Document?
   a) Suggestion from Jean: Budget
      i) Remember – user can name the document you are attaching
      ii) In future, plan to have budget attachments in budget module
      iii) Decision, for now, “Other” will work for budget information
   b) Not sure if we need to differentiate between Proposal and Award attachments
      i) Narrative types? Internal Attachments? Nevermind for now, Susan will look into which Table needs to be amended.

4) How critical is it, for schools implementing now, to have system generate next applicable number in code table when a new maintenance entry is made to code table? If system does not generate automatically, individual (back office function) will have to go to table, and identify next applicable number to assign on their own.
   a) Decision needs to be made for 2.0: must we have this automated (will take time and $ for developers) or, for 2.0 can we handle doing this manually? With future release (at some point) it will be automated; Rice currently does not provide.
   b) If manually entered, user will not be able to save or submit if they enter a duplicate code.
   c) Decision: Is manual entry for 2.0 acceptable? Yes – IU, CSU, UA, MSU
   d) Susan will code need for system assignment of codes as major, but will note that if it doesn’t get in for 2.0 it will be okay.

5) Data Dictionary: Diane
   Medusa Development Proposal
   a) Medusa mock may need updating for Prop Dev (note for Susan)
   b) SME group for Medusa Institutional Proposal has already reviewed.
6) Mock Updates: Susan
7) Equivalency Project Planning Team update? – Susan
8) KC Glossary? : Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
9) Kuali Application Integration (KAI) update? – Renee, nothing til Jan
10) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) QA Update – Renee or Wendy

2) Outstanding Issues: Susan
   Payment & Invoices table values out of the box – See Appendix for proposed values
   Financial (Fiscal) report class should remain intact because there are Financial reports that are not
   invoices. Just add Payment/Invoice report class.
   TD: Currently there is both a Financial class and a Fiscal class. The Fiscal class is what's mapped to
   Invoices and Payments.
   SM: Oh, I suppose that works, although it isn’t as descriptive as it could be and might be confusing
   because what Coeus schools know as Fiscal is Financial in KC. Can Fiscal easily be renamed
   PaymentInvoices or something that more closely resembles the panel label? Or rename Payment/Invoices
   in slash possible
   a) Discussion of Invoice/Payment types and frequencies for Out-of-the-Box (See appendix to
      Minutes)
   b) Suggest adding Standard Institutional, SF1034, Other, and Online – all with same frequencies as
      Standard Institutional – See details in appendix below for frequency details.
   c) Need to add 60 days after expiration for Final

   Cost Sharing duplicate row message (KRAFDBCK-2612)
   Duplicate defined by same values in Type, Fiscal Year, Source, Destination
   In KC Warning upon save, error upon submit.
   Coeus standard Language: “This is a duplicate row”
   What do we want error message to be?
   a) Suggestions for error message: There is a duplicate Cost Sharing entry which must be fixed prior
      to workflow submission?
   b) No, most don’t like this suggestion. Decision: Message will be: “This is a duplicate row.” This
      should be sufficient because rows will already be identified.
   c) Prefer this be a Validation error (can’t submit until fixed).

2) Mock Updates: Susan
   AWD BGT History panel – approved revised order
   a) Approved

3) Data Dictionary: Diane
   Comments, Notes & Attachments
   b) Comments – Change to “Remarks to be maintained as part of the official award record that are
      not captured elsewhere in the application.”
   c) Drop Comment Type from DD
   d) Notes – Note Topic: Brief description of the subject of the Note.
   e) Restricted – If checked, restricts access to the note by users who do not have assigned
      permission...
f) Note Text: The content of the note. This is intended to support correspondence between administrators regarding the award.

g) Attachments – Description – Remarks used to identify the Attachment. Give examples??
   i) Neil to work on list of possible in drop down e attachment types available for out of the box.

4) **Equivalency Project Planning Team update?** – Susan
   
a) Potentially stressful news - Don – developer from UA – has resigned. UA is having some problems with resource efforts between KC and KFS. Hopefully it won’t affect Awards Release 2.0.

5) **Kuali Application Integration (KAI) update?** – Renee

6) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

7) **Questions and Roll Call**

Reminder 12/23 and 12/30 cancelled

Neil will next be available Jan 13 (after next week’s meeting) – they are furloughed

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix: Summary and mapping for Payment & Invoices

TD: The table removes Invoice from Financial class - should it be added to Payment/Invoice class?

SM: Invoice report type with Invoice report type didn’t seem very useful, so I first considered renaming Invoice report type as Standard Institutional, but thought maybe better to add a new report type in case of problems with Coeus data migration. What do you think?

Valid Frequency Base table OK as is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Class (code: descrip)</th>
<th>Report Type (code: descrip)</th>
<th>Frequency (code: descrip)</th>
<th>Frequency Base (codes only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Financial (Coeus = Fiscal)</td>
<td>remove Invoice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add: SF 425</td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Quarterly</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6: Semi-annual</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7: Annual</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add: Payment/Invoice</td>
<td>1: None</td>
<td>1: None</td>
<td>No entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: Final</td>
<td>3: Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12: 90 days after expiration</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13: At expiration</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14: As required</td>
<td>2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33: 45 days after expiration</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43: 75 days after expiration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58: 15 days after expiration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: Form Provided by Sponsor</td>
<td>2: Monthly</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Quarterly</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Scheduled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: One in advance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7: Annual</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13: At expiration</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14: As required</td>
<td>2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56: 15 days after each quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51: SF270</td>
<td>2: Monthly</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Quarterly</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Scheduled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: One in advance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7: Annual</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13: At expiration</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14: As required</td>
<td>2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56: 15 days after each quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add: Standard Institutional</td>
<td>2: Monthly</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Quarterly</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Scheduled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: One in advance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7: Annual</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13: At expiration</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14: As required</td>
<td>2,3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56: 15 days after each quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add: Payment</td>
<td>2: Monthly</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(temp solution for KC2.0?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3: Quarterly</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4: Scheduled</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5: One in advance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6: Semi-annual</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7: Annual</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9: Bi-monthly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FYI: Freq Base table codes

1: Execution Date
2: Project Start Date (Coeus = Effective Date)
3: Obligation End Date (Coeus = Exp Date of Oblig)
4: Project End Date (Coeus = Final Exp Date)
5: Obligation Start Date (Coeus = Eff Date of Oblig)
6: As required
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13: At expiration</th>
<th>3,4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>add?: SF 1034</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>add?: Online</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QA Update – Renee or Wendy
a) Still on goal for 500 scripts by mid-December
b) Were able to automate staging data. Good possibility this will be done before testing starts up again.
   i) Ken wrote a Java application that can be deployed to any desktop for any user to stage data into any of the test environments (works with multiple modules). Just hit execute and it goes.
      (1) Only takes about 3 or 4 minutes. Saves trouble of “I need a proposal to test workflow.” Should be a huge timesaver.
      (2) Non-technical users should be able to use with relative ease.

Kuali Days 8 and FC Update – Susan or Renee
Remaining AWD scope after KC2.0
a) University of West Virginia is joining soon.
   i) Not sure what that will mean in relation to our group, if anything, yet.

Process Changes for KC3.0
Equivalency Project Planning Team update – Susan
a) Will work in smaller SME teams
   i) Coeus expert, Business Analyst, KC Developers, SME’s
   ii) Developers will do first attempt and then get feedback from there
      (1) Will not have formal mocks
b) Plan to release smaller chunks of functionality to make QA more efficient
c) Project planning – need better estimates. Lead SME’s have started working on.
d) Susan has Enhancement Tracking spreadsheet. Shows which items we have already specified for KC. Spreadsheet includes:
   i) Coeus release notes. Susan and Renee went back to one version prior to our test version to accumulate Coeus release notes.
   ii) Includes Coeus enhancements and KC enhancements.
   iii) Are 116 items on the list currently
   iv) Kenton is revamping the spreadsheet so we can compare apples to apples across modules.
e) Support model going forward.
   i) 1st school to implement will get everyone’s help.
   ii) Going forward will need to evaluate what levels of support are available and expected to for other implementations.
f) Members need to provide both technical and functional commitments that materialize.
g) Will still have formal design critiques.
h) Will have a UI Design guide. Have not determined yet who will develop it.
i) Graham and Kenton will do gap analysis between KC and Coeus to see what is missing for Functional Equivalence.

j) Lori is working on integration with KFS.

k) Project Plan in rough form should be available before Holidays.

l) Business Analysts – ISU is going to try to replace Marcus with another BA.

m) Discussion about possible KC Accounts Receivable module will be taking place because schools have identified deficiencies in KFS for A/R for Sponsored awards.

n) This group will continue to meet each Wednesday until further notice.

Kuali Application Integration (KAI) update – Renee

Mock Updates: Susan

Style Guide issue: required field Asterisks –

a) Susan would like to get input from mock people before we do away with formalized mocks.

b) What exactly is the rule?

   i) In panels where there is an add row, asterisks mean field is required in Add row to Add something. Does not mean user is required to add a row in order to save. Confirmed with Lisa Oliva, this is true.

   ii) Asterisk fields that are required to save – Yes, confirmed with Lisa.

   iii) Other than that, required fields taken care of by validation.

Award Print panel issue: **KCAWD-360** and AWD BGT History panel

a) Having trouble with which T & M transactions print with different award versions.

b) Related issue – History Screen

   i) Issue with ordering history items, what goes with what?

      (1) Document in reverse order, but when expanded in chronological order (This is the suggestion SME thinks seems logical).

      (2) This would show a shorter list when you go into screen, and then click to get the detail / open the detail

   ii) May need some serious re-work. Susan will take suggestions to Terry.

Data Dictionary: Diane

**Award Budget / Non-Personnel / Travel**

**Award Budget / Non-Personnel / Participant Support**

**Award Budget / Non-Personnel / Other Direct**

**Award Budget / Budget Actions / Route Log**

a) Route Status?

b) Changes made to Document Title: The title assigned to the document by the user. The Document Title is intended to help the user identify a document in a document list, not intended to be a unique identifier.

c) Route Node(s): Ad hoc is two words.

d) Last Modified – why not just “Modified” instead of “Last Modified”?  

   i) Change modified last to “most recently edited”

e) Last Approved – change ‘is last approved’ to ‘was most recently approved by users in workflow’

f) **KC Glossary** : Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

Questions and Roll Call

a) December Meetings

   i) 12/30/09 meeting and 12/23/09 cancelled

   ii) We will meet 12/9 and 12/16 for SME conference calls

   iii) Officially restart team testing, with newly formed teams, when we return in January
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Lisa Oliva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, November 25, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) QA Update – Renee or Wendy

2) Kuali Days 8 and FC Update – Susan or Renee
   Remaining AWD scope after KC2.0
   Process Changes for KC3.0

3) Kuali Application Integration – Renee

4) Data Dictionary: Diane
   Award Budget / Non-Personnel / Equipment
   Award Budget / Distribution & Income / Cost Sharing
   a) Use F&A instead of indirect
   b) On Campus – Label needs ?: “On Campus?”
   c) Fiscal Year – Is this going to be changed to Project Period? (Princeton’s suggestion)
   d) Unallocated is long – but no suggestions for improvement.
   e) Susan not sure if we are getting subtotal changes or not with this release.
   Award Budget / Distribution & Income / Unrecovered F&A
   a) Fiscal Year – Omit will be expended. Just state: The institution’s financial period associated with
      the unrecovered F&A funds.
   b) Applicable Rate – How is this field used? Rate is not a calculation. It is entered by user. Could
      represent different things.
      a. We could pull definition from F&A Rates panel
   c) Unallocated – eventually may want to add something (probably to multiple entries in this section)
      about the top subpanel F&A Distribution list (to let user know where data is coming from) but
      this would be for 3.0 not 2.0
   d) We need to leave Budget Change and Previous Budget as in Review
   e) Can approve ‘Total’ as is
   Award Budget / Distribution & Income / Project Income
   Award Budget / Budget Actions / Print
   Award Budget / Budget Actions / Budget Attachments
   a) Changes made to Description
   Award Budget / Budget Actions / Ad Hoc Recipients
   a) Workgroup – at end add ‘responsibility for the requested action’

5) KC Glossary : Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

6) Mock Updates?: Susan

7) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **QA Update** – Renee  
   a) JIRA-Renee has all bugs dispositioned as of today except for a few new ones.  
   b) Script Writing: Per Wendy, script writing is finally picking up. This is very encouraging.  
      i) There are several functional areas that have scripts written, but need reviewers.  
      ii) Chris from Cornell and Jeff for Iowa State will help with this as Script Reviewers.

2) **Coeus Equivalency Project** – Susan & Renee  
   Awards module scope beyond KC2.0 – Let’s identify and prioritize work incomplete as of KC2.0  
   SMEs, please suggest process improvements  
   a) Resources are not going to surface until we merge with Coeus.  
   b) Following Kuali Days in mid Nov., Functional Council will start organizing action plan for re-focus.  
   c) We will be getting more Coeus involvement at a higher level to make sure we don’t fail when we merge with Coeus.  
   d) Anything not developed for Awards in KC 2.0 will be prioritized when the two groups are merged.  
      i) Need to determine what has been accomplished with KC and what is left (including list of enhancement requests that didn’t make 2.0).  
   e) Going forward will have a more technical involvement in the demos.  
   f) Functional SME’s will be involved in QA (and previous months to get familiar with what we will be testing).  
      i) Burden on SME’s in regard to what system does will not be as large.

3) **Kuali Application Integration** – Renee  
   a) Renee says her involvement is small  
      i) Integration: Enhancement request on account number assignment and budgets feeding from KC to KF  
      ii) Some smaller enhancement requests as well.  
   b) Want someone who is functionally familiar with Awards module to work with them on these enhancements.  
   c) Send Renee an email if you are interested in being a liaison  
      i) Jean at Indiana said she would be happy to sit in on meetings  
      ii) She doesn’t have many details at this point

4) **Spec Updates** – Susan  
   **Current & Pending Support Report**  
   a) Waiting to hear from Lisa Oliva for her Feedback  
   b) We decided to merely document which statuses are not included in either Current or Pending, and not make a decision as to where to place them.  
   c) Note: Fund Advance is not in Coeus, but we previously agreed it would be out-of-the-box for KC

   **Award Budgeting**  
   a) Terry working on. Put info Susan previously gave him into a spreadsheet.  
   b) Discussion of merging periods from multiple budgets. Do we need this?
i) Susan thinks yes since Coeus does this.
ii) She will discuss this further with Terry. SME is okay with direction Susan is heading.

c) Many changes have to get input from PD/B, and outcomes have been acceptable.
d) Will not have data validation panel in 2.0 – Susan to have them removed in mocks.
e) Budget version number is not permanent if budget rejected or cancelled.
f)

5) **Data Dictionary:** Diane

   a) Diane got permission to just focus on the help prompts

   **Award Budget / Summary**
   a) Budget Change –as is
   b) Previous Budget–as is
   c) Obligated Total
      i) The amount obligated by the sponsor to date under the award, not including cost share. This
         is the sum of the Budget Change and the Previous Budget.
   d) Personnel Subtotal–as is
   e) Non-personnel subtotal….and remaining items….as is

   **Award Budget / Personnel / Project Personnel**

   **Award Budget / Personnel / Budget Overview**
   a) Change Label Name of Total Cost to Total Sponsor Cost
      i) Change ‘requested from’ to ‘provided by’? (Or do we need both)
      ii) Use ‘requested or provided from’
   b) Period Start/End – Use Later/Earlier rather than greater/less
   c) Unrecovered F&A - A-110 language being sent to Diane and Chris by Carmen (CSU) to update
      this.

   **Award Budget / Personnel / Personnel Detail**
   a) Group – change grouping to combining
   b) Start Date – remove extra characters at end
   c) Period Type – change to displays in the person-months column on grants.gov forms
   d) Requested Salary – The amount of funding requested from the sponsor for salary(ies)
   e) Calculated Fringe – Fringe benefit amount requested from the sponsor based on salaries requested
      and the applicable fringe benefit rates
   f) Unrecovered F&A – adding cumulative total to the A-110 definition being sent from Carmen
   g) Apply Inflation? – adding reference to institutional rate table to the field level help prompt

   **Award Budget / Non-Personnel / Budget Overview**
   a) Period 1 State Date – changing the greater than similar to the Personnel/Budget Overview panel
   b) Period 1 End Date - changing the less than similar to the Personnel/Budget Overview panel
   c) Indirect Cost – change to F&A Cost

   **Award Budget / Non-Personnel / Equipment**
   a) Will go over the Non-Personnel/Equipment section next week – it is a lengthy section

6) **KC Glossary:** Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

   a) Removing the following terms from the glossary as there could be multiple definitions depending
      on panel/situation - Comments, Effective Date, End Date, Notes, Start Date
   b) Institutional Proposal ID – add ‘submitted’ before proposal
   c) Job Code – use DD help text prompt
   d) Key Person Role – PD definition ok
   e) Prime Award – Chris checking to see where this is used, we have Prime Sponsor already defined
      and we need to see context
   f) Report Type – stop glossary description after first sentence
   g) Status – don’t need since we have Award Status
   h) Unit Total – Sum of credit split totals for all units for project personnel
   i) The items below in black were accepted as is – no changes necessary. Changes noted in blue.
      Deleted items crossed through.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Data Dictionary Help text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized Amount</td>
<td>An amount authorized by a sponsor or institution available to be spent during the pre-award period.</td>
<td>The amount authorized by the sponsor to be spent during a pre-award period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Status</td>
<td>The stage within the lifecycle of an award (eg. Active, Inactive, or Closed).</td>
<td>Indicates the state of an award for example, whether it is active, inactive or closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Not necessary—Webster definition</td>
<td>Comments related to the pre-award costs authorized by the sponsor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date</td>
<td>Multiple definitions depending on situation/panel</td>
<td>The start date for the incurrence of pre-award costs authorized by the sponsor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Multiple definitions depending on situation/panel</td>
<td>The end date of a period of time associated with direct and F&amp;A costs as reflected in the sponsor award instrument. It must be within the overall project period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Proposal ID</td>
<td>A unique identification number assigned by the system (based on institution specifications) to identify a submitted proposal.</td>
<td>Unique identification number assigned to a proposal by the Kuali Coeus system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job code</td>
<td>Use DD.</td>
<td>The Human Resources position identifier directly associated with the individual named in the Person column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Person Role (proposal def)</td>
<td>The role in which each Key Person will be assigned for the proposed sponsored project.</td>
<td>Function of the project key person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>The alphanumeric descriptor that identifies a piece of equipment to be purchased.</td>
<td>The alphanumeric descriptor that identifies the equipment to be purchased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Not necessary—Webster definition</td>
<td>Incremental number automatically generated by the system to indicate a period of time (e.g., 1, 2, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Incremental number automatically generated by the system to indicate a period of time (ie. 1, 2, 3)</td>
<td>Incremental number automatically generated by the system to indicate a period of time (e.g., 1, 2, 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Name of the person who will serve as an institution's project contact for the award.</td>
<td>Name of the person who will serve as an institution's project contact for the award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime award</td>
<td>The award where the funds originated. Used when funds are transferred through a third party.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Person Total</td>
<td>Sum of all project personnel credit split totals.</td>
<td>Sum of all project personnel credit split totals. Automatically calculated by the system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Role: Function or area of responsibility of a project contact associated with an award.

Report Type: Description of a report to be submitted to a sponsor. This may indicate if a report is due one time or repeatedly (final or progress) or references a specific report format (SF269).

Salary Effective Date: The first date during a project for which a Person will earn the corresponding base salary amount.

Start Date: Multiple definitions depending on situation/panel

Status: Necessary if we have Award Status.

Subaward ID: Unique number automatically assigned by the system to a subaward.

Technical Report: A formal summary of progress and/or results related to the scope of work of a sponsored project as required by the sponsor terms and conditions of the award instrument.

Total Cost (Direct; F&A, Total): Sum of direct costs and F&A costs. See also Direct Cost and F&A Costs.

Unit Total: Sum of credit split totals for a unit. Sum of credit split totals for all units for project personnel. Automatically calculated by the system.

7) Mock Updates?: Susan

8) Cancel 11/11/09 & 11/18/09 SME meeting?: Susan – Kuali Days 8 and FC meeting is this week.

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Carmen, Diane, Dawn, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) **QA Update** – Renee
   Release schedule and QA planning
   a) System messages – a lot are not according to the specs
      i) if meaning is same then we will just update test scripts
      ii) If meaning wrong or need more info, then we need to create a JIRA

2) **Data Dictionary**: Diane
   **Award Budget / Rates / F&A**
   a) Mocks for this area
      i) Ignore Affected Budget area- mock needs to be fixed to remove this
      ii) Whatever you select as activity type will display on panel header (ie Public Service)
   b) Rate Type – pulled from previous definition where we talking about rate type
      i) The type of F&A rate applicable to the project (e.g., Modified Total Direct Costs [MTDC], Total Direct Costs [TDC], Salaries). This is the base to which F&A is applied for the Award Activity Type.
   c) Campus – Indicates whether the F&A rate being applied is on-campus or off-campus.
      i) We removed ‘Public service’
   d) Fiscal Year – remove Public Service
      i) The institution’s financial period including the start for which the F&A rate is applicable.
   e) Start Date – Remove public service
   f) Institute Rate – Accepted as is.
   g) Applicable Rate – Accepted as is.
   h) Question – Is F&A rate defined elsewhere in the data dictionary? It is in the glossary.
      i) Susan to ask group developing references for users if there is somewhere they will be referred to for definition of general industry terms.
      ii) We have defined F&A costs in the data dictionary.
      iii) Susan will point out that we may need to include this type of thing in the panel help.

3) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

4) **Mock Updates?**: Susan

5) **Questions and Roll Call**
   a) Diane asked if there is an area of higher priority than data dictionary where her efforts should be concentrated. Susan will get back to her after talking to Kenton.
   b) Susan wants everyone to look over System Messages in AAA KC_AWD Contour Rqmts
      i) Changes are detailed in document. Susan went through several of the change she made. Additional changes not requested by group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Agenda

Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) QA Update – Renee
   Release schedule and QA planning
   a) Need volunteers for test script writers
      i) Chris can work on instead of testing
      ii) Wendy will get her started
   b) Revised release dated TBD
   c) For now we have suspended scripted group testing
   d) Locally schools will continue pre-QA type testing while waiting for formal test scripts
      i) Schools should play around in test environment

2) Data Dictionary: Diane
   Award Budget / Parameters / Budget Periods & Totals
   a) This is where user goes if they do not want to enter detail budget. Or, if they do enter a
detail budget, the info feeds here.
   b) These definitions look fine.
   c) For Direct and F&A costs, took the definitions we already had and just added ‘for the
budget period.’ Looks good.
   d) Unrecovered F&A – Diane added ‘for the budget period.’ Looks good.
   e) Cost Sharing – pulled from glossary
   f) Cost Limit – We reviewed last week. Current changes documented by Diane.
   g) (Totals) Budget Change – Obligated total less obligated total previously budgeted. Can be
   broken down into periods (should we add this or leave it off?)
      i) Suggestion: Budget Change Total is the (Award) Obligated Total less Previous Budget
      committed. The Budget Change amount may be distributed into Budget Periods within
      the total Budget Period defined by the Obligation Start and End dates.
   h) (Totals) Previous Budget – committed vs. posted? Use committed.
   i) (Totals) Obligated Total – Use same definition as we have used in other sections. Start with
      Obl. Total definition from award document. End with the calculation (what Diane
      currently has here).

3) KC Glossary: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
   a) Unit of Organization – we started this at the last meeting and got stuck.
      i) Keep first sentence.
      ii) Second sentence: The institution may define units of organization as time periods,
departments, accounts, etc. to serve institutional business needs.
   b) Award Status – Remove ‘current’. Change stage to stages. Put it in parentheses.
   c) Version ID– Number assigned by the system to identify each iteration of Award data.
   d) Award Hierarchy – Fix tense – use ‘structure representing’ ‘which allows’

4) Mock Updates?: Susan – use http instead of https temporarily

5) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Attendees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: Wednesday, October 14, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates: Susan
   a) Must add Lead Unit on Details and Dates to define permissions upon Award create –
      i) There is an auto save when user navigates off of first award screen, so Lead Unit needs to be
         entered before this occurs because it drives permissions.
   b) Lead Unit New FRs:
      i) Lead Unit required to create Award – System shall require that user select Lead Unit prior
         to first Award save.
      ii) Lead Unit populated in PI Unit Details when PI added – System shall display Lead Unit
         selection (from Details & Dates panel) automatically in PI Unit Details when a PI is added
         after initial Award save.
      iii) Lead Unit changes must happen in PI Unit Details – System shall require Award modifier
         to change Lead Unit in Unit Details for PI, and the change will be displayed throughout the
         award. In other words, Lead Unit is NOT editable on the Details & Dates panel after a PI has
         been selected for the Award.
      iv) Question from Diane: Is field on details & dates editable when pre-populated from Proposal
          module?
             (1) Additional FR: Funding Proposal populated Lead Unit: Funding Proposal populates
                Lead Unit, but field remains editable in Details & Dates panel until PI added to Contacts
                tab.
             (2) DM Q: Since Funding Proposal link includes a PI, then would it be easier to require any
                edits to Lead Unit to take place on Key Personnel panel?
             (3) DM Q: Is any other information being driven by lead unit? We can’t think of any besides
                workflow, but this does not change our functional requirements.
   c) Award/Time & Money locking of Award Hierarchy:
      i) New Rules OK?
         (1) “A new Award version cannot be created or committed while a T&M doc is still
             pending.”
         (2) “T&M docs must be complete before Award versions can be created or committed.”
         (3) In other words, The entire life of a T&M doc must be completely within or outside an
             Award version.
      ii) Examples:
          (1) T&M doc is created and completed before Award version is created.
          (2) Award version is created, T&M is created and committed, Award version can complete.
          (3) Award version is created, T&M is created (NOT completed), Award version cannot
             complete until T&M completes.
      iii) Can we think of any circumstances when these rules would not work out? No.
   d) Susan to update specs, post JIRA’s, and get requirements in Contour for Q&A (for items
      discussed above)

2) QA Update – Renee
   Release schedule and QA planning
   a) Some items ready for re-testing
      i) There are lots of resolved bugs that need to be tested again. Let Renee know if you have time
         to do so.
b) Per Wendy, script writing seems to be falling to the wayside
   i) People in this meeting are best suited to do unscripted testing
      (1) Easiest thing to do is start at the top of script list and go down, running through all of use cases. Use spec as a guide if you don’t understand the functionality.
      (2) CRUD- Create, Update, and Delete

3) Data Dictionary: Diane

Budget Overview
a) On/Off Campus – Like it
b) Budget Start/End Date
   i) Same as obligation start and end date
   ii) In End Date – change ‘or’ to ‘of’ (typo)
c) Description – This is in overview. Specific to different budget versions? Yes, overview displays version, with description for that version.
   i) Alphanumeric text used to identify the displayed budget version.
d) Comments – Remarks or explanations related to the displayed budget version. Intended for internal correspondence.
e) Budget Version – Numeric, sequential, system generated number assigned to a Budget document for each Award.
   i) Rejected or cancelled documents will not be displayed in later release. For now (Release 2), they will all show (rejected, cancelled…). Susan doesn’t think rejected and cancelled budget should receive version numbers and rejected and cancelled budgets should not be shown.
      (1) Susan will talk to Terry about this not making Release 2.
f) Budget Type – Assigned by the system when a user with permission…Budget (e.g., New, Increase, Rebudget, Decrease)
   i) Diane to go through and remove all e.g. for consistency

g) Budget Status- Like it as is
h) F&A Rate Type – took from glossary. Like it. Capitalize components making up acronyms
i) Budget Change Amount – Should ‘removed’ be ‘subtracted’? No preferences stated.
   i) Add Previous. Use ‘previous budget’ instead of ‘existing budget’

Budget Version
a) Version – add ‘for each award’
b) Budget start/end – correct typo.
c) Budget Change – should be consistent with help prompt from Budget Overview above. Which one should we use?
   i) The sentence currently here that is more technical than other section.
   ii) Keep this and add help prompt from section above to put in more in layman terms?
iii) Decision: We will keep both sentences with general explanation first, followed by longer more technical description. We will put the same help prompt in both Budget Overview and Budget Version for Budget Change.
d) Cost Sharing –ok
e) F&A Rate type – change capitalization
f) Last Updated

Budget Limits
a) Diane notated changes to Cost Element and Cost Element Description
   i) Cost Element- will have to look into if this is numerical or alpha-numerical
b) Limits – The dollar amount which may not be exceeded (e.g.: sponsor limits, institutional limits).

c) Budget Change – Reuse from above,
d) Previous Budget – Obligated Total from the last posted Budget Version, not including current version Budget Change Amounts.
e) Obligated Total thru Total Costs – All good. Short and simple.

4) KC Glossary: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
Account, Anticipated Total (or Amount), Award ID, Distributable Total (or Amount), Distributed Total (or Amount), Obligated Total (or Amount), Obligation End Date, Obligation Start Date, Project End Date, Project Start Date, Award, Child, Parent, Root Award, Unit of Organization, Award Status, Version ID, Award Hierarchy.

a) Account:  
   i) Change to Account ID? Or ‘Account (Account ID)?’ Use: Account (Account ID)  
   ii) DD – Unique identifier for an account in the financial system.  
   iii) **Keep current definition.**

b) Anticipated Total (or Amount)? Use **Anticipated Amount**.  
   i) If shared with any other modules, we need to clear with them. Don’t think it’s shared – Chris to check.  
   ii) Take DD as first sentence. Then 2\textsuperscript{nd} sentence: This includes current obligation plus expected incremental funding, and future year funding, including possible option years. This does not include cost share.

c) Award ID – Leave as is.

d) Distributable, Distributed/Obligated Total. All ‘Total’ changing to ‘Amount’ (Obligation being changed to Obligated)  
   i) Obligated is used in reference to amounts. Obligation is used in reference to dates.

e) Obligation End/Start Date – use DD entry

f) Project End Date – Leave as is for glossary– we think it is shared.
   i) Slight changes made to DD side – please update DD Diane. End first sentence after parentheses (keep everything that is there prior to the parentheses currently). Then second sentence: This is the current funded period plus unfunded periods (including possible option years).

g) Project Start Date – Diane to break into two sentences in DD – similar to Project End Date.  
   i) Keep glossary the same. This is a shared glossary entry.

h) Award – Leave as is.

**Time & Money and Create an Award Hierarchy:**

i) Child class
j) Parent

k) Root Award

l) Unit of Organization – An Institution may divide a sponsored award….This is called a Unit of Organization. We will pick up here next time.

5) **Mock Updates - Susan**

   a) Budget Versions – Remove # after Version label

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica (briefly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: Wednesday, October 7, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: [http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/](http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/) Enter as “guest”

1) **Data Dictionary:** Diane

**Time & Money / History**
- a) Diane to check if we have been hyphenating system generated. We don’t think we have, but she will confirm.
- b) Transaction – Money does refer to the Money part of Time & Money – but it is only a Money transaction, no change needed.
- c) Obligated Change – Great as is.
- d) Obligated Distributable - correct Typo in distribution
  - i) Change allocated to “to be allocated” in example.
  - ii) after the obligated change amount has been applied
    - (1) Does this statement only apply to pending view?
    - (2) No, no choice in history. This is fine.
- e) Anticipated Distributable - Change allocated to “to be allocated(to)”

**Medusa / Award**
- a) This section is now done- minor changes made by Diane

2) **KC Glossary:** Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

3) **QA Update** – Renee – **Everyone’s top priority!**

Release schedule and revised QA planning
- a) Losing Award data entry testers 1 or 2 per week
- b) Many testers are confused
- c) Chris has some testers at Cornell that are not extremely busy right now, can they help out somewhere?
  - i) Renee recommends they learn how to create award and proposal docs
  - ii) They have done this. Does Renee want them to test with other groups?
  - iii) Renee might do some re-assigning
- d) Testing assignments report – fields that show last date tested are not always correct
  - i) Wendy to talk to Kenton about this.

4) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:** Susan, Specs/Mocks locked for KC2.0 change!

5) **Mock Updates:** Susan

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Dawn, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KC Awards SME Minutes
October 7, 2009
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Date: Wednesday, September 30, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) **Data Dictionary**: Diane (41% complete)
   - DD is now a top SME priority! We will review DD items first today.
   - Can anyone help Diane with help prompt text?
     - a) Obligation Start: Field Level help should refer to “Project Start Date”
     - b) Obligation End: Field Level help should refer to “Project End Date”
     - c) Obligation Cumulative: add “to date”; change “under” the award to “for” award.
       - i) Final: The total amount authorized by the sponsor for spending on the award to date, not including recipient cost sharing.
     - d) Change Amount: Increase or decrease in the cumulative obligated amounts as a result of the transaction. Final.

2) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
   - a) Nothing for today.

3) **QA Update** – Renee – Everyone’s top priority!
   - Test Script % completion, need help with Test Scripts
     - a) Can anyone additional contribute who is not already?
       - i) No volunteers (not a lot of members on the call today).
     - b) About 40% completion (at most) for Test Scripts (this is test scripts only!!)
       - i) Placeholders are in for most of test analysis and majority of test scripts.
       - ii) FR ready to be uploaded, but having issues.
     - c) Neil will likely step in more when we get to Time & Money and Award Hierarchy
     - d) Bug regarding date should be fixed now – this was an Internet Explorer issue.
     - e) Susan to ask Terry about entering FR for Budget into contour (ie what FR will make it into Release 2.
       - i) Wendy doesn’t want to entire a whole bunch of FR now to find only 1/3 of them are actually in Release 2
       - ii) Needs to know which of the Budget FR are going to make it into Release 2 because she doesn’t want waste time testing things that will be deferred.
     - f) Award Hierarchy and Funding Proposals – Susan will be validating FR’s.
       - i) Should Neil wait for Susan to be done to do his test analysis?
       - ii) Susan will keep Neil up to date on where she is.
     - g) Time & Money – test script will take longer than other areas per Neil. It will have to be theoretical at first.
     - h) Renee went through everything except Time & Money and Budget and compared to mocks.
       - i) Award Budget testing has not started
     - j) Per Renee, Award Hierarchy & Award Data entry have assignments. Renee lost 3 data entry testers this week, so let her know if anyone can provide extra testers.
       - i) UCB will be doing some testing (including unscripted) for Awd Data Entry that should give us a lot of useful feedback.

4) **Spec Review/Issue Updates**: Susan, Specs/Mocks locked for KC2.0 change!

KC Awards SME Minutes
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5) **Mock Updates:** Susan – Bart says mock work should be done by next Monday, 10/5/09

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Carmen, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Shelley, Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes  
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)  
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#  
Breeze Session: [http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/](http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/) Enter as “guest”  
UA network crash! MSU will project breeze at Alternate Breeze [http://Breeze.msu.edu/awards/](http://Breeze.msu.edu/awards/)  

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates: Susan, **Impending Spec/Mock cutoff this Friday, 9/25/09!**  
KC_AWD-Print – Susan,  
   a) Award Notice Select/Print Order  
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coeus – Select (alpha)</th>
<th>Coeus - Print</th>
<th>Alphabetical (New)</th>
<th>Functional (New)</th>
<th>NGA Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signatures Required</td>
<td>Basic data</td>
<td>Approved Equipment</td>
<td>Terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(separate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address List</td>
<td>Signatures Required</td>
<td>Approved Foreign Travel</td>
<td>Special Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Hierarchy Info</td>
<td>Submittal Approved</td>
<td>Subawards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Science Code</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Approved Foreign Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Sharing</td>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Submittal Approved</td>
<td>Subawards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Cost Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Thru</td>
<td>Technical Reporting</td>
<td>Flow Thru (Prime Sponsor &amp; Sponsor Funding Transferred)</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Rates (Benefits Rates &amp; F&amp;A Rates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Travel</td>
<td>Proposal Due</td>
<td>Funding Summary</td>
<td>Flow Thru (Prime Sponsor &amp; Sponsor Funding Transferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Summary</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>Hierarchy into Distributions</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy Info</td>
<td>Foreign Travel</td>
<td>Science Code Keywords</td>
<td>Funding Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td>Subcontract</td>
<td>Other Data</td>
<td>Hierarchy into Distributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Data</td>
<td>Cost Sharing</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>Technical Reporting Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>Indirect Cost</td>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td>Proposals Due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Due</td>
<td>Flow Thru (Prime &amp; Sponsor Funding Trans)</td>
<td>Indirect Cost Rates (Benefits Rates &amp; F&amp;A Rates)</td>
<td>Reporting Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Reporting Reports</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Code</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>Special Review</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Review</td>
<td>Other Data</td>
<td>Address List Sponsor Contacts</td>
<td>Address List Sponsor Contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontract</td>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Technical Reporting Reports</td>
<td>Other Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reporting</td>
<td>Special Review</td>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Science Code Keywords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Address List</td>
<td>Signatures Required (separate)</td>
<td>Signatures Required (separate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red = not checked by default</td>
<td>Red = not checked by default?</td>
<td>Red = not checked by default?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b) Comments about table above: We have to determine selection order AND print order  
   c) Like the idea of same order for selection and print order: UA, MSU,  
   d) **Prefer Functional order as is:** MSU, Cornell, UA, (UCB will go with majority, Shelley not comfortable with a judgement, not her area of expertise)  
   e) Prefer Alpha order: IU (Jean), CSU  
      i) Carmen: PI might prefer alpha order  
      ii) Chris: training issue for either. PI will have to get used to our labels anyway. So many groups using this, maybe best just to order alphabetically.  
      iii) Diane asked for review of what info is in basic data.  
      iv) Basic data always prints first (regardless of selections)  
      v) Renee: Central Admin folks will be comfortable looking in Coeus, and PIs will be primary users of printouts.  
   f) **Decisions:** Same order for selection list and print order, Use Functional (New) column  
   g) Diff from coeus suggested: Print headers regardless of null contents Agree: MSU, Cornell, CSU, UA, (no disagreement)
h) Wendy suggested changing label from Hierarchy Distributions to Hierarchy Distributions Detail, but that would make label too long and present layout problems. Training issue.
  
i) **Mimic Coeus checkbox defaults?** No disagreement.
  
j) Award Modification printout changes –
  
k) **Suggestion to change Change Report to Award Modification**
    i) Jean IU: like it better, more descriptive.
  
l) OK to move CFDA Number to Basic data section with NSF Science Code
  
m) OK to move Document Funding ID
  
n) OK to relabel in Funding Summary section to reflect Distributed/Distributable.
  
**KC_Shared-Medusa** – Marcus is working on revisions – Marcus not on call (no update posted)
  
**KC_Shared-Notes** – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again, Terry confirmed
  
2) **QA Update** – Renee
  
3) **AWD Data Entry** is the only group up and running. Many Jira issues logged & to dev.
  
a) Need to remember 1 bug per Jira. Note test success/failure.
  
4) **Budget** will be about 1mo until testable
  
5) **Time & Money** testers on hold.
  
a) Specs sent for review of FRs and UCs for off-script testing if they are capable.
  
6) **Mock Updates**: Susan
  
a) **Main Menu**
  
b) **Document Status Block** – Tom made corrections from last week?
  
c) All **Print** panels – DM says can’t print multiple docs at one time (neither does Coeus), so change checkboxes to print buttons on each row.
  
d) **Comments History** – Needs to be reverse chronological order.
  
e) **Award Budget** – review all screens one last time
  
f) **Budget Actions** – Added column headers (Document, Actions) – looks fine.
  
g) **Budget Summary** – enough emphasis on cost Limits row at bottom (darker shading than other Totals rows)? Yes (Carmen and Susan like it a lot).
  
7) **Data Dictionary**: Diane – temporarily on hold.
  
a) Diane hopes to have something next week.
  
8) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
  
a) Chris hopes to have something next week.
  
9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Jessica (beginning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Unv)</td>
<td>Diane, Carmen, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) Spec Review/Issue Updates: Susan, Impending Spec/Mock Cutoff next Friday, 9/25/09
   KC_AWD-Comments – Additional FRs and screenshots added – any feedback prior to cutoff?
   a) Quick overview of FR’s
   b) There are some wholes that need to be filled for Proposal Summary – they do come to Award but
don’t know where they come from on the Proposal side.
      i) There is a field in Coeus for Proposal Summary, but where is this in KC?
         (1) Per Neil, Label in Coeus is actually Summary/Comments.
   c) Discussion of Versioning comments in relation to award versions.
      i) Comment types are versioned separately
      ii) If only one version of comments, history button is not available
         iii) Blank sponsor template comments do not overwrite comments in the award.
   d) Comments history needs to be in reverse chronological order – mock should be fixed and final
      next week.
   KC_AWD-Print – Also added FRs and screenshots – any feedback prior to cutoff?
   a) Instead of check boxes, we will have one print button for each row – should be done next week.
   b) Would like to make labels all in sync with each other (example print address list is really printing
      sponsor contacts, so change to print sponsor contacts), same for Print Forms for Budget
      i) Print Forms in Budget will likely be moved to right and have separate print button on each
         row instead of check boxes to be consistent.
      ii) Flow Through is Sponsor Funding Transferred
   c) Changes made to Preaward Authorizations
   d) May need to make changes to Closeout
   KC_Shared-Medusa – Marcus is working on revisions
   a) There is not any Notes functionality that is specific to Medusa
   KC_Shared-Notes – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again

2) Award Budget Update – Susan
   a) Rates issue: logic to look at Award Rates panel 1st, then Budget Rates. Would it make sense to
      eliminate Rates panel in Award & use AWD BGT? Terry says Award Rates is already done.

3) Enhancements status: Susan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Dev Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AW-27 Share Proposal Budget Module with Awards</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-20 Validate Rates Parameter</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>WIP or Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR-22 Notes, Linked Docs Display – No longer applicable?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-26 Link Funding Proposals of any Proposal Status</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-15 Equipment Warning, Approvals Exceed Budget</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-28 Hyperlink Email</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-23 Key Person Details</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-16 Populate Central Admin Contacts</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4) **Mock Updates:** Susan
   a) **Main Menu Researcher tab** - OK per Terry for KC2.0, proceed with “All My Awards” – returns any status where current logged in user is PI, Co-I or Key Person.
   b) **Document Status Block** – made changes per SME suggestion from 9/9/09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI: Tester, Joe</th>
<th>Document ID: Status: 291607: new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Unit: Chemistry</td>
<td>Award ID: Account 000212-001:400100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   | Sponsor: National Science Foundation | Last Update: 03/30/2009 10:06 AM by <update user>

   i) Sponsor Name will be truncated at 30 to 35 characters
   ii) Last update
      (1) Could date be shortened to 09 instead of 2009?
      (2) Anyone know limit for username?
      (3) Everyone agrees it would be okay to eliminate time, only showing date.
      (4) Susan to ask Terry where else update info can be found. And what exactly is stored.
   iii) Prop Dev added Sponsor Name and PI to bottom of their document status block
   iv) Wherever node is mentioned, need to extend to 5 digits to be consistent with proposal
   c) All **Print** panels – DM says can’t print multiple docs at one time (neither does Coeus), so change checkboxes to print buttons on each row.
   d) **Budget Overview** – changes in Award doc Budget Versions tab & Awd Bgt doc Parameters tab
   e) **Budget Versions** – changes in Awd Bgt doc Budget Versions tab (to be applied to Award doc)
      i) Date format needs to be fixed in Last Updated on Budget Versions.
   f) **Review rest of Award Budget screens**
      i) Expand/Collapse all to be added to budget limits panel
      ii) Award Budget – Rates – should not be updateable.
      iii) Susan to ask Bart if he has any ideas about separating Cost Limits on Award Budget Summary so that they stand out more.
      iv) Cost Sharing Summary and Unrecovered F&A need to right justified
      v) Sub Award budget panel should not be there

5) **Hierarchy Actions:** Susan
   Changes suggested by Terry Durkin to make development easier.

6) **Data Dictionary:** Diane – temporarily on hold

7) **KC Glossary:** Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

8) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Ed, Carmen, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**CNV Award Search criteria:** Award ID, Sponsor Award ID, Award Number, Account ID, Award Status, Sponsor ID, Award Title, Investigator, Unit Number, Unit Name, OSP Administrator, Archive Location, Archive Date From, Archive Date To.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Search Criteria</th>
<th>Changes in Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doc Search - Basic</td>
<td>Detailed Doc Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Doc) Type</td>
<td>Initiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator Approver</td>
<td>Approver Initiator (current logged in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document/ Notification Id</td>
<td>Document/ Notification Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Document/ Notification Id</td>
<td>Date Modified From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Modified To</td>
<td>Date Modified To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Finalized From</td>
<td>Date Finalized From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Finalized To</td>
<td>Date Finalized To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Doc) Type Narrative Writer</td>
<td>(Doc) Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created From Viewer</td>
<td>Date Created From Viewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created To Group Viewer</td>
<td>Date Created To Group Viewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Status Route Status</td>
<td>Route Status Route Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created From</td>
<td>Date Created From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created To</td>
<td>Date Created To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Approved From</td>
<td>Date Approved From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Approved To</td>
<td>Date Approved To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Route Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name this search (optional)</td>
<td>Name this search (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For All My Awards, SME thinks that Investigator should be able to click one button and get a set of results. Investigator should not then be taken to another search.
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## Table 2: Search Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doc Search – Basic, Detailed &amp; Superuser</th>
<th>Coeus</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award Number</td>
<td>Award Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Award Number</td>
<td>Sponsor Award Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Unit (code)</td>
<td>Lead Unit (code)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove if need space</td>
<td>Remove if need space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Award Number</td>
<td>Sponsor Award Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Unit Name</td>
<td>Lead Unit Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account ID</td>
<td>Account ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account ID</td>
<td>Account ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Status</td>
<td>Award Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Status</td>
<td>Route Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Code</td>
<td>Sponsor ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove if need space</td>
<td>Remove if need space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP Administrator</td>
<td>OSP Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligated Amount</td>
<td>Obligated Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Total Amount</td>
<td>Anticipated Total Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligated Dist. Amount</td>
<td>Obligated Dist. Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this Distributed or Distributable?</td>
<td>Is this Distributed or Distributable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Dist. Amount</td>
<td>Anticipated Dist. Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this Distributed or Distributable?</td>
<td>Is this Distributed or Distributable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Eff. Date</td>
<td>Project Start Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obligation Expiration Date</td>
<td>Obligation End Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Expiration Date</td>
<td>Project End Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Created (Last Award Version Date)</td>
<td>Date Created (Last Award Version Date)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action(s)</td>
<td>Action(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) **AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards** – Susan, Prioritize changes for deferral to KC3.0
   All Award Budget requests cannot be implemented in current KC 2.0 time frame.
   SME to confirm prioritizations. Review issues 8-10 recently added, in progress or resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRs</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1 Must have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 Nice to have for KC2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3 OK to defer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   a) **Rates issue: logic** to look at Award Rates panel first, then Budget Rates. Would it make sense to eliminate Rates panel in Award and just use AWD BGT?
   b) **Row 39 – Make changes to an Award Budget before approving** – Can we upgrade to 2 Nice to have for KC2.0?
   i) UC wants as much flexibility as possible about returning a document to a workflow node.
   c) **KC_AWD-Create an Award Budget spec Issue 10: Award Budget Workflow** –
      i) SMundt suggestion for 9/9/09 SME discussion: I asked Terry if KEW was revised to allow return of a KC doc to the initiator (or is that submitter)? What is that action called? Is that different than reject or the same for specific hard-coded doc types?
      ii) [9/8/2009 1:01:27 PM] Terry Durkin: that should be working for Prop Dev. It has to be coded that way. We didn't do that for anything else yet.
      iii) Susan didn't have time to create route maps and set up system to research what it does,
   d) **Row 1 – Only Cost Limit feeds to Financial if no Award Budget**. See Issue 9: Financial System Feed – OK to defer to KC3.0. Coeus doesn’t provide an FS feed out of the box & no one has KFS experience enough to make informed decisions about enhanced KFS integration. Let those implementing KC2.0 provide info for analysis.
   e) UC would like to change rows 82 (**Manually Override EB Cost**) and 83 (**Manually Override F&A Cost**) to priority 1 Must have – These are issues of functional equivalence, so they must be developed before KC merges with Coeus. Leave as 2 Nice to have for KC2.0 and add “Really nice to have.” Make note this is Functional Equivalence issue.

2) **Drop dead stop date for SME Changes to Specs & Mocks is Friday, 9/25/09** – Lead SMEs for PD/B and AWD met with Terry (DM), Kenton (LBA), Scott (QA Mgr) and Lori (Functional Project Mgr) to determine that all specs and mocks must be complete by 9/25.
   a) All changes after 9/25 go into enhancement pool for future consideration.

3) **Prioritize Enhancements**; Susan – We are out of resources and must cut scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhancement</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AW-27 Share Proposal Budget Module with Awards</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-23 Key Person Details – Developed?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-16 Populate Central Admin Contacts</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-25 Populate Non-Lead Unit Contacts</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-20 Validate Rates Parameter</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-21 Add Closeout Reports – Developed?</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KR-22 Notes, Linked Docs Display – No longer applicable?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-26 Link Funding Proposals of any Proposal Status</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-29 Increase Award Node Extension Digits – Check w/MIT?</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-14 Approve Equipment Below Capitalization Minimum</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-15 Equipment Warning, Approvals Exceed Budget</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW-28 Hyperlink Email</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Hierarchy Actions:** Susan  
Changes suggested by Terry Durkin to make development easier.  
a) Show/Hide will be removed from within the Hierarchy Actions panel, but will remain in the hierarchy pane  

5) **Main Menu:** Susan  
a) **Researcher tab:** Per discussion with Terry this morning, a multi-select for lookup criteria will require a Rice enhancement.  
i) Terry did not specifically address our sorting request.  
ii) For KC2.0, we’ll proceed with the “All My Awards” option from Researcher tab – This will return results of all Awards (any status) where the current logged in user is a PI, Co-I or Key Person.  
b) **Unit tab:** lookup (magnifying glass) – “+” will be removed from mocks  
c) **Central Admin tab:** add (+), lookup (magnifying glass) – Already done in mocks  

6) **Document Status Block** – Susan,  
Gray space or white space: Terry says it won’t be possible to develop & have it look good.  
PI Name: Lead Unit Name: Sponsor Name:  
Title (cut off)  
Doc Status Block Award ID: Account:  
a) Terry gave us 4 choices for static info on all tabs:  
1. **Document Status Block** – combine fields and distill information into 5 boxes in upper right  
2. **Add Bubble** – at top of all tabs (can’t make it less ‘fat’)  
3. **Show/hide Panel** – like the Budget Overview panel in Budget  
4. **Popup** – locate a button to show Award Summary near expand all/collapse all at top right  

7) **History:** Susan  
a) Per Terry, History has already been developed, so there will be no changes for KC2.0  

8) **Data Dictionary:** Susan  
a) Ed Kissam at CSU emailed Susan that Diane has been pulled away from SME duties to work on CSU implementation, so we need a volunteer to step in and help with the Data Dictionary by writing at least field level help entries.  
i) Neil will be assigned to writing Test Scripts or he would volunteer.  
ii) Susan is already finishing up specs, Renee is a QA Lead, Wendy is QA Test Script lead  
iii) No volunteers.  

9) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**  
a) **Please try to attend regular weekly SME meetings.** They will likely be short in future and used to address SME questions and approve development decisions  

10) **Questions and Roll Call**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Carmen, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) Main Menu: Susan
   - Researcher tab: I know we discussed this, but can’t find it in past minutes. Does anyone have documentation of prior discussion? If not, we’ll have to do it over!
     a) Would like a way to differentiate between active and inactive awards. (Renee)
     b) Cal U’s think current search is a confusing way to get to things
     c) We are probably not in a position to spearhead the search screen – may end up being Rice stuff
     d) If we are going to provide multiple filtered searches, what would they be called and what they would include? Search screen would look the same, but some of the selections would be pre-filled for the user.
       i) “My Current Awards” - to include active, funds advance, and hold for current logged in user
       ii) “All My Awards” - sorted by status – Includes all statuses except void for currently logged in user
     e) For Award Status in search screen – may need a multi-select rather than drop-down that only allows user to make one selection
   - Unit tab: lookup (magnifying glass)
   - Central Admin tab: add (+), lookup (magnifying glass)

2) Document Status Block – Susan,
   - Gray space or white space: Terry says it won’t be possible to develop & have it look good.
   - PI Name: Lead Unit Name: Sponsor Name:
   - Title (cut off)
   - Doc Status Block Award ID: Account:
   - Terry gave us 4 choices for static info on all tabs:
     1. Document Status Block – combine fields and distill information into 5 boxes in upper right
     2. Add Bubble – at top of all tabs (can’t make it less ‘fat’)
     3. Show/hide Panel – like the Budget Overview panel in Budget
     4. Popup – locate a button to show Award Summary near expand all/collapse all at top right

Comments:
1) Option 1- If we can’t get our original choice, we pick Option 1.
   a) Title is too long to go in Doc Status block
      i) Suggestion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI:</th>
<th>Tester, Joe</th>
<th>Document ID:Status:</th>
<th>291607: new</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Unit:</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Award ID: Account:</td>
<td>000212-001:400100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor:</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Last Update:</td>
<td>03/30/2009 10:06 AM by &lt;update user&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Bubble – Terry said size could not be changed – and this takes up too much space
3) **AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards** – Susan, Prioritize changes for deferral to KC3.0
   All Award Budget requests cannot be implemented in current KC 2.0 time frame.
   SME must prioritize changes
   a) List is still too long. Per Terry, cannot possibly get all of it in for Release 2.0.
      i) We cannot push back date.
   b) We need to prioritize what must get into Release 2 and what can be deferred to Release 3.
      i) We need to rank according to what is more important/needs to be done first.
      ii) The basic things we need are: Ability to create the periods, Summary, Personnel, Non-Personnel
      iii) Action: Susan to go down list of FR’s and ranks as Essential, Nice to Have, and Ok to Defer.
         (1) She will send list to voting members for review.

4) **History**: Susan
   We’ll continue discussion of ideas for a collapsed (simple) view of the History screen
   a) Let’s go with what Susan displayed in excel – looks good!
      i) Remove “Award” (in Award Version x)
      ii) Discussion of Notice Date. It is actually a text field.
   b) With expand/collapse; do we want chronological or reverse chronological order?
      i) Previously we had asked for chronological, starting with earliest at top, but with focus
         at most recent when panel is open. Terry said no. Susan to ask again?

5) **Agenda Add-in**: Bart made some updates to Hierarchy screen.
   a) If either Award Copy or New Child is selected, the other one will be hidden.
      i) Do we like this? Yes
      ii) Note: Award Copy pull down should not have select child as an option per Neil.
         Should say select award. Susan to get this changed.
   b) Do we want him to carry new look down to all other nodes? Any changes?
      i) We like.

6) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review**: Diane

7) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

8) **Spec Review/Issue Updates**:
   - **KC_AWD-Print** – Jessica
   - **KC_Shared-Notes** – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again
   - **KC_Shared-Medusa** – PD/B revised. UA/MSU will lead discussion?

9) **Mock Progress/Requests**: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

10) **New specs for review**: None

11) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
    - **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed
    - **KC_AWD-Award Lookup** – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs
      will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.

12) **Questions and Roll Call**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Ed, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley, Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1-3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) QA F2F Update: Susan or Renee
   a) Renee will be QA lead
   b) Susan will be updating spec

2) Design Critique 3 Report Analysis: Susan
   a) Summary Tab #14-Approved
   b) #15 – will discuss later today
   c) #17 – Berkeley comment - PI, Unit, Sponsor is one of first things they added to Coeus screens
      i) Susan thinks account and award number also important, Berkeley agrees
      ii) Any possibility to have this information be at top left of screen as a title? (Ken)
      iii) Chris/Cornell - Title is key to some PI’s, but it can be very lengthy. Perhaps even a few words could help.
   d) Suggestion: Award ID and Account could be put in document status block (white/right), the other text items above in gray space to left.
   e) Response to comments received after critique:
      i) We do not feel heading titles are needed for hierarchy tree descriptors
      ii) Question about use of dollar signs.
         (1) Discussion: Be consistent with KC standards. If not consistent anywhere, we agree this should be updated. In general, amounts in a list do not have a dollar sign. Totals and Subtotals do.
         (2) Recommendation – Get Rid of dollar signs in budget screens.
      iii) Add expand all/collapse all to History / View History? Yes, add this.
         (1) Discussion of Comments on View History, worthwhile to have collapsed view showing a simplified version? Susan will mock something on a spreadsheet and we will come back to this.
   f) Highlighting is now in mock screens.

   45- Document Status Block – Susan, outstanding item (see 2, c &d above as well)
   a) Suggest: In grey or white space
      PI Name (possibly just Surname), Lead Unit Name, Sponsor Agency Name (ie NIH), (Sponsor) Award ID, Account No., Title (Truncated)
   b) Separate: Award ID & Account – in white space

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
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AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards – Susan, to Terry Durkin for DM review
  a) This has been narrowed down to a few pages of differences between proposal budget and award budget

5) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane

6) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

7) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_AWD-Award Budget Printouts – Susan
   a) Tried to keep changes to a minimum to increase chances of getting this done for Release 2.
   b) Ron to confirm Unrecovered F&A appropriate title (pg 1), and will email Susan.
   c) Labels on printed Report should be identical to Labels on Print options.
   KC_Shared-Medusa – PD/B revised. UA/MSU will lead discussion?
   KC_AWD-Print – Jessica
   KC_Shared-Notes – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again

1) **Mock Progress/Requests**: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) Hierarchy Actions – suggested changes
      i) Instead of Show Details, whole line is hyperlink to open details
      ii) Get rid of buttons at right
      iii) New Child, Award Copy buttons removed, down to one line each (left to right)
      iv) Susan should be able to show us next week what this will look like

2) **New specs for review**: None

3) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   KC_AWD-Parameters – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed
   KC_AWD-Award Lookup – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.

4) **Questions and Roll Call**
   a) Ron still willing to take on Award look-up

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Ed, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley, Ken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Susan

a) Changes given to Developers
   i) AW27 is punch list to Terry of changes to Proposal budget to make it Award budget.

b) Permissions question
   i) Do we need to add a special permission for release 3.0 for budget initiator vs. budget approver?
   ii) Does workflow take care of this?
   iii) Don’t want people to edit along the way because then approval process would have to start over again?
      (1) Would SPO be exception to be able to edit and not send back for approval?
   iv) Wendy said this may be a business practice vs. system issue, and n/a here
      (1) Susan says, but would it be worthwhile to have a permission for someone to be able to make minor changes without killing the budget altogether and stopping the process?
      (2) Per Wendy, the Institution could just create a new role, (roles are flexible in the system), and this would not be needed out of the box.

c) Suggestion: Person with Approve Award budget role could have permission to make minor budget changes
   i) Would this be a Unit or Central Role?
   ii) At MSU, this is a Unit Role currently
   iii) Potential issue with this could be that one dept could approve budget and then forward on to another dept that makes major changes. 1st dept would not have to approve again and a budget they do not agree with could be put through.
      (1) Per Renee, when changes are made the system will send an acknowledgement back down to the other Units that are affected/have already taken action so that they are aware of changes. If they don’t agree they can work it out amongst themselves.

d) System administrator’s roles/permissions- Wendy to look into those listed.

e) Functional Requirements, con’t review from last week. Discussed differences from PD/B.
   i) Lines 339-343 – Grants.gov capability doesn’t apply to awards. Works more like Attachments for us.
   ii) It is a drop-down list requirement. For PD/B you used to have to extract xfd files, but now converted to pdf, so doesn’t work the same.
   iii) SME agrees to leave open to different types of documents rather than limiting to pdf’s
   iv) No errors associated with subaward panel – Susan will have Jessica help her double check these

f) Outstanding Issues
   i) Issue 1: Neil happy with federal vs. non-federal benefits rates based on response he received from San Diego and Irvine. Can close/resolve issue. Will send Susan an email
   ii) Issue 2: Next step is for Terry to get back to us.
      (1) Is this already resolved by workflow? Not sure – wait for Terry to answer.
   iii) Issue 4: Susan to update and close
   iv) Issue 5: A note for later.
v) Neil brought up issue regarding HR stuff.
   (1) FICA non/FICA split (applies to one group but not the other)
   (2) CORE applies or not applies
   (3) At IU have the same issue w/ faculty on grants vs. faculty not on grants
   (4) There are tables where you relate job codes to a cost element? Could it be picked up in
       job code, whether or not something applies?
       (a) For IU, yes.
       (b) For Berkeley???
   (5) Cornell has a variety of fringe rates as well – which are not associated with the job code.
       Based on college, sponsor.
       (a) For example all people in one college, 34%
       (b) Paid by NY State, 0%
       (c) Susan and Wendy think rates can be set up by Unit, which would handle this for the
           most part, but system may not be fool-proof.
       (i) Can also manually override

KC_Shared-Medusa – PD/B revised. UA/MSU will lead discussion?

2) New specs for review:
   KC_AWD-Print – Jessica
   a) Susan went over MSU comments.
      i) Wording changes in narrative sections
      ii) 4.1 – Add reference to capability for pdf documents
   b) Suggestion by MSU for separate use case for printing award notice and change (delta) report
      i) Need to talk this out. Susan does not necessarily agree we need to separate this.
      ii) MSU says change report requires user to enter more info to print what they want (for award is
           simpler)
          (1) Note: At Berkeley – the purpose of Award Notice is to reflect most recent changes to
              award. Neil doesn’t see need for separate change report. He can share a copy of what
              they do if desired.
          (2) We are keeping it for functional equivalence
          (3) What about putting print change report on history panel instead of here???? (No)
      iii) Back to the point, should this be 1 use case or 2?
          (1) Decision: Susan will split into two use cases, highlighting the change report as being
              different.
      iv) There are no error messages in Coeus
      v) Data Dictionary – Diane, what will you include? She will let Susan know.
   c) Changing Cost Sharing to Cost Share is not consistent with what PD has done.
      i) Suggestion: Awards will go back to using “Cost Sharing” and adjust our mock screens (so
          that KC is consistent across modules).
          (1) We will have to discuss with Terry to see if this can be changed based on what has
              already been developed
          (2) Susan will let DD and glossary know when decided so they can update accordingly.
   d) Order of how things print on award notice? Susan will bring 3 lists for group to review next time.
      i) Alphabetically?
      ii) In current Coeus order? (May be hard to figure out – seemed inconsistent when Jessica tried
          before)
      iii) Jean’s suggestion is to compare to order that data is shown on NGA, see if there is similar
          order across common federal sponsors

KC_Shared-Notes – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again

3) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
   AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards
4) **Design Critique 3 Report Analysis:** Susan  
   a) Participants wanted hierarchy selection/highlighting to be more prominent.  
      i) Accepted. SME likes appendix B! possibly use blue instead of yellow  
   b) Like suggestion of adding account number next to node number on subpanel titles  
   c) Suggestion to add acct number next to node in Transactions, source/destination account. (8)  
      i) Denied. SME not too sure about this idea. This is a back-office function & back-office should be aware of node numbers. Also this would clutter the screen. It already shows on the sub-panel above.  
   d) F&A Distribution (9) Add F&A Rate to Time & Money/ Direct/F&A Funds Distribution?  
      i) Denied. SME suggestion – add additional help text to tell user where they can locate the rates.  
      ii) Not a required area. Input by user. Would not add much value w/out having F&A Base- gets too complicated.  
   e) We will pick up next week with Budget Versions Tab  
5) **Mock Progress:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.  

6) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane  
   **Medusa / Institutional Proposal**  
   a) Susan to ask Lisa or Tyler if labels for Inst. Proposal are up to date. Should not be abbreviations. Should use ID (not No.)...  
   b) **Proposal No.** should be **Proposal ID** (Mock may need updating as well).  
   c) **Account** – not sure what this refers to? Is it the financial account ID?  
   d) Hesitant to change anything appearing in Proposal DD or KRA user guide – all pulling from those sources seem okay  
   e) Notice of Opp. – out of box is drop down with approx 3 choices. Is not numeric identifier.  
   f) In mock, things that are not editable should not be displayed as such.  
   g) Check boxes (CS, IDC, Special Rvw), assume indicate presences of data on IP record. These items currently not in Prop DD. Susan to check with Lisa/Tyler.  
   h) IDC rates should be F&A Rates  

7) **KC Glossary:** Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.  

8) **Design Critiques:** Susan, outstanding issues from **KC_AWD-DC Rvw Decisions** (in spec grid).  
   **21-Colleges have different F&A Rates** – Chris will bring suggestions if needed by Cornell  
   **45- Document Status Block** – Susan, outstanding item  

9) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**  
   **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed  
   **KC_AWD-Award Lookup** – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.  

10) **Questions and Roll Call**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Shelley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Susan

a) Susan still has 7 specs to go through to make sure we have all of our Award budget requirements
b) Had to make a few changes on things we previously discussed
c) Made a few additions to differences to Coeus
d) Need a quick turnaround
e) Has mostly been working in FR, system messages, DD
   1) Assumes a familiarity with Proposal Budget
f) System does not require that a budget is done
   1) If you do one, you do have to adhere to cost limit
   2) If no budget entered, would we still like to input some sort of cost limit to feed to financial system
   3) Neil suggests we also integrate an Anticipated amount to feed to financial system
   i. Susan will put a note in Design and Implementation notes
g) FR 7, High level list of PD Budget functionality n/a to Award budget
h) FR 9 – Read-only fields, this is new
i) FR 12 – Implied save upon submit
   1) Different from Prop Dev b/c PD doesn’t require actual submit, has behind-the-scenes workflow
j) FR 14 – Currently some issues with statuses. Once a document is denied, it can’t be routed again and you have to copy it and start over. Trying to fund a way for submitter to be able to make changes when needed rather than having to start over. Don’t know if this will be possible, not very likely with this release.
k) There are some things (FR 22-27) that Susan doesn’t completely understand. Will need help from Terry, Lisa (Proposal), or our SME. Let her know if you are familiar with any of these.
l) FR 30 – Think MIT AWD BGT parameter will go away now that we are basing Award budget on Prop Budget.
m) FR 31 – Likely won’t apply if don’t use SAP.
n) FR 49 – Won’t be in 2.0, flagged for future discussion – Permission for changing award budget before approving
o) Wendy to look at which permissions allow you to maintain different tables – FR 59-61
   1) Wendy will email it to her
   2) May be able to get rid of some of these
   3) Wendy says this should be in Contour, but she will email Wendy spreadsheet of summary of FR’s for Award permissions.
p) FR 68 – Residual funds, do we need to keep this in here? Susan will take out, move to N/A.
q) FR 74 – Duplicative of implied save – already taken care of – can delete or move to N/A section.
r) FR 75 – 82; Budget Statuses
   1) Should cancelled and rejected budget version be displayed? (FR 82). Susan thinks no.
s) When exactly does a new budget version get created?
   1) When opening AWD budget module,
      i. When creating a new or making certain changes—would assign new KC doc #, and next incremental award budget version.
      1. If rejected it would go away.

t) Coeus budget types, have types of new or rebudget
   1) Susan thinks system is capable of making this more descriptive.
   2) If new, system would assign type of new

u) Susan doesn’t think “Name” for budget version would be very useful to awards. We will have a version, so Name may not add much value.
   1) System can also tell if negative, positive, or zero, to label budget change as Decrease, Increase, or Re-budget.

Opening and creating budgets will be slightly different than it is in Prop Dev

w) Next new one is FR 52, budget start date.

x) FR 112 – UI change

y) FR 114 – manual override of F&A is a Coeus requirement that is different than PD/B

z) FR 118 – as a result of design critique.
   1) Show goal/ cost limits under Total Costs.
   2) Later may add back in a column, but that may be an information overload

aa) Couldn’t find anywhere in PD spec that they recognized two places to enter rates (negotiated rates & stipulations)
   1) Don’t know if just not relevant to them

bb) Adjustment key is required for MIT/SAP – don’t know if we need to keep or not out of the box. Terry can decide.

cc) EB rate in benefits panel will overwrite if present. Same with F&A

dd) FR 140- just added by Susan at Neil’s suggestion. Coeus equivalence to manually override EB…? Susan to research

ee) Why are both on and off campus rates shown if project is either all on campus or all off campus? Susan to consult with Lisa.

ff) Apply to Later Periods – this should not even be an option if you are in the last budget period

bg) FR 192- People are automatically in drop down – still need to put budget amount for them. Same functionality as Pd/B, but pulling data from Award personnel rather than Proposal Personnel

hh) Why do we allow zero base salary? Something particular to K award for grants.gov forms per Jessica.

ii) FR 326 – Changing the budget period dates…question for Terry or Lisa

**Design Requirements**

jj) Some differences, have already talked about most of them.

**KC_AWD-Comments** – Wendy will lead discussion?

a) Nothing to discuss yet. Waiting on feedback from Terry.

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again

a) MSU says this is currently a mess

b) Will be deferred to IRB release

1) Need to clarify with Terry

**KC_AWD-Print** – Jessica

a) MSU has lots of comments that were sent to Susan

b) Susan needs to go over comments and update once Award Budget is at or near completion.

**2) New specs for review:**

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Renee, Comments/Notes Combo abandoned, review again

a) MSU says this is currently a mess

b) Will be deferred to IRB release

1) Need to clarify with Terry

**3) New Enhancement Requests for Review:**

**AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards**
4) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

5) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane

   Medusa
   a) View Proposal > Award
      1) Change centric to centered. Remove i.e. & parentheses and make this a separate sentence.
      2) Another suggestion….A hierarchal view showing the relationship of Institutional Proposals to Awards and other Document types (Dev Props, Negotiations, and Subawards) with the Inst Prop as the top node of the hierarchy.
      3) We will go with second option here, and do something similar for View Award > Proposal
   b) View Award < Proposal
      4) Change centric to centered. Remove i.e. & parentheses and make this a separate sentence.

6) **KC Glossary:** Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

7) **Design Critiques:** Susan, outstanding issues from KC_AWD-DC Rvw Decisions (in spec grid).

   - 21-Colleges have different F&A Rates – Chris will bring suggestions if needed by Cornell
   - 45- Document Status Block – Susan, outstanding item

8) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**

   - **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed
   - **KC_AWD-Award Lookup** – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.

9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Agenda
Date: Wednesday, July 22, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Update from QA Kickoff at MSU: Susan & Renee

2) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   - KC_AWD-Create an Award – Susan, 99% SME-F; a couple final questions…
   - KC_AWD-Budget – Susan
   - KC_AWD-Time & Money – Susan, Need resolution of Issue 16: Std Workflow Rules for T&M…
   - KC_Shared-Medusa – PD/B revised

3) New specs for review:
   - KC_AWD-Comments – Barbara
   - KC_AWD-Print – Jessica

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
   - AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards

5) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

6) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
   Resolve duplicate definitions of Project Start Date and Project End Date in DD/Glossary.
   Revised Project Start Date and Project End Date
   Time & Money / Award Hierarchy
   Award / Funding Proposals (outstanding issue)

7) KC Glossary: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

   21-Colleges have different F&A Rates – Chris will bring suggestions iff needed by Cornell
   45- Document Status Block – Susan, outstanding item

9) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   - KC_AWD-Parameters – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed
   - KC_AWD-Award Lookup – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.

10) Questions and Roll Call
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, July 15, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Pre-QA SME Testing: Test & create bug Jiras by this Fri, 7/17/09. Problems? Progress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functionality</th>
<th>SME Tester(s)</th>
<th>Bugs rptd? 7/1-7/8</th>
<th>Bugs rptd? 7/9-7/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subawards</td>
<td>Tara Gonzales, UofA</td>
<td>No, tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Ron Schultz, JHU</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes-8, 1 major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Share</td>
<td>Carmen Morales &amp; Diane Rees, CSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2503-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A Rates</td>
<td>Renee Dolan, MSU</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Rates</td>
<td>Marva Ruther, ISU</td>
<td>not yet rptd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaward Authorizations</td>
<td>Jeff Klein, ISU</td>
<td>Not yet rptd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment &amp; Invoices</td>
<td>Renee Dolan, MSU</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports &amp; Report Tracking</td>
<td>Wendy Derby, MSU</td>
<td>Blockers for all!</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Carey Conover, IU</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Eqmt &amp; Foreign Travel</td>
<td>Tara Gonzales, UofA</td>
<td>No, tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown, Cornell</td>
<td>Still working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/F&amp;A Funds Distribution</td>
<td>Bill Payne, Cornell</td>
<td>No, tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Template</td>
<td>Susan working on entering templates</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, Still working</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contacts: Ron having issue adding a project person, gets an error that unit is required, but doesn’t take him to a search screen/insert a unit.

a) Wendy already logged this bug and could not find a work-around

Cost Share: Prime sponsor and modification ID marked as required, already bugged

Tips for bugs:

a) QA home page – has a link to create a bug
   i) There is a list of all open Awards issues/bugs

b) Also, can log onto JIRA and search for bugs with Award in title.
   i) Should be logged in: Project: KRA Coeus QA Feedback.
   ii) Sometimes duplicates are created and will be caught later.
       (1) However, is useful to check for duplicates up front as time permits.
       (2) As number of bugs increase, may be too tedious for each tester to look for duplicates each time they need to do a JIRA for a bug.

c) Creating a bug
   i) Description should be a step-by-step description of how you got to bug including what field you entered (was it a drop-down, what did you select or enter), what happened, and what should have happened
   ii) Classifying correctly is very important
   iii) Can add watchers and watchers will be copied on emails sent related to the bug
iv) Profile, Edit Preferences, check box “email me when changes...” will determine if you get copied on emails related to bugs you have created.

d) Currently in REG, have to pull up award you have created by dates under doc search unless you have document number. Also need to reference the document number in the JIRA.

e) Go ahead and try to break things. Do put in letters in date fields, etc. and see what happens.

f) Don’t worry about the appearance of screen layouts right now.

g) Stay away from maintenance tables for now. This will be tested later.

2) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

KC_AWD-Time & Money – Susan, Need resolution of Issue 16: Std Workflow Rules for T&M…

a) Neil wrote workflow for segregation of duties for Award Maintainer vs. Time & Money Maintainer

b) Susan will submit the spec for Development Review

KC_AWD-Create an Award – Susan

a) Has a few questions – almost finished

b) Statuses appearing in Current & Pending were determined

c) Discussion of locking of documents

i) Should a budget document in process lock the entire hierarchy? We think no.

ii) Jessica suggested we talk to Rhonda about how this works in Proposal Development.

Susan will talk to her.

d) Updated some of the error messages

e) Needs to add some KC screen shots

f) Almost done – has received few comments – time is running out for comments on this, so send them on.

g) Discussion of how the Award statuses may affect KFS. In KFS, CSU is having problems stopping expenses posting from accounts that they shouldn’t post to. Currently the only mechanism they have to control this is the end date. Perhaps when they implement KC, these statuses will extremely useful.

KC_AWD-Budget – Neil

KC_Shared-Medusa – PD/B revised

a) Susan plans to seek clarification. She is not sure it is appropriate to add references to Notes in the Medusa spec.

b) The changes don’t necessarily say anything that is wrong, but not clear if it belongs here.

c) Not sure about error message “No negotiation exists for…Do you want to …?” – User shouldn’t be able to make that mistake. (Should be no open button if nothing exists).

3) New specs for review:

KC_Shared-Current & Pending Support – Don (PD/B has already reviewed)

a) MSU and UA sent comments

b) Discussion of Awards on Hold. When IP linked to Award, and status changed to Funded, but Award is “Hold”, the Award does not show up on current and pending support currently.

c) SME agrees HOLD should be included in Current Support.

i) HOLD would be set as status at the discretion of the Institution if they had internal questions or issues to clear up before the award feeds to the financial system.

ii) With a HOLD status input by Institution, most likely from the sponsor’s point of view, the award is executed.
iii) Can generate C&P from selection in person table as well. Need to add this to spec.
iv) This will become SME Final after these changes (assuming no additional comments to come).

KCAWD-Comments – Barbara
KCAWD-Print – Jessica

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards
AW-28 Hyperlink Email – Susan
a) This was written as a result of Design Critique Feedback report.
b) Approved as is! SME - Final

5) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

?Transactions – MSU, Do we need Transaction Type at Document AND Transaction levels? How?
a) MSU has decided they are fine with things as is.

6) Design Critique 3: Thursday, 7/16/09 3-5pm EDT!, Participant lists went to Carey by Tues, 7/14?
a) We have 22 confirmed participants
   i) IU
   ii) UA
   iii) Cornell
   iv) Princeton
   v) Brown
   vi) Rosemary (from Coeus/MIT)
   vii) MSU Approx. 11-12 (not included in 22 above) to be added to the list

7) KCAWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
Resolve duplicate definitions of Project Start Date and Project End Date in DD/Glossary.
a) Diane will re-work, and we will give final approval next week.
Award / Funding Proposals (outstanding issue)
a) Diane to check back with Keith on outstanding issue.
Award / Details & Dates / Time & Money (4 fields to review)
a) Obligation Start Date
b) Obligation End Date
c) Anticipated Amount
d) Obligated Amount
e) Like these all as is. Chris to compare to glossary.
Payment, Reports & Terms / Special Approval / Approved Equipment
a) Item: Suggest moving examples to right after ‘equipment.’ Instead of special approval use ‘sponsor approval.’
b) Vendor – change to ‘item’ to ‘equipment’
c) Model – The alphanumeric descriptor that identifies the equipment to be purchased.
d) Amount – Approved dollar amount of the equipment to be purchased.
Payment, Reports & Terms / Special Approval / Approved Foreign Travel
a) Traveler Name – Name of the person traveling to a foreign destination
b) Destination – As is
c) Start Date/End Date – as is.
d) Discussion of Foreign vs. International Travel – to be continued next week.

8) KCAW Glossary: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
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21- Colleges have different F&A Rates – Chris will bring suggestions if needed by Cornell

45- Document Status Block – Susan, outstanding item

10) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings

KC_AWD- Parameters – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed
KC_AWD- Award Lookup – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.

11) Questions and Roll Call

  a) Meeting next week? YES
     i) Those at F2F should have conference room with phone available

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Jessica, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Cheryl, Marva, Don, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Pre-QA SME Testing:** Test & create bug Jiras by Fri, 7/17/09. Any issues? Progress?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functionality</th>
<th>SME Tester(s)</th>
<th>Bugs rptd? 7/1-7/8</th>
<th>Bugs rptd? 7/9-7/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subawards</td>
<td>Tara Gonzales, UoFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Ron Schultz, JHU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Share</td>
<td>Carmen Morales &amp; Diane Rees, CSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A Rates</td>
<td>Renee Dolan, MSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Rates</td>
<td>Marva Ruther, ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaward Authorizations</td>
<td>Jeff Klein, ISU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment &amp; Invoices</td>
<td>Renee Dolan, MSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Carey Conover, IU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Eqmt &amp; Foreign Travel</td>
<td>Tara Gonzales, UoFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown, Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/F&amp;A Funds Distribution</td>
<td>Bill Payne, Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Template</td>
<td>Susan working on entering templates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system has been not cooperating and there are big bugs that aren’t allowing users to proceed….these issues have been JIRA’d and moved to development by Wendy. Please continue to try and test your assigned sections if possible.

2) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**
   - **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Susan
   - **KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil

   No progress, didn’t review

3) **New specs for review:**
   - **KC_Shared-Current & Pending Support** – Don (PD/B has already reviewed)
   - **KC_AWD-Comments** – Barbara
   - **KC_AWD-Print** – Jessica

Current/pending: MSU has submitted their changes and they’ve already been adopted into spec

4) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:**
   - **AW-29 Increase Award Node Extension Digits**, Susan, trim leading 0’s from Award, node suffix?
   - **AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards**

5) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

   **History**
   - **Transactions** – MSU, Do we need Transaction Type at Document AND Transaction levels? How?

   In Award tab and Details & Dates panel which sub-panels do we want to default to open? (Susan)
1) Sponsor/Time&Money should be, and institution if we can (Neil)
2) Can we have different defaults based on edit/view mode? (Renee)
3) For the view then I would only want them to see sponsor funding transfer (Susan)
4) All sub-panels seem okay, and doesn’t like to keep hitting the show button (Neil)
5) Show hide on sponsor funding transfer/current action (if view) but see if the others could be all open
6) Could we change order of main panels? Or include Funding proposal info into the Details/Dates panel? (Cheryl)

History: changes made based on SME comments
1) Column labels were upgraded to be clearer from grey to black in finer font
2) Changes to lefthand column with doc # hyperlinked and trans hyperlinked expands detail….we’re asking scrollable div be bigger. Also, the doc # and tran # differentiated.
3) Group: Take another look and let Susan know if any other changes need to made

Hierarchy Actions:
1) View full/single node versions
   a. Single node view 001, does it always bring it up to the parent? (Cheryl)
   b. Yes, because all single nodes only have parent, always rolling up to 001(Susan)
   c. Number extension necessary? (Neil)
   d. Group decided they’d only want to see acct # not extension

Budget:
1) Do we want to have the user navigate through time/money to get to budget or have a direct link from Budget versions?? (Susan)
2) That would be nice to have direct link since we don’t know how this is going to be utilized (Neil)
3) Updates to mocks
   a. Limits section re-titled due to what proposal dev budget uses
      i. Is this scope of 2.0? (Neil)
      ii. Most likely it’s still 3.0 but still going over with Terry (Susan)
   b. Budget Overview section
      i. Bothered by empty space on left and decrease space between the columns (Neil)
   c. Budget panel:
      i. Would transactions show up here? Start/End dates?(Cheryl)
      ii. Need to think about this for financial system feed (Susan)
      iii. Perhaps pull from details/dates? But might cause issues…(Susan)
      iv. Which would you prefer actual budget start end date or the project period of award?
      v. Problem displaying info that is not consistent above (Neil)
      vi. Only be a disconnect with budget start/end dates when a budget is due and they haven’t yet done a budget….or there is not an amount change in that time (Susan)
      vii. Show actual start/end dates of project (Cheryl)
   viii. Group: we want the summary of the transaction
   ix. T&M column = transaction sequence # in Coeus? when a user isn’t creating a version but rather editing for error 1.1 to 1.2 (using edit button not new entry)
   x. Moot point for versions in KC, so we should make T&M column reference the associated Time/Money dock that the budget neds to validate against (Neil/Susan)
   xi. Okay with T&M Doc Abbreviation? YES
xii. Budget Start/end/change or obligation start/end/change???
xiii. Like budget (Neil)
xv. Past posted means it’s history vs. current posted which is still active…..should it be just posted? And then version number is more current?
xvi. YES, just posted, get rid of other posted categories (Cheryl/MSU)
xvii. Reverse chronological transaction?
   1. No (Cheryl ISU) No (MSU) Yes (Carey IU) Yes (Ron Coeus, other Inst.like to have most current info on top), YES (UA), YES (Neil-Berkeley), YES (Cornell) with totals on bottom
xviii. Does the order of columns in the panel make sense???
   No objection
d. Budget limits:
   i. How do you translate in your financial system? (Cheryl)
   ii. Cost element numbers are included (Susan)
   iii. Need detail of cost element numbers in salary
   iv. Does 0.00 mean no limit? Or that the cost limit is 0.00? (Cheryl)
      1. 0.00 should be not allowed and blank or NA for no limit (Cheryl)
      2. blank for no limit, 0.00 for limited (Neil)
v. In Budget
   1. need to remove applicable rate column in F&A rate table for award
   2. Distribution/Income tab: Cost share vs. cost sharing table
      a. Award will populate top panel
      b. We have type/destination/cost share met/verification met fields….do we want to add these or keep only the fields brought in from prop dev? Or kill the whole tab? Please develop opinions and we’ll come back
c. Look at cost sharing tab and see what we want to include/not include
d. Audit problems with fy field in cost sharing, so try to address (will be an enhancement in 3.0)
e. Reverse chronological order
f. Dev opinion about unrecovered FA panel
g. Project income panel?

(Action Item) Group: please look through these mocks and let Susan know any details you notice that need correction. Specifically Award Budget mocks/Distribution & Income tab

6) Design Critique 3: Rescheduled to Thursday, 7/16/09 3-5pm EDT!
   Send list of participants to Carey by Tuesday, 7/14/09

7) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane

8) KC Glossary: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

21-Colleges have different F&A Rates – Chris will bring suggestions iff needed by Cornell
45- Document Status Block – Susan, outstanding item

10) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings 
   KC_AWD-Parameters – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed 
   KC_AWD-Award Lookup – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we’ll be consistent.

11) Questions and Roll Call

UA: Susan, Jessica
MSU: Renee, Wendy
IU: Carey
ISU: Cheryl, Marcus, Jeff, Don
Coeus: Ron
Berkely: Neil
Cornell: Chris, Bill
Hawaii: absent
1) Pre-QA SME Testing:
   a) Test is REG environment: https://test.kuali.org/kra-reg/ OR can use CNV test environment if REG is not working
      i) JIRA’s to be done by Friday, July 17
   b) Note things like filed that is marked required but isn’t
   c) Compare REG environment to spec and find inconsistencies
      i) Determine if Developers need to fix REG or we need to update SPEC
   d) Side Note: Let Susan know of any roster changes
   e) Assignments: (Volunteers first, remainder assigned by Susan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functionality</th>
<th>SME Tester(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subawards</td>
<td>Tara Gonzales, UofA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>Ron Schultz, JHU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Share</td>
<td>Carmen Morales &amp; Diane Rees, CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F&amp;A Rates</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Rates</td>
<td>Marva Ruther, ISU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaward Authorizations</td>
<td>Jeff Klein, ISU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment &amp; Invoices</td>
<td>Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports &amp; Report Tracking</td>
<td>Wendy Derby, MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Carey Conover, IU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Eqmt &amp; Appvd Foreign Travel</td>
<td>Tara Gonzales, UofA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown, Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct/F&amp;A Funds Distribution</td>
<td>Bill Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Template (need to get some into DB)</td>
<td>Susan working on this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   f) Wendy has been playing with things this week in REG and has noticed error not allowing user to exit Awards tab
   g) See Kuali Coeus Quality Assurance Home Page
      i) Far right has link to all environments
      ii) Below that FAQ and step-by-step instructions for entering a bug
         (1) To do a JIRA, same username and password as Confluence
   h) If you have never tested before, it would be useful to meet with the QA coordinator at your Institution
   i) Send Susan an email if you think we need to take meeting time to go over Testing and Bug reporting.
      i) Wendy thinks we should focus on specs in meeting
      ii) New plan: Contact Susan if you need help and do not know who your QA coordinator is, we will not take up meeting time

2) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
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a) UC 1, N, step 12
   i) Do not send notices for transactions that cancel each other out…
   ii) Per Terry, we can write a workflow rule that only sends when transaction amount is not zero
       (1) Different types of notices, acknowledgement, etc.
       (2) Can also do ad-hoc Notices
       (3) User decides if they want to get emails periodically
           (a) They can turn off Notices completely and just work off of their action list if they prefer
       (4) For future (Release 3.0?) may be possible to customize the content
       (5) Not possible to send aggregate notices
           (a) Each transaction gets a notice

b) UC 3, Alternate 2
   i) Yes, we did intend for person to be able to break lock if they have permissions
   ii) This is a low priority and may need to be deferred depending on how development progresses

c) FR – line 12
   i) Root Award to be versioned when hierarchy amount changes
   ii) Terry said will not be able to consistently do this
       (1) Should they do it where possible or not all?
       (2) Will do it when possible. Will occur when T&M doc is committed / submitted.

d) FR – line 48
   i) Implied save with each “add”
       (1) Because we are not moving between tabs, there is not an implied save
   ii) He prefers not have the implied save because it will effect performance
   iii) Is implied save or performance more important to us?
       (1) We will proceed without implied save with each “add”

e) FR – line 24
   i) We may use inquiries temporarily as an interim solution
   ii) This is an area we may have to defer due to time constraints

f) Workflow – one office to enter T&M transaction and another office to approve – is this possible?
   i) Potentially
       (1) This can happen if this is what we want
   ii) Workflows are optionally applied
   iii) We need to provide rules for what workflow options are provided out-of-the-box
       (1) Rules would include what happens if something goes wrong – person ignores item to be approved, or person wants to deny
   iv) Can assign workgroups for workflow

g) Button/link to History from Details & Dates
   i) Terry says OK.

h) Terry prefers reverse chronological order
   i) Susan to make change to spec

i) Elimination of leading zeroes
   i) Concern of searching and being able to pull up just the root level in last weeks meeting
       (1) Search of *-1 will give only root awards
   ii) Terry says data is actually different (not just a change in display of data)
iii) Terry says data migration would not be a big deal
iv) This is a preference decision for us
   (1) Neil/Berkeley – says definitely get rid of it on the suffix, leaning towards getting rid of zeroes on base award number
   (2) Diane/CSU – says definitely get rid of it on the suffix, indifferent to keeping the leading zeroes on base award number
   (3) Ron – commented that zeroes on base award number help orient user to how large the number is, get rid of zeroes on suffix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Award – keep zero, Suffix – trim zero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Award – keep zero, Suffix – trim zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Trim both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Trim both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Trim both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) Agree to trim leading zeroes from suffix
(5) Close to a tie on award number
(6) Susan to ask if this can be a parameter per Ron’s suggestion
   (a) If it can’t, we will need to get Cornell’s opinion and vote again

KC_AWD-Create an Award – Barbara
a) Barb is off the hook
b) Susan working on remaining issues
c) Provide corrections or concerns to Susan
d) Functional Requirements
   i) What happens if User has Award lock and tries to go to Time & Money? What is locked? Locks influence each other.
   ii) What happens if User has Time & Money lock and tries to submit an Award document? What is locked? Locks influence each other.
   iii) Suggestion: Warning displayed by system when user leaving Award document, as follows:
       (1) You are leaving a document that is locked, would you like to
           (a) Save & Continue?
           (b) Cancel navigation?
           (c) Open in Read-Only?
   iv) When leaving Time & Money with lock: System asks user:
       (1) Commit changes you have in progress (then open award for editing)
       (2) OR, open award in read-only?
v) Award Status Table
   (1) What is to be included in Current and Pending Support?
       (a) Only Active awards are included
       (b) (Pending comes from Proposals)
       (c) What happens to projects that have Funded proposals, but Awards are coded Pending, where would these show up?
           (i) Questioning whether Pending, Hold should be included? Jessica to test
           (ii) Funds advance to be included in C & P – not able to test because it is a new status
   (2) Changes made to table in spec for Y/N for some attributes
e) Tab Order – Standard
   i) Exception that Title is last in Institution subpanel
   ii) Note: Get through one subpanel before moving to next

KC_AWD-Budget – Neil

3) New specs for review:
   KC_Shared-Current & Pending Support – Don (PD/B has already reviewed)
   KC_AWD-Comments – Barbara
   KC_AWD-Print – Jessica

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
   AW-29 Increase Award Node Extension Digits, Susan (more input from Terry) …trim leading 0s from node? Maybe we ditch '0000001-001', '0000001-000001' model, & just do 1-1, 1-2, 2-1, etc? This would change the data itself, not just the display. We can trim Awd#, Node extension, or both. Data migration is NOT a problem. We WILL be able to search for list of root awards (*-1).
   AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards

5) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   History - Could bring entire history panel into AWD doc or possibly do it as a pop-up. We can also have ‘history’ button on D&D that opens T&M doc in view mode w/History open. Terry prefers History be in reverse-chron order. It would be confusing for user to enter doc at bottom of a panel.
   ?Transactions – MSU, Do we need Transaction Type at Document AND Transaction levels? How?

6) Design Critique 3: Thursday, 7/9/09 3-5pm EDT! Send list of participants to Carey by when? By next Tuesday
   a) https://test.kuali.org/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=187236633
      i) Sample invitation – make sure you change times to be locally correct
      ii) Carey has uploaded a list of past participants

7) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
   a) Time & Money / Transactions / New Transaction
   b) Award / Funding Proposals / Institutional Proposal Version (follow up from 6/17/09)
      i) Waiting to here from Keith Young, DD editor for Proposal
   c) Notice Date – Accepted, correct typo in notified
   d) Award / Details & Dates / Action Overview (Follow up from 6/17/09)
   e) Special Review (follow up from 6/24/09)
      i) Protocol #
         (1) Do we need to define Protocol? No
         (2) Took these definitions from KRA 1.1 User Guide – leave as is
      ii) Expiration Date
         (1) Remove commas
         (2) The date upon which the existing approval expires.
      iii) Are these already defined by Proposal?
         (1) They may not be as far along in the DD as we are – but Diane thinks they have done this section using the KRA User Guide. Diane to check on this.
      iv) Exemption #
         (1) May not always be six categories?? Don’t refer to six, so if this changes we don’t have to update DD. This is multi-select.
         (2) Suggestion: A numeric reference to the category(ies) of research which are exempt from the requirements of Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects as specified in 45 CFR 46.101(b). Related to Institutional Review Board (Human Participants) only.
v) Comments
   (1) Institutional remarks relevant to the protocol or special review item.

8) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.

9) **Design Critiques**: Susan, outstanding issues from **KC_AWD-DC Rvw Decisions** (in spec grid).
   21-**Colleges have different F&A Rates** – Chris will bring suggestions if needed by Cornell
   45-**Document Status Block** – Susan, outstanding item

10) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
    - **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Barbara, Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed
    - **KC_AWD-Award Lookup** – We probably need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from std. Rice. PD/B SME is writing their spec now, so we'll be consistent.

11) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Jessica, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Don, Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

**Merge Permissions with Contacts?** – For KC3.0, IRB suggested moving Assigned Roles panel for overview, and assign permissions as a detail sub-panel for each appropriate person. Would it be appropriate for Awards to move the Permissions tab next to Contacts?

  a) Contacts tab potentially to become Contacts & Permissions.
     i) Potentially another show/hide for permissions for each person in Contacts tab
     ii) Berkeley likes this idea, CSU does too.
  b) Another alternative – Move separate Tab to be right after contacts
     i) UA prefers this to option 1, likes to have two separate tabs because two separate functions-simpler. Order of tabs not too important to UA.
     ii) If this option is taken, Berkeley prefers that at a minimum, the tabs are next to each other.
     iii) Chris – Cornell – Separate tabs, doesn’t care about order. MSU agrees with this.
     iv) ISU would put Permissions tab to end. – see f, i below.
  c) Brought up by IRB Module, we are evaluating currently for consistency – which option do we like?
  d) Will there still be a single place that you are able to go to assign all permissions/roles? (Maintenance level) Yes
     i) Changes at the detail level in specific award would override the maintenance level permissions.
     ii) This would enable workflow to be managed at award level
  e) Was there a reason to separate them in first place?
     i) Not necessarily
     ii) Module specific tabs show first, then shared tabs to the right – that is why it was originally placed over there (shared)
  f) Permissions tab currently could include any employee – if this is combined with Contacts, Contacts will show any individual that has any permission, including view-only. For some institutions, this list could get very long and Contacts tab information could become overwhelming.
     i) If limited to only show permissions for actual contacts added at time of award creation, instead of permissions for everyone, on Contacts tab - ISU and Berkeley prefer this.
  g) Carey at Indiana – not voting member, but only one here, could go either way.

2) **Schedule Design Critique 3:** Carey, UXG NOT Available T 7/14 1-2pm, Th 7/16 9-11am & T 7/21 1-2pm

  a) Focus is time & money and budget
  b) Tentative July 9th.
     i) 3-5pm eastern, (2-4 or 1-3 for different time zones
  c) Carey to contact UXG team to lock in this date

3) **Testing Planning:**

  a) SME’s are expected to test
  b) 3 hour block per week minimum per person
  c) Kenton prefers 1 person at 15 hrs/week vs. 5 people at 3 hrs/week
  d) If interested in testing, please coordinate with testing coordinator for your Institution now to get familiar with process for testing, reporting bugs, creating Jiras, etc. List of testing coordinators is listed in Confluence.
  e) Please send Susan names and # of hours person will be available per week.
i) Provide to her by Monday - Susan has QA meeting on Tuesday.

f) From last week’s minutes: ALL QA PREP @ MSU (creating test scenarios) July 20-24th

i) People in mind: Renee, Wendy, Iowa, Neil, Barb, Cheryl, Marcus, Don (and anyone else that’s able and has travel funds?)

   g) Side Note: Aug 17-21, IU, Award Module specific kickoff QA, anyone welcome – whoever the school can afford to send

4) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane

   a) Award/Sponsor Template

   b) Time & Money / Transactions / New Transaction

   c) Award / Funding Proposals / Institutional Proposal Version

      i) Yes, is the sequence number for proposal data

      ii) Default would be version 1. It is a whole number. Mock shows 1.2 – this is not correct – would be 1 or 2.

      iii) Can link any IP to any award by inserting # in Medusa in Coeus….it is just informational.

      iv) Need to be clear with last sentence and make sure we understand what is happening.

         (1) Wendy to discuss with Lisa from IP and make sure this is true. Wendy to come back to Diane with suggestion.

   d) Award / Details & Dates / Action Overview

      i) Transaction Type

         (1) Decision: A description of the reason for adding or modifying Award data. Can add parenthetical examples.

      ii) Notice Date – not always the date the institution became aware of transaction. Different schools use / interpret this differently. Berkeley interprets this date as the date they notify the dept of the award.

         (1) Where is this field in Coeus?

         (2) Need to contact Rosemary for intent of this field at MIT

         (3) Help text is customizable by Institution

         (4) Ron says this is new functionality and can look into it.

      iii) Comments. Accepted as is.

   e) Payment, Reports & Terms / Payment & Invoices

      i) Payment Basis - use alternate as listed

      ii) Final Invoice – “current date” should be “project end date.” Remove “line item.”

      iii) Payment Method – The mechanism for obtaining payment from the funding source. Keep for example…

      iv) Document Funding ID – accept as is - except formatting change to use For Example instead of ie.

      v) Diane to go through DD and change all “ie” to “For Example” for consistency.

   f) Payment, Reports & Terms / Payment & Inv

5) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

   KC_AWD-Time & Money – SME-F

   a) System Messages redone – please review and send any comments to Susan ASAP.

   b) Put a view of history on panel in Awards screen in addition to Time & Money? Does this lessen the clicks to get to history? Not less clicks, but may be easier for user to find if it.

      i) There also can be administrative changes - like a PI change – that would show up in History. Shows financial and non-financial changes.

      ii) The reason it is on Time & Money currently is that it is node specific.

      iii) Suggestion from Ron – Link from Award, Details & Dates: have a Show History button– which will take you to History in Time & Money

         (1) For now, Susan will see if this is a possibility and we will come back to this topic later.

   c) Action Summary only has Time & Money transactions.

   d) Issue 8: A simpler view for future release if no hierarchy existed.

      i) Susan has listed which fields would still apply

      ii) Additional Functional requirements added

      iii) Terry said this should probably be ready for Release 2 rather than delayed to Release 3 in order to serve the majority of the users (lots of schools will have relatively flat hierarchies).
iv) Group needs to review and give Susan feedback or suggestions.
e) For now, Susan needs to leave this spec alone and let Terry have a chance to read it.

**KC_AWD-Create an Award Hierarchy – SME-F (Use Cases, FRs, DRs are changed)**

a) Down to 2 use cases
b) For Comments = Copied Award, Jessica suggests that similar to Proposal, we state Copied Award No.x123x111. (List specific award number).
   i) Reference award number that was copied?
      1) YES (2 schools) Cornell, UA
      2) NO (1 school) Iowa State
      3) No preference (3 schools) Berkeley, IU, MSU
   ii) Susan will see what the cost is – free or cheap?
c) Susan to ask Rosemary (or check Coeus again later to see if it is working) about Effect of Copy Functions on Attachments – not currently functioning in Coeus.
d) Sync to parent is deferred functionality
e) Filtered search is deferred
f) Enhancement written for increasing number of extension digits for award node

**KC_AWD-Create an Award** - Barbara

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil

6) New specs for review:

- **KC_Shared-Current & Pending Support** – Don (PD/B has already reviewed)
- **KC_AWD-Comments** – Barbara
- **KC_AWD-Print** – Jessica

7) New Enhancement Requests for Review:

- **AW-29 Increase Award Node Extension Digits**
  a) Agree with low priority?
    i) ISU says medium
    ii) Will not effect a lot of Institutions, but for those who are affected, it is a lot easier and cheaper to do now.
  b) Change priority to medium.
  c) Suppress leading zeros?
    i) Susan to ask Terry, maximum of 5, but is it possible for each Institution to decide how many digits they will display?

- **AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards**

8) **KC Glossary** : Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review.
   Archive location, Closeout, Faculty, Organization Name, Small Business Subcontracting Plan

9) **Design Critiques**: Susan, outstanding issues from **KC_AWD-DC Rvw Decisions** (in spec grid).

   - **21-Colleges have different F&A Rates** – Chris will bring suggestions if needed by Cornell
   - **45- Document Status Block** – Susan, outstanding item

10) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**

   - **KC_AWD-Award Lookup** – We probably will need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from standard Rice functionality. Proposal doing one now, so we’ll wait and make sure we’re consistent.

   - **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed

   - **Person Mass Change** has been deferred to 3.0 to allow appropriate enhancement.

11) **Questions and Roll Call**

   - **Note – Person Mass change deferred to 3.0**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Jessica, Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Ed, Dawn, Carmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Don, Marcus, Cheryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

*KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee

a) May add small section at top of Details & Dates, which will allow us to get rid of Action Overview section here.
   i) Or set-up of Action Overview may change to pure data entry without add rows.

b) Gateway to Time & Money as separate document would be through a blue Time & Money button next to Medusa button. (Actually Medusa blue button is going away and it is becoming a tab so they are switching places).
   i) Time & Money tab currently shown would disappear.
   ii) Why are we doing this? It is a separate document. If it was on its own tab, the tab would merely have a button to take user to time & money

c) A mock has been decided on for layout
   i) The static screen is more straightforward for developers, and allows for changes coming with Release 3.0
   ii) Also allows more space on left for award info to display (PI name, acct #, etc.)
   iii) For later release, there is space to left of current / pending where button(s) would be added for different views (Direct/Indirect for example) in top section of Award Hierarchy.

d) Ron is concerned with the user’s eye being able to follow which node they are looking at when user is toggling back and forth between different views.
   i) For example, if looking at node 25 and switch views, node 25 would need to be displayed on same place on computer screen and still be bolded when new view is shown. (Would not want screen to go back to the top and show node 1, if we were working with node 25 before view was switched).

e) Discussed concern of not having collapsibility with this UI.
   i) However, user will have collapsible view choice that just shows total.

f) Does anyone prefer tabbing over scrolling?
   i) No – scrolling is preferred for this screen.

g) There will be new mock screens Susan can show us next week.

h) Discussion of Time & Money Transaction.
   i) Side Note – Susan does not believe Explanation is required on Award tab – Document Overview panel. This will need to be corrected.

j) Spec changes
   i) User Classes updated – additional classes for this spec as compared to most other specs
   ii) Action Summary and history are not the same thing, so we can’t combine them. Susan to add Action Summary in User Requirements (in #3). Add Direct / F& A Funds Distribution as well.
iii) We don’t have an EOM process exactly like Coeus – this is listed as a resolved issue. Appendix 3 has documentation describing this.
   (1) Action Summary is a higher level overview. All deals with obligations, does not list sequences or versions.
   (2) History – to be discussed next week.

k) Spec – Use Cases
   i) Re-did UC 1 & 2
   ii) Q for thought – Is there a search, or does it automatically do “create new” every time user clicks Time & Money button?
      (1) There is not a deny, so everything is auto-approved. But what if user gets distracted in the middle of an entry and needs to go back to recall it?

iii) Walked through UC 1
   (1) Can delete transactions, but only by backing out most recent transaction one at a time.
   (2) Transaction Type is going to be taken off of Transactions Panel.
      (a) Comment will remain.
      (b) No date here.
      (c) Because Time & Money is its own Document, the Transaction Type will be entered at the Document level.
         (i) Therefore, it will be entered, but not on this Panel.
         (ii) It will show in History.
   (3) Transaction Type and Date both show in History.
      (a) History also shows interim system transactions with net effect of zero.
      (b) For example, moving funds from node 1 to node 3 would show a “flow-thru” entry for node 2 in History. (Note to Susan, other options to consider: Intermediate Transfer or Intermediate Transaction)
      (c) Ron likes flow-thru.
      (d) Neil and Susan to discuss offline. Neil brought up there may not necessarily be a zero effect on intermediate node, so referring to zero net effect may be inaccurate.
   (4) We still have to talk about Award Actions & Workflow more
   (5) Neil brought up being able to use workflow to allow OSP to enter info and then allow a separate analyst approve what was entered. This is still being discussed and worked out. A workflow document is yet to be written.

iv) UC 2
   (1) Susan suggests that system indicates Dates, etc. that user has changed. When date is changed, should become highlighted or bolded somehow, so that user can see changes they have made. Once user saves, data returns to normal format.
   (2) Group does not object to this. Neil really likes idea.
   (3) Who does change notice get sent to? Is it possible for each school to make their own rules for whom this gets sent to?
      (a) If each school could not set this up on their own through standard workflow provided by system, who do we want this sent to?
         (i) Lead Unit Administrative contact is Susan’s suggestion.
         (ii) In addition to the two common units we deal with (lead administrative unit for project and PI home unit), Berkeley has additional units that provide administrative services for a multitude of departments regardless of where the programmatic work is taking place. This 3rd Unit may need to be in the loop on these notices. Additional units may need to receive notices.
based on certain conditions such as cost share requirements or contracts greater than a specified amount.

1. Susan took notes on this as well and will bring these concerns up when workflow is discussed. Flexibility is the key.

v) UC3
vi) Cut out another Use Case about Navigating to other screens/views. These were basically just Functional Requirements.

vii) UC4 also has pretty standard navigations. This Use Case may be able to be cut as well.

viii) Grouping and Sort Order
(1) Pull down menus (action overview for example). Do we want to order the choices alphabetically or most frequently used at top? (With most frequent, would have to have choices numbered with a code, and then numerically by code).

(2) Cannot accurately determine what will be used most frequently from school to school.

(3) Can user just start typing and then have system fill in what you want? No, Susan believes she asked about this previously and it would be a major enhancement.

(4) Group leaning towards Alphabetically.

(5) May be possible to have a default entry populate that is not necessarily the first item alphabetically.

*KC_AWD-Create an Award Hierarchy – Neil
KC_AWD-Create an Award – Barbara
KC_AWD-Budget – Neil

Looking Ahead to Award Hierarchy in KC3.0 – Ron, What Coeus school advocated for breakout of DC/F&A? What’s the history of Coeus Enh COEUSQA-408 / PT 3857? Ron provided this information to Susan. Susan to take action and discuss with Neil.

2) New specs for review:
KC_AWD-Comments – Barbara
KC_AWD-Print – Jessica

3) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
*AW-26 Link Funding Proposals of any Proposal Status
a) Group needs to read offline and give any comments or changes to Susan.
b) Need to set priority – Susan put Nice to Have for 2.0
c) Discussion of Revision Pending Status. Once link is made to award, unlocking of proposal to make changes. Coeus allows this link to be made currently (w/Revision Pending Status), so we don’t want to change anything in regard to this. (This is not currently in enhancement- this was just a side discussion).

AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards

4) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
Proposed PD/B changes to Contacts/Key Personnel:
a) Rename panel Key Personnel & Credit Split
b) Add show/hide buttons to each subpanel

5) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
a) Award/Sponsor Template
b) Award/Keywords
c) Time & Money / Transactions / New Transaction
d) Payment, Reports & Terms / Payment & Invoices
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e) Payment, Reports & Terms / Payment & Invoice Requirements
f) Special Review

6) **KC Glossary**: Chris will review all specs and bring new entries for SME review. Archive location, Closeout, Faculty, Organization Name, Small Business Subcontracting Plan

7) **Design Critiques**: Susan, continue review **KC_AWD-DC Rvw Decisions** posted to spec grid.
   a) See Goals section below (Item 8 on agenda) for discussion of 3rd Design Critique, which will cover the screens that were not ready last time (including Hierarchy).

21-Colleges have different F&A Rates – Chris will bring suggestions if needed by Cornell

45-Document Status Block – Susan, outstanding item

8) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   - **Design Critique** – There is an outstanding Design Critique that we need to get done. We need to determine a time that does not conflict with July 4 holiday – many people take extra time off. Likely will be during the week after the 4th.
   a) Susan to talk to Tom or Carey.
   b) Renee to check with Terry regarding if that is too late – if so we will need to do it week before July 4th.

   - **Person Mass Change** recommended for deferral to 3.0 to allow appropriate enhancement.

   - **KC_Shared-Current & Pending Support** – Don, draft ready to review

   - **KC_AWD-Award Lookup** – We probably will need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from standard Rice functionality. Proposal doing one now, so we’ll wait and make sure we’re consistent.

   - **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed

9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Jessica, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Carmen, Ed, Dawn, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Cheryl, Don, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Design Critiques:** Susan, continue review of UXG Report: [KC_DC_04_2009_FINAL](#)

a) CSU, MSU, Cornell, UA had made comments. Are other schools planning to do so?

b) No. 19 – (detailed comments are on document)

i) UA, Indiana, Cornell, Berkeley, MSU do not feel it is worth requesting an enhancement and changing the screen. Leave as is and have good help text.

ii) Cheryl at ISU commented F&A rates map to financial system rates, and main purpose for validation is to coordinate w/ Financial System.

iii) Decision: User Interface (UI) will not be changed. Include detailed help text on parameter and validation.

c) No. 20

i) Decision: Not crucial. Leave as is.

ii) From Cheryl’s experience with Coeus, haven’t seen these tables get long at all. Neil agrees.

d) No. 21

i) Action: Chris to look into further regarding Cornell’s comments and come back with suggestions if changes are necessary

e) No. 22

i) Suggestion: change sub-panel label to Non-Standard Benefits Rates?

ii) Should F&A Rates also be changes to Non-Standard F&A Rates?

   (1) Do need to enter at least one F&A rate, even if non-standard

iii) Can enter standard and non standard rates for both sub-panels

iv) Suggestion: Change Panel label to Non-Standard Rates, and leave sub-panels as is.

   (1) However, can enter standard rates as well, but intention is to enter non-standard rates.

v) Final Decision: Leave labels alone. Have good help text.

   (1) Rationale: Can enter a rate that is standard or non-standard although intent for Benefits Rates was to capture something non-standard.

f) No.23

i) UA and Cornell withdraw previous comments. Running out of room.

ii) Discussion of Award hierarchy mocks present status and options. Looking ahead to release 3.0, which will add breakdown of direct vs. indirect in obligated and anticipated distributed/distributable. Adding direct/indirect breakdown will make screen even busier – there is already a lot of information here.

iii) Ron will check with Coeus consortium to see who main advocates are for indirect/direct display

iv) Comment from Ron: ability to choose to truncate vs. wrap may be very useful (in node titles with info on left). This can save space when user is looking at several nodes.
v) Suggestion from Cheryl, list 6-digit “family name” at top somewhere (i.e. 000121), and then on individual lines just have 3-digit node extension (i.e. -001), as all nodes belong to same “family” award.

vi) Which view do we like?
   (1) Blocked View – always showing distributed and distributable? Berkeley, MSU
   (2) Row View- with expand/collapse for distributed and distributable?

vii) Action: Susan to ask Bart and Terry if we can toggle between expanded and collapsed view as a screen choice. Have both options presented above.

viii) Decision: Do not change title of “Anticipated.”

g) No. 24 – yellow ? icon
   i) Suppose you have a missed a workflow step, or have a situation that requires special handling - can you create a special status for that?
   ii) Decision: No change will be made to UI

h) No. 25/26
   i) UI updates already made. New mocks resolve this issue.

i) No.27
   i) Indicators shown next to node. Input?
   ii) Suggestion: Full name rather than only surname
   iii) Coeus currently limits award number to 7. There are enhancement requests to increase this per Ron.

j) No. 28 – Resolved

k) No. 29 – Want account type and account ID on same line
   i) Solution:
      
      | Award ID | Award Type |
      |----------|------------|
      | Sponsor Award ID | Activity Type |
      | Account ID | Account Type |
      | Award Status |
      | Title [full width text box] |

l) No. 30 – Add title next to PI name on Investigators panel?
   i) Defer discussion. Not sure what type of title they want displayed.

m) No. 31 – Award Features section
   i) Decision: Change to “Award Details Recorded” and have help text explaining that this is an indication of whether or not the data entry for the specified panel was completed by user.

n) No. 32
   i) Bringing forward phone number and email without clicking for inquiry?
   ii) Decision: No changes

o) No. 33
   i) Decision: Detailed help text

p) No. 34
   i) Drag and drop for file attachments
   ii) Decision: Developers can’t make this happen. Depends on the browser being used by the user.

q) No.35
   i) Decision: Change will be made

r) No. 36, 37, 38 already resolved – see document.

s) No. 39
   i) Decision: pursue hyperlink unless costly

t) No. 40
   i) Leaning towards leaving as is until we found out from Ron that Coeus uses icons. We may have to reconsider. Ron to send Susan sample of award with attachments that have icons.

2) Spec Review/Issue Updates

KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee
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KC_AWD-Create an Award Hierarchy – Neil
KC_AWD-Create an Award - Barbara
KC_AWD-Budget – Neil
  a) Possibly reworking to use some budget functionality from proposal
  b) We will need to give Terry a list of similarities and differences so a cost/benefit analysis can be completed.

3) New specs for review:
   KC_AWD-Comments – Barbara
   KC_AWD-Print – Jessica

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
   AW-26 Link Funding Proposals of any Proposal Status – Action for group: Send Susan comments
   AW-27 Share Proposal Budget with Awards – Skeleton Enhancement started

5) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

6) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane - Absent
   a) Award/Sponsor Template
   b) Award/Keywords
   c) Time & Money / Transactions / New Transaction
   d) Payment, Reports & Terms / Payment & Invoices
   e) Payment, Reports & Terms / Payment & Invoice Requirements
   f) Special Review

7) KC Glossary : Chris
   Special Project for Chris – Please review all specs and double check that we’ve made all Glossary entries necessary for awards.

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   Should we suggest deferral of Person Mass Change to 3.0 to allow appropriate enhancement?
     a) Decision: Defer to 3.0

   KC_AWD-Award Lookup – We probably will need a spec for custom Award lookup since our needs will likely differ from standard Rice functionality. Proposal doing one now, so we’ll wait and make sure we’re consistent.

   KC_AWD-Parameters – Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Jessica, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Carmen, Ed, Dawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Cheryl, Marcus, Don, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey, Tammy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: Wednesday, May 13, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ Enter as “guest”

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee/Kenton (Priority 1!)
   a) Currently you can only transfer funds in Time/Money by total costs but Coeus has upgraded to the ability of transferring direct/indirect costs. Group decided that KC will defer this change in time/money to 3.0 rather than devote the time/effort to get it incorporated into 2.0. Also, there are still questions in regards to the impact/feasibility of this change.
      a. Neil: Tracing transactions is currently not tracking from node to node, although there is a transaction id from parent to child or child to child
   b) Kenton brought up the issues of period dates/money are the two most common changes in award hierarchy, but since you aren’t directly editing in the panel but rather below there are challenges. Dates are also a challenge in hierarchy
      a. Susan: Are changes to date part of the award sequence or time/money sequence?
      b. Kenton: Business rule MIT requires you create a new version of the award when you modify time/money.
      c. Susan: moot point with KC since we don’t have an edit mode.
      d. Neil: Regardless of edits it should have the same extraction logic for audit purposes.
      e. Kenton: When you move money around and change the dates as well?
      f. Neil: Reporting logic and queries should be in the same location as where the transactions occur.
      g. Cheryl: Need to be able to pull out separate transactions for any change (* indicates on Coeus printouts to changes to amount or dates).
      h. Neil: Everything is driven of the money table.
      i. Kenton: Begin/end dates picked up by financial system?
      j. Neil: Correct, this is driven by money tables.
      k. Kenton: Problem is when changing the money you may not be changing the dates as well….have to go to each award and change it right now in Coeus…if you want to change at the same time then it makes sense the way they’re doing it….if you want to do it separately then we need two separate actions user has to take (for same result).
      l. Susan: If you allow user to change dates in the hierarchy but move money as a financial transaction below….need to experiment to see what happens to sequence numbers when you do transactions or change dates on multiple nodes from hierarchy panel. Need to check.
      m. Per Neil, it creates a new time/money sequence but not new award sequence….
      n. You wouldn’t need pass-through history if moving from one department to another. (Neil/Susan)
      o. Neil: key is to be able to see all that information in one area for all transactions, ultimately
      p. Neil please remember to show Susan the problems for transaction view in CO to resolve matter.
a) Issues/Changes with person mass change:
   a. Updated narrative user story
   b. Added important concepts/backgrounds in regards to current Coeus functionality
   c. Noted this under use case that functionality existed and added issue for this since a integration spec will need to be written for award and accounting system
   d. Susan: since such a wide batching process not many people use it, should we scale it back? Enhancement to make it more useful?
   e. Wendy: response that users use it when its an employee coming to institution or a transfer to set them up in the system and then do a massive change across all entries when employee is approved.
   f. Susan: problem is it changes all status’s of documents blindly, complexity to system if we added a document status selection?
   g. Wendy: would add usefulness but not sure how complex
   h. Cheryl?: Other issue, most schools will rarely use this feature, with reporting you want to change only certain proposals.
   i. Susan: when it makes a change to this page, does it create sequence change?
   j. Wendy: No it only changes the date of the record not the sequence #
   k. Neil: explore simply adding to rolodex or other options for changes.
   l. Susan: use cases are very limited with current functionality but it has potential, need detail in issue or appendix to facilitate the discussion of issue’s future.
   m. CONSIDERED SME FINAL aside from Wendy adding the additional detail, won’t bring back for group discussion, enhancement issues might arise but we need to open it up to other groups since it’s a shared spec.

KC_Funded Proposal:

a) Three options need decision:
   a. Either filter results
   b. Show everything but user/status permission dictate what you could link
   c. To all proposals and if wrong proposal status if user has permissions could they change it without having the additional step (would be an enhancement)

b) Lisa/Terry currently writing Institutional Proposal integration spec….need to check with her on this and make her aware of the above issue/enhancement.

c) Wendy thinks there might be a way of editing status from award module, she’s checking on it….will let us know the path if she finds it.

d) VOTE: agree with the enhancement request to ask for option C
   a. Berkely nice to have
   b. ISU low priority
   c. CO nice to have
   d. MSU low priority
   e. CORNELL no one in attendance
   f. IU not voting member
   g. Coesu absent

e) Sort orders for keywords, cost share, and f/a rates:
   a. Missed this in other specs, Terry said they would have to be enhancements and bring up as priority allows
   b. See Issue 4 within spec for decisions
f) Issue: what if you time out browser and you’ve done a data feeds how does it save? Still need to get more info going to discuss at CO FTF

g) Should suggest a formal discussion regarding versioning at CO FTF, developers will also want to discuss….need to schedule (Neil would want to be there)

h) Duplicates: Coeus was an issue punted on since they wanted users to manually remove duplicates. If we want to address this we can take same approach as Coeus or address the issue of duplicates in a different manner?
   a. Priority level of potential enhancement? Both Cheryl and Neil feel it is a high priority and wouldn’t want to manually have to go and delete these duplicates.
   b. Define duplicate Cost Share:
      a) An entry with the same type, commitment type, and source?
      b) Cheryl: Every single field in that line being the same (Neil agrees), but there are additional frustrations because the primary keys don’t have enough fields to compare…..
      c) Special Review more complex
      d) Neil feels that special review and cost share are most important…
      e) Susan: Definitely wouldn’t want verfication date as criteria???
      f) Percentage type/fiscal year/source/destination/commitment amount, etc (exclude only source destination and unrecovered F/A amount) should be criteria for duplicate on cost share. FINAL DECISION
   c. Define duplicate Special Review:
      a) Anomaly in Coeus special review that items are dropping off.
      b) More complicated…will not be included in enhancement request due to the shared aspect and the frequent updates.

**KC_AWD-Budget – Neil (Priority 3!)**

a) Update a few sections based on previous remarks
b) Susan: when you enter the budget it acts as a mini-module and does an implied system save…found error messages we missed on other specs. (Susan)
c) Neil: Does seem to be a system save, does a validation at the first step.
d) Susan: Just make some indication that system is doing the validation and see relevant specs for details.
e) Not enough time to review today but Neil should put most recent version up and have team review/critique this next week on own time, forward comments directly to Neil.

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas – Wendy**

**KC_AWD-Contacts – (Susan), Discuss w/group next time Rosemary can attend**

2) **Design Critiques:** Susan, continue review of UGX Report: KC_DC_04_2009_FINAL

a) Starting review again on #5.
b) Budget end date on details & dates panel.
   a. Which end date? Latest end date for that node of the hierarchy? YES but where? Location should be over/under as it is in current mock and add expiration date.
   b. Labels consistent on this pane and time/money.
c) #6 will change.
d) #7 user help documentation will be provided so no change.
e) #8 confirmation prompts, reload option is available or do we need confirmation prompts? Are you sure is also another prompt, and reload rather than save. Currently has a confirmation step so we already addressed concern.
f) #10 True currently a system parameter.
g) #11 best practice when using sponsor template, you don’t edit the original template you simply create a new version of the sponsor template with edits. No change more of a training issue, possible misunderstanding of functionality.

h) #12 include fax no. and cell no.(out of room), one click away from more details. No change, one click will provide all information.

i) #13 some items in lead unit contacts cannot edit, cannot delete lead unit contacts and there’s no indication or flag identifying that these are lead unit attributes. Do we want a flag for lead unit? Where should we put it? Bolding of Unit name for all lead units or some other indicator wanted. Susan to get something together for next time to show group.

j) #14 disagree, project roles are the indicator for primary contact and for what. Going to disregard, they probably didn’t see the project role section.

k) #15 descriptor numbers (rolodex numbers) would be important to see on person contacts within sponsor contacts? Don’t see value of adding this data…do we want to display this code? We have alternate entry functionality currently but it just doesn’t display. Again information is one click away. Will need to find out who brought up this issue and see what their reasoning is for this change? Maybe the wanted it in lookup? Not update in mock screen but that it’s part of lookup functionality

a. SIDE NOTE: Merge two columns of Person/Organization in Sponsor Contacts?

l) #16 would be ‘nice to have’ as an enhancement to have hyperlink of email. Susan to write enhancement request.

m) #17 print interface great 😊.

n) #18 participants want last 3 cost sharing fields reordered. We should change it to Commitment amount, cost share met, verification date. GROUP AGREED IT SHOULD BE CHANGED. Look at it again once mocks are complete.

o) Look at rest offline staring with #19- please make own comments and forward to Susan BY NEXT MEETING BY Monday 5/25/09

3) New specs for review:
   KC_AWD-Print – Carey Conover

4) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

5) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
   a) Contacts/Central Administration

6) KC Glossary : Chris

7) New Enhancement Requests for Review: None

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   KC_AWD-Create an Award – Maybe Susan? (revised target ?)
   KC_AWD-End Of Month Process– Susan (Ron requested info from All_Coes 5/11/09)
   KC_AWD-Parameters – Spreadsheet may be required as Parameters are developed

9) Questions and Roll Call

10) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Carmen, Dawn, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Cheryl, Marcus, Don, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil (Priority 3!)

a) Posted new version 30 minutes ago with some specific questions.

b) Incorporated changes from last meeting.

c) Use Case 1 should be pretty good.
   
i) Will add titles for alternates

d) Budget module says you can only move budget from parent to child or child to parent.
   
i) When funds are made from node to node within a hierarchy, Neil is assuming there would be a budget associated with the move. How does group want to handle this? Is it worthwhile to pursue?
   
   (1) Neil feels strongly that if moving money should be able to move budget with it.
   
   (2) Ron – Q? – Would it be required? Neil envisions no, it would be optional.
   
   (3) Currently, Neil believes that moving budgets would have to be moved one node level at a time – (parent to child, child to parent). Would be more useful to use it more similarly to award hierarchy.

   (4) Renee believes Coeus has given us the blessing to move money from any node to any node.

   (5) Everyone agrees we would **not** like for the movement of money vs. budget to be different. We would like to be able to move budgets as freely as money, not restricted by moving one level at a time.

   (6) Discussion of warning - Money has been moved in Time & Money – A budget move is needed to balance the budget.
      
      (a) Amounts feeding to financial system would need to be in balance.

   ii) Neil to go forward with idea of moving budgets with Money and reconciliation language.

   e) In A2, there are two courses of action – manual vs. copy from proposal. Neil couldn’t see where there was any difference in creating a budget for sequence 1 vs sequence 12.
      
      i) Susan and group to try this out.

      ii) If steps really same, it is fine to refer to other steps in use case.

      (1) A2 – Title

      (a) See Use Case Normal Course, steps x-xx.

   f) Discussion on if Award Budget pulls from Dev Proposal or Inst Proposal.
      
      i) SME originally under impression this came from Dev Proposal.

      ii) Neil believes Rosemary told him that it comes from Inst. Proposal

      iii) Neil to go back and do a budget to confirm and where it is coming from and update spec if needed.

   g) Deobligate is essentially the same as create, but user is entering negative amounts.
      
      i) This can go in FR’s. Doesn’t need to be a separate use case.
h) To have Use Cases as close to final as possible by next week.

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy
i) Pretty much a done deal.
ii) A tool for testing scenarios
iii) Susan to remove from future agenda.

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals** – Susan
a) Added note in Terms & Definitions that Funding Proposal is the same as Institute Proposal, and the terms are intended to be used interchangeably.
b) Susan tested question regarding permissions.
   i) Was able to view search list of Inst. Proposals with only Modify Award role. Didn’t have a separate View Inst. Proposal Right. This right is not within Modify Award Role. Wendy to confirm.
c) Discussion of filtering proposal search results.
   i) One option was not to display options that could not be chosen and would only result in an error message.
   ii) Another is to show all, but have invalid selections grayed out.
   iii) A third option is that user has rights, to just make it possible to go ahead and link any proposal. For example, link a rejected proposal and the status would change from rejected to funded.
d) Code Table is customizable by Institution (for Inst. Proposal statuses).
   i) Nobody knows what Do Not Use – Revision Required is supposed to mean.
e) CFDA No. will feed forward from Inst. Proposal to Award.
f) Opportunity No. to pull forward? Where does this display in Award? Neil is looking.
   i) Neil cannot find anywhere this appears in Award module.
g) Funding Proposal Start and End Dates don’t display until after user saves and goes back in. Just a quirk of Coeus programming. Not a FR we need to duplicate.
h) Indicator Flags – Under the impression these do not feed from Inst. Proposal. Terry looking into this.
i) Special Review and F&A duplicates – Coeus just left this up to end user to get rid of duplicates. Susan asked Terry if this is something we can fix so that it is not left up to the end user. He will get back to her.
j) Are we okay with Coeus sort order?
   i) Coeus adds keywords in order added.
   ii) It would be easier to find in alphabetical order.
   iii) Susan will ask Lisa for history to see if this was a conscious decision, or just slipped through.
   iv) Our group prefers ascending ABC order by keyword. Susan to pursue.
k) Cost Share, F&A Rates, Special Review
   i) Sorting has changed for some things in the latest version per Ron. Susan needs to test in Consortium instance to see if these have changed.
   ii) Majority agrees (MSU and IU silent) that we would like to see most recent data for cost share and F&A rates at top – oldest at bottom.
   iii) If there is a discrepancy with these specs, Susan will bring it back to the group.

**KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (*Priority 1!*)

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – (Susan), Discuss w/group next time Rosemary can attend

**KC_Shared-Mass Person Change** – Wendy Derby
a) Changes all records included closed and inactive. The only school she could find that uses it hardly ever uses it for that reason. Rosemary has not replied to Wendy yet.
2) New specs for review:
   KC_AWD-Print – Carey Conover
   a) Susan, Carey, and possibly Renee to discuss offline.
   b) Carey to insert screen shots per Marcus’s instructions.

3) Design Critiques: Carey or Susan, UXG Report posted to Confluence: KC_DC_04_2009_FINAL
   a) When we know who is doing help documentation, Susan and Renee need to make sure they are
      aware of these.
   b) Not a better suggestion for Medusa. For now, our response is to provide good page-level help.
      i) If anyone has an alternate suggestion – speak up.
   c) A bigger space will be made between Awards and ?. Page level help to be added.
   d) Adding items to Funding Proposals table. Does anyone think this would be beneficial to the
      majority of users? NO. They can get this through Medusa.
   e) Sponsor Name will be made black for more emphasis and to be more legible. Font size should be
      as large as other fields as well.
   f) Discussion of showing Budget End Date on Details & Dates. The latest obligated end date would
      be the budget end date for the node selected.
      i) Need to keep Final End and Project End consistent across screens. Which do we prefer?
         Project End.
      ii) Award hierarchy mock needs to be fixed to read project end instead of final end.
      iii) Same consistency for budget vs. obligation. Perhaps we need to use Obligation End Date?
      iv) Grouping?
      v) End Dates to be grayed out after initial entry –OR we could consider making it an entry only
         screen.
      vi) Discussion will have to be continued next week.
   g) Come prepared with comments next week.

4) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

5) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
   a) Organization – did not find a better piece of data to show here
      i) Susan has not done anything further with mock yet – may need to change it.
   b) Contacts/Central Administration
      i) Person – not necessarily a single central administration office. Change to “…point of
         contact for a central administration office involved in administration or compliance
         activities for the award.”
      ii) Unit - Use “division for organization that is associated with a central administration
         contact” rather than “division for organizing…” Diane will review other Unit field
         level help prompts for consistency.
      iii) Project Role – change ending to”…associated with an award.”
      iv) Phone – This is “Office Phone” in the table. Most mocks simply display “Phone.”
         Change “primary” to “office” in help text.

6) KC Glossary : Chris
   a) Effort definitions. Change award to project. Instead of ie., state this can be expressed as
      a percentage of an overall appointment, in person months, etc.
   b) Chris to make similar changes to other effort definitions.
   c) Unit – OK.
   d) Unit ID – Unique identifier assigned by the institution for a given unit. (See also Unit).
   e) Central Administration Contact – add compliance (administrative or compliance unit).
      i) Need to close parentheses at end.
   f) Sponsor Contact – change provide to providing.
g) Unit Contact – Instead of using the word unit in this definition, replace it with the definition used above for unit.

7) New Enhancement Requests for Review: None.

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   KC_AWD-Create an Award – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target ?)
   KC_AWD-End Of Month Process – Need volunteer (documentation requested from Coeus)
   KC_AWD-Parameters – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed
   KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting - Need volunteer
   (Renee-Do we need to defer to KC 3.0? Error msg: “There are no awards in the subcontracting table”)

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn, Diane, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Jeff, Cheryl, Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) NOTES update from Renee.
   a) Discussion w. Terry and Kenton. Comments are versioned and Notes are not. We have to divorce the two. We are going back to having a Comments Spec for Awards. Notes Spec will still be shared.
   b) Having Terry put a price tag on versioning Notes – which would be an enhancement.
   c) Mock screen will go back to having Comments, Notes, and Attachments on one panel.
   d) Business Analyst – new from Hawaii- that Kenton is going to work with on this spec.

2) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee (Priority 1!)
   a) Looking to combine this all in one spec with Time & Money. Waiting for Rosemary’s guidance
   b) Feed back from Rosemary regarding skipping nodes in hierarchy for transactions – and need some further discussion prior to moving forward.
   c) Q from Diane - On mock did not see account ID next to award ID. Where do we stand on this? Coeus shows this.
      i) We also previously talked about enhancement to display additional info.
         (1) What is status of this?
         ii) This came up in design critique
         iii) Neil refers to this in mock
      iv) Rest assured this issue has not been forgotten, and will be discussed a t a later time.

   KC_AWD-Report Tracking - Wendy (Priority 2!) updates regarding KC 2.0 vs 3.0
   a) Issue 4 closed per last SME meeting – and resolution updated.
   b) Ready to go SME-F.

   KC_AWD-Budget – Neil (Priority 3!)
   a) Minor changes to Business Requirements and Business Rules.
      i) Management of Awards for faculty and departments
      ii) Additional references to OMB Circulars
   b) Broke Narrative out into two sections
      i) Made point that data is managed over time and has workflow associated with it.
      ii) Wendy suggests clarifying what a deobligation is in this section, page 7.
      iii) Wendy suggests to replace Account with Award in last paragraph of 4.1.2 (Neil will be sure to use Award throughout rather than account or node as necessary).
   c) User Requirements
      i) MSU comment on “configure” – may want to reconsider wording to be clear this is referring to a parameter setting that is chosen.
      ii) Cornell has three different fringe benefits rates. Endowed rates, fed rates, and no-fed rates.
         (1) Coeus currently has on and off campus fringe rates.
(2) When you turn parameter off – system will not calculate amount based on salary, user just enters a dollar amount for fringe
(3) Neil will make a note/issue regarding fed/non-fed rates and various other permutations that may come up.

iii) Renee believes pop-up calculator will not be possible in KC. She will have to double check. If we will not have calculator, will have to move this from User Requirements, FR’s, etc. to Differences from Coeus.

d) Functional Requirements
   i) Comment from Marcus - a few FR’s (Additional Funding for example) read more like a definition than what the system needs to do. Need to clarify.
      1) Create a budget…for example – need verb in there somewhere for action of what system does.
      2) Neil previously had system shall on some of the FR’s, which Kenton had him remove. Neil will go back through to add verbs/actions to make the FR’s clearer as needed.
   ii) Will need to add issue regarding skipping nodes when transferring funds until further discussion with Rosemary takes place
   iii) Will slightly change FR regarding permissions
   iv) System Messages –
      1) For first error listed, Neil is going to double-check, may be a soft warning where user can save but not submit.
      2) May be additional messages for validations that Neil has missed – so he will go through again and add anything else that comes up.
      3) Marcus suggests that after each FR that would trigger a system message, Neil insert reference “see system message…”
         a) This should aid developers

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas – Wendy**

**KC_Shared-Person Mass Change – Wendy Derby**

a) Hasn’t been able to get responses from current Coeus users yet.
   i) Let Wendy know if you know of somebody who uses this.

b) Updated “Mass Person” to “Person Mass”

c) Put in current template

d) In FR’s – reference to User in 1, and then Maintainer in 2. This is same person, so need to change to consistent reference to one term or the other.

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals – Susan**

a) Made some changes suggested by MSU
b) Index to Use Cases
   i) Have two UC3, change first one to UC2

c) In Use Case, need to note that system reverts proposal status to “pending” if user disconnects a funding proposal

d) Wendy comments on rights in relation to Use Cases - contact Wendy if questions regarding these notes
   i) System message that user doesn’t have appropriate rights to view
   ii) If have maintain, that would work for view as well.
   iii) Message has to do with combination of rights assigned to user.

e) Comment from Chris - if not initial set-up, system will not pre-fill anything – make sure this is in FR’s.

Q from Marcus - Should this be a shared spec with Institute Proposal? Action item for Renee
i) Renee feels it should not.
ii) Marcus believes that it possibly should – and says developers may have thoughts on that.

iii) If the Status Field is affected by functionality in Awards spec that is not in an Institute Proposal spec, then developers need to know and this may need to be a shared spec. May be sufficient to have it noted as an integration point in our spec. Renee will bring this up with Terry.

iv) Comment from Marcus - If the user can go in and select the newest version and a version that is 3 versions, old, and one that is 8 versions old - that is different than linking all versions.

v) We need to clarify this. – Can user link all – or can user select multiple versions they choose to link, while not linking them all. Susan – contact Marcus for questions regarding clarification to this FR.

h) In FR’s refer to Institutional Proposal at times & other times Funding Proposals – this is the same thing, so Marcus suggests being consistent on the term we are using.

i) In FR’s, be clear that deleting link to proposal, not the proposal itself.

j) Data feed tables – why doesn’t CFDA come forward? Susan to ask Rosemary about this. CSU and UA would want it to come through if possible – other schools did not comment if they would want this or not.

k) Other Does NOT come forward questions are for Terry – for Susan to confirm her understanding of what she is seeing.

l) Cost Share actually does come forward – Susan to update table.

m) Wendy says Proposal Development Table in Awards is much different than Institutional Proposal Table- like comparing apples to oranges.

n) Are SME’s happy with search criteria from Coeus and order they are displayed?
   i) Not just Lead Investigator, can be any Investigator
   ii) Does Inst. Proposal have a spec for this? Should the look-ups be the same?
   iii) Notate in spec that this search functionality integrates with Institutional Proposal spec.

iv) Proposed Title – can use wildcard, search for key words

v) For now leave list and order as is, with notation that this integrates with Inst. Proposal.

o) 5.3 – Would like to see Total Cost (sum of Direct and Indirect). UA, CSU, Cornell agree.

p) Need to get mock going for proposal search

q) In User Documentation there is a note regarding business practices at some schools to link proposal at root level.

r) Plans to have spec completely drafted next week.
   i) Can go ahead and test use cases. Let Susan know of any problems.

KC_AWD-Contacts – (Susan), Discuss w/group next time Rosemary can attend

3) Design Critiques: Carey or Susan, if UXG report received before meeting time…

a) Carey is looking at first report received by Jay. She will post to Confluence tomorrow hopefully.

b) 3rd design critique – really cannot schedule yet without knowing when screens will be ready.

c) If anyone has a limited window of availability or time that absolutely will not work – let group know at next weeks meeting – perhaps we will know more on progress of screens by then.
4) New specs for review:
   **KC_AWD-Print** – Carey Conover
   a) She and Marcus and Renee have been in discussions.
   b) A first draft will go to Marcus tomorrow. Then when comfortable, Carey can go ahead
      and post to Confluence and group will discuss next Wednesday.

5) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

6) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane
   a) Contacts/Sponsor Contacts
   b) On mock, do we want to add the actual sponsor name somewhere? Under label
      Organization, we have division or department within sponsor listed rather than actual
      sponsor currently.
      i) What is Organization pulling now? Depends on how it is input, could be Grants
         Management, could be NCI. Organization and Sponsor Name form Rolodex could be
         same. All fields can be seen from opening rolodex.
      ii) At ASU, Rolodex Organization field was used for Subcontracts, Sponsor field was
          used in Proposals and Awards.
      iii) To be more similar to Coeus -may need to display something slightly different here.
          Susan to investigate
   c) DD items accepted as displayed.

7) **KC Glossary:** Chris

8) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:** None

9) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target ?)
   **KC_AWD-End Of Month Process** – Need volunteer (documentation requested from Coeus,
      revised target ?)
   **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed
   **KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** - Need volunteer
      (Renee-Do we need to defer to KC 3.0? Error msg: “There are no awards in the subcontracting table”)

10) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Jessica, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn, Diane, Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marcus, Jeff, Cheryl, Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **CSU F2F**: Susan, AWD business during week of May 17-22. **Objectives:**
   
   a) **Spec wrap-up**: Can primary spec writers attend?
      i) Renee, Susan and Neil will definitely be there
         Need AWD SME voting members accessible toward end of week (of face to face).
         Prefer EM or phone? Voting members of each school, be aware – check your email that
         Thursday and Friday. Susan will send an email of list of things that need a
         vote/blessing/last minute suggestions on Thursday or Friday. Hopefully there won’t be
         too many things that need a big discussion – if so, those items may need to wait.
   
   b) **Shared specs/integration issues**: COI/IRB links, Workflow, Medusa, Notes (this week),
      Mass Person Change, Current/Pending Support, Person Maintenance, Sponsor Hierarchy,
      Meta Rules UI… what else?
      i) This list prepared by Lisa Oliva.
   
   c) **QA Preparation**: Need to learn and begin to write test scenarios.
      i) Need to shift gears from writing specs to writing test scenarios
      ii) As of end of May, we will be switching gears to Quality Assurance and Testing

2) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**

   **KC_AWD-Contacts** – (Susan), Issue 5 resolution this week, then SME-F!
   
   b) Issue 5 – What is OSP Admin supposed to be in Coeus? It is person in OSP office.
      i) Coeus does not track outside / 3rd party contacts in Rolodex
      ii) Only incoming PI’s would be in rolodex to accommodate that they are not yet in person table
      iii) The lead PI on a subaward would be captured in the subaward module
         1) Neil is not aware of where this goes in subaward module
         2) Ron said this was a suggested enhancement to add outside Co-I on contacts
         3) Steve shot down the enhancement, saying at MIT they just put the site PI on the
         subaward contacts in the subaward module. This does come from the same rolodex.
      iv) Berkeley does use this for any outside contacts.
      1) System does not prevent you from putting them in, even if this wasn’t Coeus original
      intention
   
   v) We are not talking about a rolodex spec, we are doing Sponsor Award Contacts under award
      only.
   
   vi) **Decision** – Under Contacts tab, does panel label need to be changed from Sponsor Contact
      to something else? NO, leave UI design AS IS.
   
   vii) This is now SME - Final

   **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (**Priority 1!**) 
   
   a) No outstanding issues
   
   b) Meeting with Kenton tomorrow – at this point Renee is not sure what all of the issues he wants to
      discuss are.
c) In this spec, we may need more detailed references to UI due to the complexity. In some areas generalizations regarding UI may not work for this spec.
d) Need to add reference that Indirect and Direct must foot to total distributable, etc.

**KC_AWD-Report Tracking** - Wendy (Priority 2!) updates regarding KC 2.0 vs 3.0

a) Terry brought up some issues, and some changes have been made
b) Editability of Report Tracking has been moved from 2.0 to 3.0. Wendy revised spec, footnoting that items will not be editable until 3.0.
c) This eliminates the other issues, but brings up Issue 4
   i) Status of fields inactive in 2.0
   ii) In UI, should these fields that are inactive be eliminated completely or just left blank (keeping columns with labels as placeholders)? If we keep place holder headings, we will need to get rid of icons so people don’t assume they work.
   iii) Decision – Keep Column headers but delete icons, etc.

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil (Priority 3!)

a) Nothing to report. Working on something else for Kenton.

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy

3) **Design Critiques:** Carey or Susan, if UXG report received before meeting time…

4) **New specs for review:**

   **KC_Shared-Mass Person Change** – Wendy Derby
   a) About 90% done
   b) Waiting on feedback from Rosemary and some of the Coeus schools
   c) One reference – developers will need to be aware of current level of RICE capability so they can work around it or request an enhancement.
   d) 4.2 – There is an SAP check box in Coeus for a feed functionality – Wendy waiting for Rosemary to give her background on this and what exactly it does.
   e) Issue of versioning. Will new individual replace old individual on active awards & current version only, or also on closed awards & older versions?
   f) Q on clear person data – clarified this can only be done before you save or navigate to another screen. There are 3 confirmations, so it will be pretty hard to put through an erroneous change by mistake.
   g) Marcus has some formatting comments.
      i) All subrequirements in the FR section should also have a name in bold.
      ii) Note of caution – Be sure to reference updates to other FR’s, when you refer a prior or future item within a current item step. For example, see 1a. Can change to “refer to requirement ‘xxx xxx’” and state name of requirement, that was shown in bold with that requirement.
   h) Do a find and replace for Institutional Proposal
      i) Should be consistent throughout “Person Mass Change,” not “Mass Person Change”
   j) Needs to be copied to a fresh spec template – Susan will go through and update for this – and post for Wendy to make her other changes
   k) Susan will re-post to Shared Spec grid. Wendy to get it there next time so these changes aren’t lost.

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals** – Susan

a) Narrative sections are complete – feel free to comment
b) Looking at again because this spec was done early on when we were still learning
c) Added info about unlocking funding proposals
d) Many references added
e) Not 100% comfortable with data feed grid
f) Send Susan comments on Search and Results criteria for Institutional Proposal search, Used Coeus for starting point. Relabeled labels that we have changed.
g) Use Cases and FR’s to be added in over the next week.
h) Appendix 2 is MT reference, with info pasted that is relevant, so that we are not going to a website that also contains a bunch of irrelevant information.

5) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) Single panel for notes with hide/show for different types.
   b) When adding a new note, is there an option to mark active, final, print, or does user then have to go into note to edit these things? If you can set these things when you add, mock needs to be updated to reflect this.
   c) Final indicator was requested by IRB. They want to be able to work up note, possibly over several days, without continually creating a new version. Once marked Final, any changes would result in a new version. Older versions would be viewable in history.
   d) Discussion of Final/Active indicators.
      i) Something would be unmarked Active if we don’t want to see it anymore.
      ii) You can inactivate a Final comment.
      iii) A note should not be Active until it is Final?
   e) Ron comment - When print box is checked, should it somehow lock the note? We wouldn’t want to print incomplete notes.
      i) If something is restricted, in our opinion print should not be available.
      ii) Should never be able to print a version of a note that is not final?
   f) We are happy with design, but availability of print may be an issue.

6) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane
   a) **Award/Document Overview** – Renee, update on last week’s discussion of Org Doc #
      i) Not the same as the number assigned by KFS – Renee sent email to Diane
      ii) It is Organization Document No. Do not know if we can spell it out on screen.
      iii) Neil suggestion – May want to add in help text, this is not the Financial Document No. used by billing system to draw down funds. Good idea!
   b) **Contacts/Unit Contacts**
      i) Suggestion – use Name of Individual(s), so we are not using the word person again.
         Change Institution Unit Contact to primary departmental point(s) of contact for their area of responsibility (see Project Role) for the award.
      ii) Change “for organizing” to “of organization.” At end of first sentence, add “that is associated with an Award Contact.” Delete second sentence.
      iii) Project Role – change “job” to “area of responsibility.” Remove e.g. list - these can be seen in drop down.
         (1) General Q, is this going to end up in a manual somewhere? Don’t know. If so, the listing of the e.g. would be helpful.
      iv) Phone: change to: Unit contact’s primary phone number.
      v) Email: Unit contact’s primary electronic mail address.

2) **KC Glossary:** Chris

3) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:** None

4) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   **KC_AWD-Print** – Carey Conover – Carey and Marcus meeting on Friday to discuss at 1pm eastern
   **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target ?)
**KC_AWD-End Of Month Process** – Need volunteer (revised target?)

**KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed

**KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** - Need volunteer

(Renee-Do we need to defer to KC 3.0? Error msg: “There are no awards in the subcontracting table”)

a) MSU started researching

5) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Jessica, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn, Diane, Ed, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marcus, Jeff, Cheryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, April 15, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

a) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – (Susan), Issue 5 remains: Coeus User Q1 - Is OSP Admin the OSP employee who maintains the award OR the dept admin that deals with OSP? Why would there be a separate OSP Admin for each dept on an Award?

a) This would be the OSP Employee – UA, MSU, Cornell, CSU, Iowa State agree this is intention

Coeus User Q2: Are other outside contacts entered on Contacts tab? Subaward contacts are in funded Subaward, not award, right? BUT, should Sponsor Contacts panel really be Sponsor & Outside Contacts?

a) Wendy understands it that Contacts is strictly sponsor contacts – CSU, MSU, UA (Tara) agree we could just leave this as sponsor – group also wants to ask Susan for her thoughts
b) Ron says that their would be Outside Contacts, his example is the Lead-PI on a subcontract would be another outside contact

**KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (Priority 1!)

a) Minor changes and updated made to narrative, Index to Use Cases
b) Use Case 1
   a. Question from Ron – Every edit a version? And every version must have a transaction type? So is entry of transaction (defining type, etc.) being put in a more prominent place?
      i. Renee says no, we were concerned with moving Action Summary to front page.
      ii. Renee showed where this is on mock – new transaction would be first 3 fields in Transactions panel (which is next section below award hierarchy).
   b. Would majority of transactions deal with $ and dates? Could depend – Renee said input was being rec’d from other schools – depending on sponsor – w/one year award, would likely just be entering this once (state funding for example)
   c. Q - Why does transaction # look so similar to award node #? This was intended so you know which node you are in.
      i. Then why if we are in node -005, can we move money from -001?
         Renee says this is intentional because you don’t have to move only one level at a time like in Coeus. The node listed on the panel is not relevant to what $ are being moved to and from.
      ii. Perhaps we should remove node # on panel label because it is not relevant to transactions, as transactions can be made w/any node here. Group agrees to remove reference to node number in label. Susan or Renee to request mock changes.
d. Marcus had comment regarding “apply” in step 13 – please follow up w/ him for questions regarding this change

e. Marcus suggestion to separate “User adds…” to a separate line (User enters dollars and dares……and selects “add”

f. May need to add something generic between from… and to… for transaction – suggestion: System retains information.

g. Decision not made regarding drop downs for different views – not sure how UI will work. Renee to consult with Terry regarding the design.

c) Use Case 2 – These are all view only screens

d) Ron Q – What do we mean by deleting transaction? This is a difference from Coeus because we have workflow. When a transaction is still pending, it can be deleted. Once fully approved, cannot delete. In Requirements, we should specify in both lines of f that the transactions that are deleted must be pending. (Once fully approved, a transaction cannot be deleted).

e) Marcus – Looks like we have a lot of requirements in a row under Requirement 2. If these are not separate functional requirements, then in user requirements can state “the system shall allow the user to view the following:”….and list them.

f) Currently no History requirements shown in User Requirements.

g) Developers really want this – so please send Renee any remaining comments ASAP.

**KC_AWD-Report Tracking** - Wendy *(Priority 2!)* DM issue with versioning that may affect generating the payment schedule as well.

- a) Thought it was SME Final, but Terry raised an issue.
- b) If you open reporting requirements when you are in an award in Coeus, you are in view mode only. To get edit mode have to open it with icon in Coeus.
  - a. Terry’s concern was that the edit mode in Coeus the table shown does not have a sequence shown. Terry wanted to know if this was intentional. Ron says they don’t use this at JHU. KC updates version every time a change is made to an award. It doesn’t seem to work this way with this screen in Coeus. KC may not necessarily want a new version every time a date or comment is entered for report tracking. Terry is looking into this further and developers are moving ahead as much as they can with this one.

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil *(Priority 3!)*

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus/Don, update on Roundup progress

- a) Currently being polished by Kenton
- b) Side note – Shared Versioning spec not really started – only discussions of what needs to go into it. Not ready to be drafted until Marcus gets more info from Kenton.

**Design Critiques:** Carey or Renee, update

| Name: Kuali Coeus Awards Design Critique 2 |
| Screens: Time & Money, Award Hierarchy, Budget, Direct/F&A Funds Distribution, Cost Share, Rates, Summary, History, Payment & Invoices, Reports and Report Tracking |
| Start Time: 04/16/2009 1:00 PM EDT, Duration: 2 hours |
| URL: [http://breeze.iu.edu/r21389709/](http://breeze.iu.edu/r21389709/) |
| Telephone Information: Conference Number(s): (812) 856-3600 , Participant Code: 002490# |

- a) Some UXG mix-ups. We will have to hold off on a few screens (including Budget). Other option was to put disclaimer that they were not done – but we are instead going to delay these to a 3rd design critique
- b) Award Heir, Rates, Summary, Invoices, notes and attachments for 2nd design critique
c) 3rd session, budget, report tracking, transactions, history?
d) The change in the scope of the design critique should work out well. 1st session we ran out of time for as many comments and questions as we would have liked – so scaling down 2nd will leave more time for questions.
e) Carey cell if issues 812 322 5253

Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
Report Tracking – Terry identified UI issues
Time & Money – New Commitments panel created
Subawards – Coeus double click opens subaward so we need to add an action button for Funded Subawards. Should it open read only? OR Should it open according to user permissions
a) We won’t have this until Release 3. Renee thinks we should be consistent and open according to permissions. Would need to have view subawards permission.
b) It is read only.
c) We think this decision should be deferred until Release 3 when Subawards module is developed.

New specs for review: Nothing posted yet…update?
KC_AWD-Print – Carey Conover - Not started will go full force when done with a Proposal spec that should be done next Monday

KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane
Award/Document Overview
a) Org. Doc. # - Is meaning different from that of KFS?
a. We rarely abbreviate on our screens. Can we spell out Original or Organization to be clear what this is? There is plenty of room.
b. With KC 2.0, will explanation and org doc# remain read-only? Renee assumes yes.
Payment, Reports & Terms/Closout
a) Will due date be required when user adds an additional report? Thoughts- why put in the report if not required?
b) Cornell, UA (Tara), CSU think a date should be required. If you aren’t going to track due date, why bother logging it? Rather than hard stop, perhaps we could have a warning?
c) Explanation of MULTIPLE under financial reports – this is because there is more than one financial report.
d) Due dates are auto generated except for the additional reports added by user.
e) Presumably, one could add another report class for closeout with the other report classes, rather than having additional report option?
f) MSU’s vote is a warning, Cornell, UA, CSU are okay with that.

KC Glossary: Chris

New Enhancement Requests for Review:

Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
KC_AWD-Create an Award – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target 04/01/09)
KC_AWD-End Of Month Process – Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
KC_Shared-Mass Person Change – Need volunteer (target ?)
KC_AWD-Parameters – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed

b) Questions and Roll Call
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Dawn, Diane, Ed, Carmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Marcus, Jeff, Cheryl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, April 8, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan, SME-Final? No Comments received; in development already.
   KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee (Priority 1!)
      a) History portion remains to be done. Wendy will try to work on this while Renee is on
         vacation.
      b) The developers want this one now.
      c) This is last chance for anyone to comment.
         i) Send comments to Renee and copy Susan. She will try to get any last minute changes
            in before the developers run with it.
         ii) History may still be missing – but the developers will have something to start with.
   KC_AWD-Report Tracking - Wendy (Priority 2!)
      a) Added info about Report Tracking not filtering down to other nodes unless specifically
         generated by User. Included this in Use Case and Functional Requirements.
      b) Also updated mock screens and other design issues (columns and such).
      c) Everyone needs to go through and review individually (or with group at your school).
         i) No further group review will be done unless there are comments and questions.
      d) Issue 2 – Can activity date be past, future, or only current date?
         i) Susan tested this in group and there was no validation in Coeus
         ii) Wendy thought this may be a turn off/turn on validation, so wanted to get opinion
            from more experienced Coeus user
         iii) This issue can be resolved- Susan brought up system parameters listing and as long as
             it is not in there this is a closed issue – Activity Date can be any date put in by User
      e) Versioning – Need to input something in Resolution section (spec updated, or something
         along those lines). Wendy to double-check that the info from Rosemary got put into
         correct sections of spec.
      f) Susan to assign this one for DM review once Wendy makes these few changes.
   KC_AWD-Payment – Susan (remaining issues?)
   KC_AWD-Reports – Susan (remaining issues?)
   KC_AWD-Budget – Neil (Priority 3!)
      a) Has complete index to use cases, user requirements is done, has started some of
         individual uses cases. Most current version is posted.
      b) 4.1.2 will be removed eventually – only for Neil’s reference.
      c) Made changes to Table 6, KC User Roles and Classes
      d) Additional detail likely to be added to 4.4
      e) 4.5 – Index to Use Cases – if level of detail is sufficient, then this section is done.
      f) Item 4 in Use Case 1 to be re-worded.
      g) Discussion of A6 – this is not an alternate if it always has to happen
i) System does calculate, but can override – may need to flip Normal course step and A6?

**KC_AWD-Award Hierarchy** – Neil - SME-F!

a) Close to done.
b) No movement on issues.
c) Susan to clean up and turn over to developers.
d) Added to mocks. Last mock is the one Bart just posted in the last couple days.
   i) Neil made one comment back to Bart that we don’t need all the buttons that are shown (display, correct ...).
   ii) Susan to call Marcus after meeting to discuss mock – there are a few things that are being pulled out of Notes, so there is a need to double check that these are in Award Hierarchy (it is currently there, but will need touch up).
   iii) Neil can consider himself free of this one.

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus/Don, update on Roundup progress

a) Meeting on Monday – have come to set of Shared Requirements. Don is updating – hopes to be final by the end of this week to development. Groups can give this one last look this week.

b) UI is being worked on.

**KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan, AWD SME-F?

**AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons** – Susan (update on Roundup progress)

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals** – Susan

a) Plugging away at research but nothing to share yet.

2) **Design Critiques:** Carey or Susan, update

| Name: Kuali Coeus Awards Design Critique 1 |
| Screens: Funding Proposals, Details & Dates, Subawards, Sponsor Template, Contacts, Preaward Authorizations, Terms, Special Approval, Closeout, Notes & Attachments and Print |
| Start Time: 04/09/2009 1:00 PM EDT, Duration: 2 hours |
| URL: http://breeze.iu.edu/r97408311/ |
| Telephone Information: Conference Number(s): (812) 856-3600, Participant Code: 002490# |

| Name: Kuali Coeus Awards Design Critique 2 |
| Screens: Time & Money, Award Hierarchy, Budget, Direct/F&A Funds Distribution, Cost Share, Rates, Summary, History, Payment & Invoices, Reports and Report Tracking |
| Start Time: 04/16/2009 1:00 PM EDT, Duration: 2 hours |
| URL: http://breeze.iu.edu/r21389709/ |
| Telephone Information: Conference Number(s): (812) 856-3600, Participant Code: 002490# |

a) Wendy to email list of participants for MSU to Carey right away. Carey has all others.
b) First 10-15 minutes, get everyone on-line, make sure everything is working, and do introductions.
c) Tom Clark to do driving, Susan to do talking.
d) First go through screens without comments from participants. – just explanation of screen. Then, a 2nd run through with questions from audience and discussion of why certain things are how they are.
e) May have 60 participants in each session – great turnout.
f) Susan to show us mocks that will be critiqued for comments
   i) Funding Proposals – final for all practical purposes – only comment currently is to right justify total
   ii) Details and Dates – final to the best of Susan’s knowledge
   iii) Subawards – Again, totals need to be right justified in the column immediately left to the amount.
iv) Sponsor Template – Final
v) Contacts – New drop-down for single row of input (employee user name or non-employee id entry if User doesn’t want to do look-up)
   1) Central Admin Contacts –
      a) Displaying all OSP contacts
      b) Would assume inquiry for individual depts. would include OSP contacts – no mock for this yet – will need to ask Rosemary. So do we need this all displayed on a separate panel as well?
      i) Is it just MIT that needs all OSP Contacts displayed?
      ii) Neil thinks they may need all these contacts listed.
      iii) In both cases of Unit & Central contacts, we can add them one by one as needed. Do we want all defaults for all depts. to show in both sections? This could potentially be 3 contacts, for 3 depts for each type of contact – which could multiply rapidly.
      iv) At CSU typically have dept contact one specific team that is tied to a lead unit. Like idea of hide/show. Lead Unit contacts shown (default show) and other units would default to hide.
      v) At Cornell, assignment for OSP person could be one of two people if a large dept. Each award has several different types of contacts. OSP person (assigned by dept) and financial fund accountant (assigned by sponsor) are two different people. Currently for Iowa State and Cornell have fund accountant financial person info residing in both research system and financial system.
      c) Are schools planning to default people in by sponsor or by lead unit?
         i) Cornell would use lead unit, for OSP person to show. They would want all associated units listed.
      d) IU does not know what they would want shown.
      e) Back to Diane’s suggestion – default show for lead unit and hide for other units (but they are there at click of show/hide) – Susan will see if this works for MIT.
      f) Question from Marcus – Project Personnel in Awards is what Proposals calls Key Personnel. Because it is same purpose, should layout and labels be more similar to Proposal? Marcus noticed some discrepancies. We changed this to Project Personnel to avoid conflict between Key Personnel and Key Person.
         i) Proposal has 4 drop-downs because they capture more info and different info. They also have a certification panel we don’t.
         ii) It is similar to Proposal Key Personnel – but not the same.
         iii) Key Personnel and Project Personnel to encompass same individuals – PI, Co-I, Key Personnel
      iv) UA, IU, CSU, Iowa, Cornell, MSU agree to change this to KEY PERSONNEL – Susan will have this changed.
      g) Preaward Authorizations - we previously got rid of Questions tab and added Commitments Tab, where this is located
      h) Terms
         i) Special Approval and Foreign Travel-some column justifications to be corrected.
      j) Closeout
(k) Notes & Attachments – Susan to do some quick work at the end of the day for critique tomorrow based on shared spec. If not done, then will try to slip it into the next session.
(l) Print – Work to be done on which Notes will be printed – Susan to work on (Comments vs Notes saga continues)

3) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) **Contacts** – See dropdown choices and add row (single row)
   b) **Time & Money** – New Commitments panel created

4) **New specs for review:** This week, I hope?
   **KC_AWD-Print** – Carey Conover

5) **Permissions:** Wendy, testing group update. Complete?
   a) Complete. Final Version is uploaded.
   b) Wendy to police our specs on an ongoing basis for Permissions issues.

6) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane - **Benefits Rates**
   a) On Campus, Off Campus. Maybe another sentence stating...if a non-standard rate is not entered, standard rates will apply.

7) **KC Glossary:** Chris – We hope to review/approve 5 new definitions during meeting.
   a) Do we really need a special term for Unit Contacts, and the different Contact types? For example, Unit is already defined, Contact is self-explanatory. No, we do not need this in the glossary. It is in the data dictionary, which I sufficient.
   b) If the root word is defined, we will not need to put an additional glossary entry for every variation (key person vs key person role for example).
   c) F&A Base – The basis upon which F&A Costs are calculated. Get rid of parentheses with ie. Start new sentence - Common examples include Marginal Total Direct Cost (MTDC) and Total Direct Cost (TDC).
   d) F&A Rate – Chris to change to: A rate usually expressed as a percentage and applied to an F&A Base to calculate F&A costs.

8) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:**

9) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target 04/01/09)
   **KC_AWD-End Of Month Process**– **Need volunteer** (revised target 04/01/09)
   **KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** - **Need volunteer** (revised target 04/01/09)
   **KC_Shared-Mass Person Change** – **Need volunteer** (target ?)
   **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed

10) **Questions and Roll Call**
    Newer Members – Names for future reference
    CSU – Ed Kissam, Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales
    Indiana – Carey Conover, Christi Arnett, Tammy Good
    Indiana (ISU) – Marva, Marcus, Jeff
    MSU – Wendy
    Berkeley – Neil
1) **Proposal Budget Demo**: Rhonda Dwyer (UofA Lead SME for PD/B 1.0), 45-60mins.

   a) Rhonda opened existing proposal document
      i) The budget itself is technically a different eDoc, but we try not to advertise that to the user. One person can be working in the proposal side while another is working in the budget.
      ii) Budget versions tab (to right) is where users can create budgets and work on multiple budgets.
          (1) All tabs now are budget related
   b) Rhonda will demo the entry of a budget. System will create new document and link it to the proposal.
      i) A little slow when first opening because system is filling in some default values.
      ii) Warning is a cost limit is exceeded. Rhonda believes warning is displayed each time system executes a save. Also, it shows up on data validation. This is a soft warning.
      iii) Residual funds not necessarily functional n the budget – used for Grants.gov
   c) Budget Versions – can play with different versions to see things like can you afford 5 grad students instead of 3, or what would happen if you had a reduced IC rate. Your first budget can be left alone and will not be changed or lost.
      i) Once you add version two, still no ability to delete. This is based on Coeus usage and desire not to delete. The compromise is you can create multiple versions but have to mark one complete and final. This will be the one validation is run against and is submitted to sponsor. Only one can be marked final and complete – then you cannot make changes unless you unmark final and complete.
          (1) To add this versioning capability to Awards would be an enhancement.
      ii) You can copy a budget and then just change the things you want, or you can start over from scratch.
   d) On/off campus discussion – at some Institutions everything has to be On or everything has to be Off campus. At others, combinations are used based on object codes. The way this is set up here is a time saver. All on, all off, or default-which will go to your tables, and user can override by individual object codes.
   e) Dates – system takes start date, and does default 12 month periods. Truncates last year. These are editable by user. Periods cannot overlap. Budget period start date can’t be earlier than project start date. Budget period end date cannot be later than project end date. There can be gaps.
   f) Most high level budget can be tracked on Budget Overview page. Can just put in total requested cost and be done if you want. System will allow it. This is al free from entry, no system maintenance besides adding direct and indirect to give you a total.
   g) Can enter cost limit per budget period. There is purposely no sum here. Does not have to match Total Cost Limit.
h) Rates is where some of the meat of system performance is coming from.
   i) Lists all possible rates available.
   ii) Categorize rate types and then can match multiple object codes
       (1) This is done in maintenance tables in your unit.
       (2) Can have different rates for different units. System will pull rates based on lead unit.
   i) Summary
      i) Within categories, can click edit, and it will take you to that tab (personnel for example)
   j) Project personnel is your ‘shopping list’ of people you may budget
      i) Job code- can enter attribute, or go to look-up table – doesn’t require a table match
      ii) 12M duration and regular employee do the same thing. Summer means 3 month.
           Temporary means 1 month.
   iii) Base salary is for the amount of time, based on appointment type. For example,
        Temporary employee with 120k base salary means he could make 120k in one month.
        Regular employee w/ 120k base salary means they could earn 120k over the year,
        which would be 10k per month.
   iv) Once you make changes here you have to select save for the system to recognize people in the Personnel detail drop down.
       (1) Difference between % Effort and % Charged is C/S
       (2) Once you hit calculate, system will calculate salary and fringe based on rates,
           including inflation, base salary, appt type, % effort.
       (3) Are able to remove fringe benefits for specified employees only.
       (4) Period Type in Personnel Detail does not drive any calculations.
       (5) Apply inflation pertains to the entire group
   v) Cannot change group once you have added a person. Must delete them and add them again to another group.
   k) Non-Personnel budget , more straight forward & less steps than personnel
      i) Default panels are Equipment, Travel, Participant Support, Other Direct (mimicked after Grants.gov)
      ii) Object code numbers are display only under the name.
      iii) The drop down is alphabetized by Name.
           (1) Other option is to go to look-up to get object code number.
      iv) Once you have entered items, tab will display the number of line items entered next to the tab name. This is a tool to know if something exists within a tab.
   l) After establishing detailed budget for year 1, user can go back to parameters tab and click generate all periods.
   m) Award budget is not as detailed. All people in one category roll into one GL line item.
      i) Generally in Awards only manipulating 1 year budget at a time.
   n) Distribution & Income – Can allocate C/S and unrecovered IC to fund sources.
      i) Parameter setting for whether Source is required. Can enter account numbers, or text. Institutions can decide how they want to do this.

2) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan, SME-Final? No Comments received, in development already.
   a) Issue 1 remains outstanding – populate central admin contacts
   b) Issue 5 – The OSP Admin shows for every unit. This can become very lengthy.
      i) Susan asked Rosemary if it was really necessary to see all these names. Rosemary says yes.
ii) Hide/show may help to save space due to lengthiness of list. Email Susan comments if any and be ready to discuss next week.

c) Issue 6 – More direct approach do data entry to avoid so many cumbersome look-ups. We need to decide what we want alternate to be. Name, username, or ID? Username seems to be preference and nobody objected.

d) CSU likes what we decided in regard to adding single line non-employee rather than employee/no-employee on top of each other. This makes majority.

e) Issue 7 – workgroups as Contacts. Terry said this would be a major enhancement. Susan suggests we just utilize workarounds. Coeus does have a “Person Mass Change.” Also could create a dummy person named Team 12, with front desk # and team leader email for example.
   i) CSU, Indiana, Cornell, UA agree to go with workarounds and not pursue enhancements.

f) Grouping and Sort Order – Unit, then role, then last name. – Everyone agrees this is fine. Silence = agree!

g) On Contacts Tab – Do we want all tabs to default to closed/hide? UA, Indiana, MSU, Cornell say Yes.

**KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (**Priority 1!**)

a) Posted updated func requirements, system messages, differences from Coeus yesterday.

b) Next will work on History screen function

c) No outstanding issues except for ongoing design dilemma

**KC_AWD-Report Tracking** - Wendy (**Priority 2!**)

a) Made two updates, details in change log
   
   - **KC_AWD-Payment** – Susan (remaining issues?)
   - **KC_AWD-Reports** – Susan (remaining issues?)

**KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil (**Priority 3!**) No Update

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy

a) Something is posted, with what can be done for now.

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus/Don, update on Roundup progress

a) Don has updated spec since a shared meeting last Thursday and has a meeting scheduled for Monday with Lead SME’s and DM’s.

**KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan, AWD SME-F?

   - **AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons** – Susan (update on Roundup progress)

a) No updates unless Proposal comes back with issues.

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals** – Susan

3) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:**

4) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

a) **Contacts** – type User ID or Username? Roundup discussion update.

b) **Time & Money** –
   
   i) Eliminate Questions tab to make room to move Rates, Cost Share and Preaward Authorizations to a tab to be named before Time & Money. Name suggestions: Guarantees?
   
   ii) MSU suggestion – Commitments (rather than Guarantees)

5) **New specs for review:** Next week, I hope!

6) **Permissions:** Wendy, testing group update. Complete?

7) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review**: Diane

8) **KC Glossary** : Chris – We hope to review/approve 5 new definitions during meeting.
9) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   - **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target 04/01/09)
   - **KC_AWD-End Of Month Process** – Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
   - **KC_AWD-Print** – Carey Conover (revised target 04/08/09 to 04/15/09)
   - **KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** – Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
   - **KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed
   - **KC_Shared-Mass Person Change** – Need volunteer (target ?)

   Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

   **Glossary to be on agenda for next week.**

10) **Questions and Roll Call**

   **New Members to contact Carey Conover for orientation-type conference call**

   Welcome our New/Newer members to the group

   - **CSU** – Ed Kissam, Dawn Sharkey, Carmen Morales
   - **Indiana** – Carey Conover, Christi Arnett, Tammy Good

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Unv)</td>
<td>Dawn, Ed, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Carey, Tammy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, March 25, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

   KC_AWD-Create an Award Hierarchy
   a) Cleaned up Issues section so we can focus on issues.
   b) Issues should be cross referenced in pertinent spec section where applicable.
   c) Issue 5 can be marked as resolved – actually doesn’t need to listed as an issue. Just list in
difference from Coeus
   d) Issue 4 – 0-999 nodes. May be able to be handled by data dictionary – put as DM
question for next step. (In DD, each institution may be able to set limit)
   e) Issue 6 – as long as you save it, you are returned to open document. If you closed it, you
would be back out to the main menu. No issue to be resolved, move info to differences
from Coeus section.
   f) Issue 7 – We told Terry what we preferred. Waiting to hear back. Leave as open issue for
now.
   g) Issue 8 – Task Based Interface – different views for distributed, distributable, etc. We
will look at feedback from different schools next week as a group. Susan likely to send
out email before that.
   h) 2 issues resolved/move to differences from Coeus, 2 to DM, and 4 remaining open

KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan (Top Priority 2!)
   a) In Coeus, OSP Admins display for every unit attached to the award. Doesn’t seem like a
practical business practice that when each different unit had a question on the same
award, each unit would have to contact a different OSP Admin.
      i) We would like to have one default for lead unit, and others could be added if the User
chooses to.
   b) Susan is going to ask Terry if an OSP Admin can be a work group. Then work group
members could be managed rather than constantly changing individual contacts. Wendy
agrees this would be useful for MSU as well, as does Berkeley and ISU. If Terry says
this cannot be accommodated without an enhancement, then we will look into a work
around or pursue an enhancement. Wendy doesn’t think a work around would be
difficult to them, but a work group would be the more attractive option. Neil agrees.

KC_AWD-Report Tracking - Wendy (Top Priority 3!)
   a) She needs comments from the group before she could do anything.

KC_AWD-Payment – Susan (remaining issues?)

KC_AWD-Reports – Susan (remaining issues?)

KC_AWD-Budget – Neil (Top Priority 4! after Create an Award Hierarchy)
   a) Section 4.1.1-Here is where most of Princeton guide ended up. Made a point that it
supports workflow. Don’t need privileges to an award to do budget.
      i) Can budget be routed separate from other parts of award?
      ii) If award document and award budget document are two separate documents, then yes.
b) Neil is still working on the distributing budget from parent to child and child to parent info. He still has Princeton info, pasted in spec for this until he has a more thorough understanding.

c) Possible issue for UA, currently our financial system shows sponsor approved budget, but this is more of a budgeting tool for departments. UA may need to change our practice - is a decision that UA will have to make.

d) 4.1.2.1- this is reference material for Neil’s reference and will be deleted eventually.

e) Sandbox currently is calculating - may be that the rates aren’t set up
   i) Is calculation expected to be a configuration option? not sure.
   f) Keep in mind other methods of entering things (besides look-ups) as time savers.

g) In Coeus, user adds cost element, and everything all is in one pool/bucket. Either you know what you are looking for, or go down a long list.
   i) In Proposal Development, the UI already has the cost pools broken down for you in buckets, so you have a shorter list.
   ii) In Prop Dev, through Summary, you can view a dollar amount on the category level (salaries, fringe, etc.).
   iii) Would it be useful to have someone give us a demonstration of Prop Dev budget? (1) YES!! Perhaps Rhonda or Lisa could do this for us.
   iv) Institutions may have to be creative with how they set up there code tables to get the Budget to work as they want. For example, only load main cost pools to table rather than specific object codes.
   v) There are calculation factors in the Proposal budget that do not exist in Coeus. So going similar to Prop Dev budget for Award budget is great in appearance, but the functionality behind Proposal Development and Award are definitely different.

h) Ideally there would be a nightly feed from KC to the Institution’s financial system, so this will be a functional requirement.
   i) Neil wants to sit down with someone from one of his dept’s to get their feedback on the direction they would like this to go (in regard to g above) and what would be useful for them. This may prompt some new ideas.

j) Susan wants everyone to read Princeton background info.

**KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy *(Top Priority 4!)*

a) Still in draft stage

b) At this point has basic calculations and functionality of Coeus budget

c) Hasn’t built in anything beyond year 1 yet

d) The big difference from Proposal is in Personnel

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus/Don, cooperation needed w/IRB SME to reach shared requirements

a) Concern from developers that it wasn’t necessarily simplifying there job to come to a shared set of notes requirements.

b) Proposal Development SME to review next week.

c) What used to be the Comments Code Table in Coeus is shown as Note Types in spec on page 7. Would also be an “other.”

d) Not sure if we will need all 3: Note Description, Note Type and Note Topic

e) Emailing notes – cut and paste could accomplish the same thing without much additional effort from the user- may want to do away with email notification

f) Notes added to Use Case – All comments should be stored at the Business Object level not Document level – believe we reached agreement where IRB was okay with doing it how award does.

**KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan, AWD SME-F?

**AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons** – Susan (awaiting Roundup discussion)
KC_AWD-Funding Proposals – Susan
KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee (Top Priority 1!), next week when Renee in attendance

2) Coeus User Conference Update: Susan
   a) Susan thanks our mocks were accepted pretty well. They were impressed with our UI. Focus was on differences from Coeus including combined functionality.
   b) Neil needs 4.4 to test issue 2 – 4.4 is not available though, so he can’t.
   c) Coeus is moving to using Jira to track things instead of Perfect Tracker – yeah!
   d) Subcommittee meetings, Ron is chair, went through top 10 enhancements at Coeus user meeting at the beginning of this week, and will be sending it out to everyone. Do not have budget yet, once Steering Committee decides how many hours are available for developers, this will go out to subcommittees and they will decide what to cut.
   e) Possible issue for UA, currently our financial system shows sponsor approved budget, but this is more of a budgeting tool for departments. UA may need to change our practice- is a decision that UA will have to make.

3) New Enhancement Requests for Review:

4) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) Contacts – type User ID or Username? Roundup discussion requested.
      i) Which look do we like?
         (1) ISU, Cornell,UA like first one – Add – select type – then a drop down all in one row
         (2) OR employee/non-employee on top of each other with two drop downs (nobody on the call preferred this
   b) Time & Money –
      i) Eliminate Questions tab to make room to move Rates, Cost Share and Preaward Authorizations to a tab to be named before Time & Money. Name suggestions: Guarantees?

5) Design Critique Estimates:
   a) Lists for Participants will need to go to Carey

6) New spec for review:

7) Permissions: Wendy, testing group update. Progress? Need anything?

8) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Email comments to Diane
   Time & Money / Rates / F&A Rates
   a) Every school needs to email changes to Diane

9) KC Glossary : Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: Nothing planned.
   a) Chris to send email with changes she is working on

10) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
    KC_AWD-Create an Award – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target 04/01/09)
    KC_AWD-End Of Month Process – Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
    KC_AWD-Print - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
    KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
    KC_AWD-Parameters – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

11) Questions and Roll Call

| UA       | Susan, Tara, Jessica |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva, Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   **KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus/Don, cooperation needed w/IRB SME to reach shared requirements
   a) Development Managers have given feedback. Don is working to consolidate spec into one version with questions/issues. Dan Dwyer, Terri Durkin, Brian Hutchinson had concerns in different places. Don populated their concerns and questions into one spec version so all concerns are in one place.
   b) Don also updated screenshots and graphics, differences from Coeus, and did make some suggestions for use cases.

   **KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan, AWD SME-F?
   a) Revised spec posted
   b) Only 2 remaining issues
      i) Configurable award hierarchy icons
         (1) Rosemary responded with history and background – section in blue on spec issue is from Rosemary
            (a) Color code indicates the accounts are treated differently based on business practices – and used to help prevent errors
            (b) The functional spec was never written for this Coeus enhancement, which is why it was not released previously
            (c) Rosemary thinks we are on the right track
            (d) Commented that could be useful to allow customization, but could also become a nightmare
         (2) Susan wrote up an enhancement request. We need to vote on the priority.
         (3) Neil is wondering if San Diego screen shot in create an award hierarchy spec with customized data would accomplish same outcome as what Coeus wants to accomplish
            (a) This info is useful to see, but may not accomplish what Coeus had in mind
         (4) We will hold off on vote due to discussion of UCSD model, these are so related that we should address them together
   c) Per Wendy, permissions are good. Award Bgt Administrator and Modify Award Budget should not both be needed – just one or the other. She sent to Susan via email.

   **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (Top Priority 1!), Move Action Summary to separate panel above D&D? Default Action Summary to show or hide? Default D&D to show or hide?
   a) Breakthrough yesterday with screen design that hopefully is going to work
   b) UI will change how things are done
   c) Until we decide how all fields are going to be in there, hard for spec to move along.
   d) Both Rutgers and Princeton are only using 4.2, not 4.3
   e) May be nice to pull out transaction type to a front screen rather than on money and end dates
i) Always have to enter transaction type before saving or moving to certain screens
ii) Suggest moving panel to a new panel under Document Overview on Award Tab. Default to open with you cursor in tab to enter transaction type
iii) Neil said Berkeley has default to new, or modification depending on sequence number
iv) Action summary would be show/hide below this
v) Comment from Renee made Susan think this may need to stay on money and end dates due to other changes to money and end dates that are in process.
vi) We may have to revisit this due to Action Summary for Award (clicking next, previous to go from node to node in Coeus)

vii) In Proposal, proposal Personnel Tab in Budget – all panels are rendered accordingly based on budget period and view at top. Terri suggests something like this may be useful in determining what node(s) you view in Time & Money
   (1) Award Hierarchy, Transactions, Budget, Direct FA funds distribution, summary, History
      (a) These are the 6 panels that depend on node
   (2) Cost share, rates, preaward authorizations are not dependent on nodes, so may move these somewhere else – to a different tab
   (3) Neil likes idea, but says rates and cost share can be node dependent as well
      (a) Susan says what Neil is describing is currently out of scope – although you would have different information, you would have to go into individual node to see it
      (b) Is he suggesting an enhancement? Nope.
   (4) Do we agree with moving Cost share, rates, preaward authorizations to another tab? Yes.

KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan (Top Priority 2!)
a) Some updates have been done
b) Q for group – enhancement to populate non lead unit contacts?
   i) In our mocks we show this, do we really want it?
   ii) Neil says it may not be a must have, but would be a really nice to have
   iii) Contacts tab and Investigator combined form Coeus to KC
      (1) Currently in Coeus Investigator tab, can see OSP Admin for each unit
      (2) Susan described how we can already add the Award Administrators 1 at a time
      (3) The enhancement would have all of the default administrators populate for all units involved
         (a) Group thinks we may take more time to go in and delete unwanted info if pre-filled, so current functionality is sufficient
   iv) We’ll kill this, adding 1 at a time would not be an enhancement
v) Discussion of changes to key persons/Investigator in Dev Proposal vs Inst. Proposal, vs Awards. Updates to any of these persons in these modules do not effect persons listed in other modules. If change made to Award, Prop will not be changed. Will have workflow to obtain any needed approval for personnel changes.

KC_AWD-Report Tracking - Wendy (Top Priority 3!)
a) Customization of View will be for 3.0
b) Document Change Log updated
c) Made changes discussed last week regarding data changes
d) Added issue for versioning. However, based on Rosemary’s previous comments, not sure this is still an open issue. – This will be switched to closed
e) Issue 2- Date Issues – Wendy to look into further

KC_AWD-Payment – Susan (remaining issues?)

KC_AWD-Reports – Susan (remaining issues?)

KC_AWD-Funding Proposals – Susan

2) Enhancement Requests for Review:
   AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons – Susan (related to Medusa spec)
AW-25 Populate Non-Lead Unit Contacts – Susan (related to Contacts spec)

3) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) Contacts – type User ID or Username? Roundup discussion requested.
   b) Report Tracking – Remove Customize View panel & defer functionality to KC 3.0
   c) Permissions – Wendy, Role Names make sense & users/roles match from top to bottom
      i) Testing almost complete, just waiting to hear from a couple people. Anticipates this
         will be done by the end of the week.
   d) Time & Money –
      i) Create “Select Node” bubble at top.
      ii) Eliminate Questions tab to make room to move Rates, Cost Share and Preaward
         Authorizations to a tab to be named before Time & Money. Name suggestions: Guarantees?

4) New spec for review:
   KC_AWD-Budget – Neil (target 03/18/09, Top Priority! after Create an Award Hierarchy)
   a) Extractions from Princeton’s award guide
   b) There is stuff in here that will be taken out later- in there for now to give background and
      outline to start thinking of the actual requirements.
   c) This will feed to KFS for KC/KFS schools
   d) Neil can see this being useful and is considering what added value this could give to
      Berkeley and how they would use it.
   e) Neil presented Overview of User Requirements
   f) 4.3- Added Coeus Roles and Classes table along with our standard table
      i) Not sure of two yellow roles, and why they are constructed the way they are
      ii) Award Bgt Admin has core roles/privileges
      iii) Wendy said some of this rights are not stand alone as Neil understood them – they
           will discuss this on Friday
   g) MIT and Princeton budget procedures in Coeus will both have to be reviewed to
      determine which one our schools want to use
   KC_AWD-Budget Formulas – Wendy (target 03/18/09, Top Priority!)

5) Permissions: Wendy, testing group update. Progress? Need anything?

6) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Email comments to Diane
   Time & Money / Cost Share
   a) Diane posts to Confluence with only rows that need comments shown.
      i) If you want to see if previous changes were made, can just unhide the rows.
   b) Verification Date- Intended use is to document the date that cost share met or
      commitment date was updated. (Originally intended for cost share met field, but could be
      used for either).
   c) Remove Voluntary from example list for type because once awarded, the c/s is required if
      it was volunteered in the proposal.
   d) Remove ‘met’ from help text of Cost Share Met and revise accordingly
   e) Verification – add reference to source….
   f) Remove fiscal from fiscal year help text

7) KC Glossary: Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: Nothing planned.

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   There WILL be a meeting next week following the Coeus User Conference
   KC_AWD-Create an Award – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target 03/25/09)
   KC_AWD-End Of Month Process– Need volunteer (revised target 03/25/09)
   KC_AWD-Print - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)

KC Awards SME Group Phone Conference
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KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)

KC_AWD-Parameters – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed

Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report
Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron, Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Don, Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, March 18, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_Shared-Notes – Marcus/Don, cooperation needed w/IRB SME to reach shared requirements
   a) Development Managers have given feedback. Don is working to consolidate spec into
      one version with questions/issues. Dan Dwyer, Terri Durkin, Brian Hutchinson had
      concerns in different places. Don populated their concerns and questions into one spec
      version so all concerns are in one place.
   b) Don also updated screen shots and graphics, differences from Coeus, and did make some
      suggestions for use cases.
   KC_Shared-Medusa – Susan, AWD SME-F?
   a) Revised spec posted
   b) Only 2 remaining issues
      i) Configurable award hierarchy icons
         (1) Rosemary responded with history and background – section in blue on spec issue
            is from Rosemary
            (a) Color code indicates the accounts are treated differently based on business
                practices – and used to help prevent errors
            (b) The functional spec was never written for this Coeus enhancement, which is
                why it was not released previously
            (c) Rosemary thinks we are on the right track
            (d) Commented that could be useful to allow customization, but could also
                become a nightmare
         (2) Susan wrote up an enhancement request. We need to vote on the priority.
         (3) Neil is wondering if San Diego screen shot in create an award hierarchy spec with
             customized data would accomplish same outcome as what Coeus wants to
             accomplish
             (a) This info is useful to see, but may not accomplish what Coeus had in mind
         (4) We will hold off on vote due to discussion of UCSD model, these are so related
             that we should address them together
   c) Per Wendy, permissions are good. Award Bgt Administrator and Modify Award Budget
      should not both be needed – just one or the other. She sent to Susan via email.

   KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee (Top Priority 1!), Move Action Summary to separate
   panel above D&D? Default Action Summary to show or hide? Default D&D to show or hide?
   a) Breakthrough yesterday with screen design that hopefully is going to work
   b) UI will change how things are done
   c) Until we decide how all fields are going to be in there, hard for spec to move along.
   d) Both Rutgers and Princeton are only using 4.2, not 4.3
   e) May be nice to pull out transaction type to a front screen rather than on money and end
      dates
i) Always have to enter transaction type before saving or moving to certain screens
ii) Suggest moving panel to a new panel under Document Overview on Award Tab. Default to open with your cursor in tab to enter transaction type
iii) Neil said Berkeley has default to new, or modification depending on sequence number
iv) Action summary would be show/hide below this
v) Comment from Renee made Susan think this may need to stay on money and end dates due to other changes to money and end dates that are in process.
vi) We may have to revisit this due to Action Summary for Award (clicking next, previous to go from node to node in Coeus)

vii) In Proposal, proposal Personnel Tab in Budget – all panels are rendered accordingly based on budget period and view at top. Terri suggests something like this may be useful in determining what node(s) you view in Time & Money
   (1) Award Hierarchy, Transactions, Budget, Direct FA funds distribution, summary, History
       (a) These are the 6 panels that depend on node
   (2) Cost share, rates, preaward authorizations are not dependent on nodes, so may move these somewhere else – to a different tab
   (3) Neil likes idea, but says rates and cost share can be node dependent as well
       (a) Susan says what Neil is describing is currently out of scope – although you would have different information, you would have to go into individual node to see it
       (b) Is he suggesting an enhancement? Nope.
   (4) Do we agree with moving Cost share, rates, preaward authorizations to another tab? Yes.

**KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan (Top Priority 2!)**

a) Some updates have been done
b) Q for group – enhancement to populate non lead unit contacts?
   i) In our mocks we show this, do we really want it?
   ii) Neil says it may not be a must have, but would be a really nice to have
   iii) Contacts tab and Investigator combined form Coeus to KC
       (1) Currently in Coeus Investigator tab, can see OSP Admin for each unit
       (2) Susan described how we can already add the Award Administrators 1 at a time
       (3) The enhancement would have all of the default administrators populate for all units involved
           (a) Group thinks we may take more time to go in and delete unwanted info if pre-filled, so current functionality is sufficient
   iv) We’ll kill this, adding 1 at a time would not be an enhancement
v) Discussion of changes to key persons/Investigator in Dev Proposal vs Inst. Proposal, vs Awards. Updates to any of these persons in these modules do not effect persons listed in other modules. If change made to Award, Prop will not be changed. Will have workflow to obtain any needed approval for personnel changes.

**KC_AWD-Report Tracking - Wendy (Top Priority 3!)**

a) Customization of View will be for 3.0
b) Document Change Log updated
c) Made changes discussed last week regarding data changes
d) Added issue for versioning. However, based on Rosemary’s previous comments, not sure this is still an open issue. – This will be switched to closed
e) Issue 2- Date Issues – Wendy to look into further

**KC_AWD-Payment – Susan (remaining issues?)**

**KC_AWD-Reports – Susan (remaining issues?)**

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals – Susan**

2) **Enhancement Requests for Review:**

**AW-24 Configurable Award Hierarchy Icons – Susan (related to Medusa spec)**
3) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) **Contacts** – type User ID or Username? Roundup discussion requested.
   b) **Report Tracking** – Remove Customize View panel & defer functionality to KC 3.0
   c) **Permissions** – Wendy, Role Names make sense & users/roles match from top to bottom
      i) Testing almost complete, just waiting to hear from a couple people. Anticipates this will be done by the end of the week.
   d) **Time & Money** –
      i) Create “Select Node” bubble at top.
      ii) Eliminate Questions tab to make room to move Rates, Cost Share and Preaward Authorizations to a tab to be named before Time & Money. Name suggestions: Guarantees?

4) **New spec for review:**
   **KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil (target 03/18/09, *Top Priority!* after Create an Award Hierarchy)
   a) Extractions from Princeton’s award guide
   b) There is stuff in here that will be taken out later- in there for now to give background and outline to start thinking of the actual requirements.
   c) This will feed to KFS for KC/KFS schools
   d) Neil can see this being useful and is considering what added value this could give to Berkeley and how they would use it.
   e) Neil presented Overview of User Requirements
   f) 4.3- Added Coeus Roles and Classes table along with our standard table
      i) Not sure of two yellow roles, and why they are constructed the way they are
      ii) Award Bgt Admin has core roles/privileges
      iii) Wendy said some of this rights are not stand alone as Neil understood them – they will discuss this on Friday
   g) MIT and Princeton budget procedures in Coeus will both have to be reviewed to determine which one our schools want to use

   **KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy (target 03/18/09, *Top Priority!*)

5) **Permissions:** Wendy, testing group update. Progress? Need anything?

6) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Email comments to Diane
   **Time & Money / Cost Share**
   a) Diane posts to Confluence with only rows that need comments shown.
      i) If you want to see if previous changes were made, can just unhide the rows.
   b) Verification Date- Intended use is to document the date that cost share met or commitment date was updated. (Originally intended for cost share met field, but could be used for either).
   c) Remove Voluntary from example list for type because once awarded, the c/s is required if it was volunteered in the proposal.
   d) Remove ‘met’ from help text of Cost Share Met and revise accordingly
   e) Verification – add reference to source….
   f) Remove fiscal from fiscal year help text

7) **KC Glossary:** Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: Nothing planned.

8) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   There **WILL be a meeting next week** following the Coeus User Conference
   **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Maybe Susan or ? (revised target 03/25/09)
   **KC_AWD-End Of Month Process**– Need volunteer (revised target 03/25/09)
   **KC_AWD-Print** - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)
**KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** - Need volunteer (revised target 04/01/09)

**KC_AWD-Parameters** – Spreadsheet documentation may be required as Parameters developed

*Need Structure from Kenton* for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report

Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid

Basis and Method of Payment Maint

9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Jessica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron, Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Don, Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, March 11, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 12-2pm (MT) / 3-5pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: [http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”]

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   **KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus/Don, AWD SME-F? Std Notes topics (Coeus Comments); still need to display as panel on Notes?
   a) Should be able to consider SME Final after Marcus’s meeting next Monday. Susan to let Terry know it is available now. No issues from our SME at this time. Marcus is anticipating some changes from Brian’s review/development-manager feedback.
   b) UI – Single text area for what used to be comments
      Maybe could have edit action here that takes you to a mini window with the details instead of squeezing everything into a little space.

   **KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan, AWD SME-F?
   a) This is progressing
   b) Want to make sure everything we are doing is in line with what Coeus is doing
   c) Email from Rosemary – discussion with Neil
      i) Mixing of Status with Purpose – has to be determined
      ii) Type codes / status codes need to be resolved before moving forward.
   d) MSU is 2/3 done with sending their comments to Susan
   e) Did Wendy have a chance to look at Functional Requirements having to do with Permissions?
      i) Yes she did, but is having computer issues and will send to Susan offline
   f) Tyler is supposed to be co-author and should let Susan know if there is anything to add for proposal Development

   **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (deferred from 02/25/09, Top Priority!)
   What should we do with Action Summary?
   a) Has new issue/question for Rosemary/Ron – Going back to select transaction type when entering time and money – is this a bug?
      i) No, per Rosemary this is intentional. Used to happen (assignment or transaction type) behind the scenes, but now the transaction type has been brought forward for user to select transaction type from code table

2) New spec for review:
   **KC_AWD-Report Tracking** - Wendy (revised review target 03/11/09)
   a) Purpose & Narrative sections – Borrowed bits and pieces from report spec
   b) User Requirements/Use Cases – overview
      i) Wendy says Customized View Alternate will need some tweaking
   c) Q from Marcus – is there any need to version if you edit or make changes?
      i) Wendy to look into, add to issues list
      ii) Susan thinks it is more of an aggregate view of info taken from other places, but is not sure
      iii) Rosemary says it is a little more complicated than this. A report stays in report tracking log when an award changes versions. If report requirement changes, prior
report needed would stay in report track log, but user would need to update status to no longer required (for example).

d) On Functional Requirement 2, Item to be changed to Data (and perhaps elsewhere)

e) Question from Marcus – Dates, can Activity Date be in past? Can it be future Date? Can it only be today? If there are rules, will they just be in data dictionary? Can be here as well? Wendy to look into.

f) Error – Please select a row to delete – can get rid of this one because KC will have a delete button on each row.

g) If we have to do away with Customize View option for this release, then need to add it to Differences from Coeus section of mock

h) Customized View to be added as an issue until it is resolved

**KC_AWD-Payment** – Susan (remaining issues?, revised target 03/11/09)

**KC_AWD-Reports** – Susan (remaining issues?, revised target 03/11/09)

a) Developer had discussion with Susan about ‘As Required’ report frequency

b) For frequency like quarterly, but frequency as required, what happens?
   i) Differences based on whether there is a due date or not
   ii) If a due date is entered, Coeus uses due date as frequency base date, and report is in schedule. If no due date, report does not show up in schedule.
   iii) There is a JIRA with the specifics

c) What would SME’s expect when they put that in there?
   i) Per Rosemary, As Required was a way to enter a potential report that may need to be submitted as requested by sponsor – sponsor may or may not request it at any given time.
      (1) Is a way of making a note, especially for the PI, that there is an obligation upon demand
      (2) If sponsor asks for it, Institution is obligated to provide it, but no due date unless a request is actually made by sponsor

d) Added Proposals Due as a Report class so we could access scheduling capabilities
   i) Code tables out of the box don’t agree with terminology we are using due to label changes, so Susan will come up with Appendix describing this

**KC_AWD-Funding Proposals** – Susan (rework target 03/11/09)

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan (deferred from 02/25/09)

a) A lot of narrative text similar to project personnel

b) Terms - Central Admin Contact is what Coeus called something else (OSP Admin?)

c) 3.2 – Susan thinks this enhancement request is AW-16, which is already written – she will add reference

d) Important Concepts

e) Use case mapping, etc is not finished. May be mapping errors.

f) Could use feedback on Functional Requirements

g) Neil is curious about general use of Rolodex and how they keep it updated.
   i) Rosemary says they update it in the Central office due to Grants.gov system issues. Previously let campus users input entries, but now do not. They provide it as a service to avoid system to system feed issues. One mistake could lead to error for multiple proposal submissions.

h) Rolodex entry could be outside PI’s (subcontractors), future employees, Collaborator/Subcontract sites (rather than individuals), as well as sponsor contacts. Some of these people may eventually be in Person table.

i) Federal Requirements – Rosemary pointed out that Contacts are needed to meet contractual invoicing and reporting requirements.
j) Are search requirements and criteria that can be searched on included in this spec? No, this was already done for Proposal Budget. When system is able to be tested, we will need to make sure that we don’t need to request changes.

2) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane  
   a) For subawards, have not received any responses  
   b) Neil sent some suggestions for some items  
      i) Diane and Susan like these definitions  
      ii) Diane is wondering if we also need to update glossary, or if we shouldn’t worry about it  
         (1) Diane to send email to Chris about this (Chris not here today)

3) **KC Glossary:** Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: Nothing planned.

4) **Permissions:** Wendy, testing group update. Assignments made? Progress? Need anything?  
   a) Expects to be done next week

5) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.  
   a) Contacts – type User ID or Username? Roundup discussion requested.  
      i) Looks like Add button is not going to work  
      ii) More to come on User ID/Username  
      i) Susan confirmed that Refresh does update entire screen – anything on that screen that can be refreshed will be refreshed.  
         (1) Susan didn’t ask what happens to other edits (elsewhere) that haven’t been saved, but Susan will ask Terry about that.  
      ii) Do we still prefer green arrows?  
         (1) Q from Ron - Worse case scenario- if somebody changed a lot of details, didn’t refresh at all – and just closed out – would the data be saved?  
            (a) Navigate to another screen would automatically save  
            (b) If you have JavaScript enabled, will automatically refresh, buttons are for users without JavaScript  
         (2) Neil thinks green arrows still good – nobody stated a change in preference, so we will stay with green arrows  
         (3) In Coeus these update automatically, no refresh needed
   c) Report Tracking – Customize View history from Coeus – Susan  
      i) There are enhancements changes to this that are not in use yet, currently it is not broadly used.  
      ii) Schools currently do not use many custom views  
         (1) We will let this issue drop off for now, which is okay with Rosemary
   d) Permissions – Review Role Names & make sure the users and roles match from top to bottom  
      i) Wendy is working on – aiming for a week from today to have this complete
   e) Notes – UI concept posted to Jira [KRAFUNC-103](#)  
   f) Time & Money hierarchy screen?  
      i) Renee to come up with a list of the most common types of transactions – she is asking other schools that use Coeus for input  
         (1) Neil is putting together a list for Berkeley  
         (2) He has asked other non-Coeus UC schools as well for input and it was useful; SME’s that don’t use Coeus are also free to give input on what types of transactions they see, esp., that would cause them to version an award.  
      ii) We may have to expand the list of transactions and associate certain rules with financial transactions vs. non-financial transactions  
      iii) Changes to mocks were requested earlier today
6) **Enhancement Requests for Review:**

7) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings – NEED MAJOR SPECS TO DEVELOPERS BY END OF MARCH!!**

   - **KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil (target 03/11/09, *Top Priority!* after Create an Award Hierarchy)
   - **KC_AWD-Budget Formulas** – Wendy (target 03/18/09, *Top Priority!*)
     a) Wendy and Neil are getting together on 3/20 to work on this – will try to have something by Wed 3/18, but not sure if it will be possible
   - **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Kenton (revised target 03/18/09)
     b) Still needs to be done, but probably will not be done by Kenton. May reassign to new BA from Hawaii.

   - **KC_AWD-End Of Month Process** – Need volunteer (revised target 03/18/09)
   - **KC_AWD-Print** - Need volunteer (revised target 03/26/09)
   - **KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** - Need volunteer (revised target 03/26/09)

   **Need Structure from Kenton** for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

8) **Questions and Roll Call**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UA</strong></td>
<td>Susan, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron, Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Jeff, Don, Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002418#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC_AWD-Create an Award Hierarchy – Neil (continue review with FRs, Top Priority!)
   a) User Requirements- updated steps for before you actually get to Node
   b) Filter results – new functionality
   c) Borrowed for Medusa spec in many places – expand/collapse all is in Medusa functionality
   d) References to view distributable, distributed….is in Time & money mock in hierarchy section
      i) Neil will talk with Susan about mocks tomorrow
   e) Use Case- Take offline. Anyone who hasn’t reviewed needs to do so and give Neil any feedback.
      i) Alternates have been constructed differently
   f) Functional Requirements –
      i) C – View Selected Award Details – can call it Summary instead to avoid confusion
      ii) Open Award Document – grabbed from Medusa – referred to permissions
      iii) Open new browser window from/to hierarchy?
         (1) UA was thinking about this earlier this week in regard to the way it shows on time and
             money – such a small area of the screen is showing.
         (2) Bart described a tool he can use that will look at the number of rows in the hierarchy and
             can scale the scroll to show more or less depending on overall size.
         (3) UA thinks anything up to 20 rows we should be able to see right off, and anything bigger
             can have scaled scroll – Neil likes this. Default to less if there are less than 20 so there is
             no blank space. Susan to check into the empty space issue.
         iv) Also, Terry & Renee talked about moving hierarchy to top and also moving history to this
             tab. – Group likes
         v) UA also suggests expanded window for hierarchy (pencil icon – like comments) to show
             hierarchy in a larger view as desired by user (useful when a large number of rows). – Group
             likes
         vi) Neil likes all these suggestions and nobody objects so Susan will see what can be done.
   g) Need to add additional system messages
      i) Suggestion to go through Coeus and put in bad data and see what messages come up
   h) Design Requirements section is new
      i) Additional summary information displayed to right as opposed to just identifying line by
         number
      i) Indicators - If dealing with only fabrication and cost sharing would not be considered new
         functionality because Coeus is already slated to do this
     j) Neil finding different labels and abbreviations in KC for field labels - to discuss offline with
        Susan and Renee
   k) This spec is almost done!!

   KC_Shared-Notes – Marcus/Don, Any remaining issues or AWD SME-F?
   a) Don & Marcus emailed response to Renee – is Renee okay with all this
      i) Current Coeus functionality – question regarding comments to a specific tab/field/panel and
         being able to change Notes types
ii) For what used to be Coeus comments, we would have subpanels with static topics with topic already decided. For invoicing instructions for example, Coeus only allows one comment (not multiple) so there would be a single text box already labeled Invoice Instructions.

(1) Renee likes – their concern was that they want to see all of these Comments (as Coeus calls it) in one place instead of going back to tab and doesn’t want user to be able to change type for what Coeus calls Comments.

(2) Susan is going to have Bart create something for us to see what she is talking about.

**KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan, Any remaining issues or AWD SME-F?

a) Award Status Code Table descriptions and flag colors

   i) If we want each Institution to be able to control their indicators would be a definite enhancement

   ii) Fabricated Equipment is an account type. Is cost share? No. It is not in any code table yet.

   iii) Ron has found that account types are created for major types of expenditures – Coeus thinks there is going to be an increasing need for this. It is intended for expenditure account type.

      (1) Is account type correct table to associate this with? Yes per Ron and Neil.

   iv) So do we need this configurable on a broader basis, with potential for future need of additional icons? Ron says this is going to catch on and grow.

      (1) Should we put the development resources now or wait for people to ask for it?

      (2) Ron thinks we should get Rosemary involved because this is an MIT thing – Susan will email her.

b) We need to decide what we want – just these two icons or flexibility for more? Colors?

c) Should all award Notes be editable through Medusa view?

   i) Susan says yes, if you are in there then let your permissions decide what you can do.

   ii) Neil agrees.

d) Side note- all affected modules also need to change labels from Comments to Notes

2) **Mock Progress/Requests**: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

a) **Sponsor Template** – Lookup ONLY OK? Not worth dev effort to find template while typing…

   i) Development effort would be substantial. Do we prefer to use development effort elsewhere?

      (1) Neil @ Berkeley says it would be really useful and he has proposed something similar in Award hierarchy.

      (2) Terry said this is a set up function and will have limited use- we will only use once with each award and each node

         (a) Based on this Neil is okay with not having filtered search here.

         (3) Diane agrees for CSU it is okay to not have filtered searching for this.

   ii) Previous argument for not having pull down (vs look-up) would be that the pull down list could be very long.

   iii) Berkeley currently uses only 1 template for the most part. They scaled down from about 160 templates due to consistency issues, duplication, and maintenance.

      (1) One issue occurred where FDP conditions attached to award, but actual award had a special condition that wasn’t picked up in template and PI made a big deal so Berkeley revisited restating all the terms and conditions in the template.

   iv) What templates do we want out of the box? Terry wants this information within the next 2 weeks.

      (1) Per Ron the purpose of the template is for validation. He thinks the first step would be to determine what fields KC will require so we know what we will need to include in the templates.

      (2) Q from Ron: Will KC follow Coeus in regard to having to correlate frequency/frequency base tables? Yes. Susan to follow-up with Kenton.

   v) Out of the box – what are 3 to 5 templates Institutions can use as a starting point. We also need templates for testing purposes (functionality testing).
vi) Ron says a good template out of the box would be a generic template that fills in validation fields.
   (1) Single generic term: See award for Terms
   (2) Generic comment, etc.

vii) If we are using a generic template to circumvent validation rules, what is the point of having validation?
   (1) For this reason, Berkeley likes the soft warnings instead of hard error.

viii) For testing:
   (1) Generic Template- See award…
   (2) One general FDP template – (There is one on the Coeus website where info can be copied and pasted into tables). Ron can load it if he knew where to load it. (Also good for out of box). Susan and Ron to talk tomorrow about getting this done,

b) Details & Dates – Under Sponsor, Need to change label Sponsor to Sponsor ID to be consistent with Proposal. (ID is look-up entry field & Name is display only)

c) Special Approval – for add, Traveler Name has entry box ‘or’ look-up icon
   i) Or was not consistently used throughout mocks.
   ii) We will remove ‘or’ and this will be training issue.

d) Contacts – type User ID or Username? PD/B did username, our spec says ID.
   i) What would data entry be more likely to know?
   ii) Colorado, MSU would like to be consistent with Proposal
   iii) For non-employees however, you would not have a Username.
   iv) For proposal, this is not in dev, so we are not positive if they will still do this, but it is in their spec
      (1) People table and Rolodex being combined currently???
      (2) Susan to follow up with Terry regarding this

e) Use of Refresh for those without Java script
   i) Data dependencies for drop downs in Reports
   ii) Do we want Refresh button on end of row or green arrows next to field
      (1) Green arrows probably will refresh everything not just individual field – Susan can confirm this
      (2) When hovering over refresh button, does say refresh pull down
         (a) MSU likes green arrows
         (b) Colorado likes refresh button – think it is clearer and straight forward
         (c) UA could go either way- think refresh button looks better, arrows may be easier for user
         (d) Berkeley likes arrows
         (e) Cornell goes with arrows
         (f) ISU-green arrows
         (g) Indiana likes refresh
         (h) GREEN ARROWS WIN

g) Report Tracking – Customize View update from Coeus Users – Susan
   i) Current Coeus users don’t use much
   ii) Terry said if a lot of common customizations, then we could have option to change view, but not ad-hoc customizations.
   iii) Ron to get history on this so we can have history to come up with functional equivalent
      (1) Berkeley will be using this more in the future as an outward facing component for PI’s and department
   iv) It would be nice to have flexibility – to revisit when we have more info on background and usage.

h) Permissions – Review Role Names & make sure the users and roles match from top to bottom
   i) Volunteer- Wendy to send Susan specific comments and to look at Proposal development to make sure sample data doesn’t mislead UI feedback group.

i) Notes – Marcus, do we want to look at this UI yet?
   i) Susan and Marcus to deal with offline
3) **New spec for review:**

**KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (deferred from 02/25/09, **Top Priority!**)  
What should we do with Action Summary?

a) Terminology discussion: Obligation dates – changing this name may result in backlash from the Coeus community  
i) Susan thinks we may need to change obligation to budget date for consistency with Details & Dates – or perhaps we need to change budget dates back to obligation dates. Are these the same fields? Does budget start date refer to first Obligated Start Date?  
ii) Consensus is we don’t need to change labels – they are fine the way the are.

b) Renee to add discussion of distributed and distributable into purpose.

c) Can remove Additional Features and Enhancements….

d) Needs to add reference to Princeton guide

e) Terms & Definitions – add “Time” and “Money”? No. We are using it in generic sense and it is a panel name rather than term.

f) Business Rules – change beginning of sentence to “Time & Money”

g) User Story – borrowed a little form Award hierarchy – they go hand in hand

h) Add Units of Organizations and Child Nodes to terms list

i) There are 13 data entry fields – struggled to show them all. Basically entering money into 4 buckets, and then there is a grand total.

j) Does Ron know of anyone that actually uses distributed and distributable? MIT and Princeton does.

   i) Renee already tried to get rid of this but Steve Dottie (spelling?) shot her down.

k) Our UI with From/To is different where you can move from level 1 to 4 (for example) rather than 1 to 2; 2 to 3; 3 to 4 (as Coeus would make you go one level at a time)

l) Proposition to Terry regarding selective drop downs like Hierarchy…more info to come

m) Pending section for Workflow implementation – Can only delete pending in certain order because transactions affect each other.

   i) Need to specify what happens once it goes to Pending

n) Data Dictionary items are the 13 data entry fields we have

   i) Will need to add system generated totals

o) Design Requirements- working on a way to view all 13 fields

p) Kenton thought Time & Money should open in view mode for everyone with edit button

   i) Renee thinks this goes against everything we have been doing. It should be permission driven.

   ii) Does everyone in SME group agree that this should be permission driven? Yes (Cornell, UA, MSU, Berkeley, CSU all agree).

   iii) Renee and Susan to talk to Kenton Thursday and see what his reasoning was and to express groups opinion to him (permission driven).

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan (deferred from 02/25/09)

4) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane  
Award/Subawards  
Time & Money/Direct/F&A Funds Distribution

a) New version posted today- send her your comments offline.

5) **KC Glossary** : Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: Nothing planned.

6) **Permissions**: Wendy, update from testing group. Demo took place 03/02/09.

   a) Ron, Chris, Marcus, Marva, Jeff helping with testing

   b) Two demo sessions done this week

   c) By next week should have their feedback and be able to finalize spreadsheet

7) **Enhancement Requests for Review:**
8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   KC_AWD-Budget – Neil (target 03/11/09, Top Priority! after Create an Award Hierarchy)
   KC_AWD-Budget Formulas – Wendy (target 03/18/09, Top Priority!)
   KC_AWD-Report Tracking - Wendy (revised review target 03/11/09)
      KC_AWD-Payment – Susan (remaining issues?, revised target 03/11/09)
      KC_AWD-Reports – Susan (remaining issues?, revised target 03/11/09)
   KC_AWD-Funding Proposals – Susan (rework target 03/11/09)
   KC_AWD-Create an Award – Kenton (revised target 03/18/09)
   KC_AWD-End Of Month Process– Need volunteer (revised target 03/18/09)
   KC_AWD-Print - Need volunteer (revised target 03/26/09)
   KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting - Need volunteer (revised target 03/26/09)
   Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report
   Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid
   Basis and Method of Payment Maint

9) Questions and Roll Call
   a) Current and Pending discussion – there will be a separate spec. Will likely be a shared spec
      between Institute Proposal and Awards.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Jeff and Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   **KC_AWD-Create an Award Hierarchy** – Neil (continue review with FRs, **Priority 1!**)  
   a) Considerable time spent on changing index to use cases 4.1.2 – Made process of getting to specific node within the hierarchy clear  
   b) Questions on current order of user requirements? No.  
   c) 4.4-Index to use cases  
      i) Included reference to expand/collapse nodes as done in Medusa spec  
      ii) How deep does a descendant go? As deep as you want as long as dollar threshold set at root award is not exceeded.  
   d) Skipping use cases for today  
   e) Functional Requirements- 1st complete early draft  
      i) Navigate to Node – Discussion of search filter-probably something new.  
         (1) This is two FR's per Marcus, 1-Search, 2-Navigate.  
         (2) Stay away from easily, user-friendly, etc.  
      ii) Line 7 – take out after… and can be easily tracked.  
   f) When copying node, you can choose to create a new award record.  
      i) Would all info. be carried over?  
      ii) Neil believes it takes everything but the money.  
   **KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan (Added to UCs, FRs, Screen Shots)  
   a) Relevant documents-  
      i) Marked for development – Coeus is adding additional color coding for fabricated equipment and cost sharing  
      ii) Add to Medusa ability to edit- not an issue for us because we are not distinguishing between edit and correct.  
   b) Can award status table be revised from time to time, and would colors be able to be changed accordingly?  
      i) This would be useful to Berkeley  
      ii) Susan to see what Terry has to say about this from development stand point  
         (1) He may have to add table anyway to accommodate FE and CS  
   c) User Requirements - 1&2 have to do with 2 different views available  
   d) Was able to keep it down to 1 use case  
   e) Susan wants group to run through use case like a test scenario and make sure everyone can run through it as it is written.  
   f) FR – 3 ways to get into Medusa – (Medusa accessibility)  
   g) May or may not be a development proposal related to Institutional Proposal  
      i) Back to User Req.- does this cover both development and institutional proposal? Yes.  
         Institutional Proposal is linked to award, while Development Proposal is only linked to Institutional Proposal  
      ii) Negotiations are linked only to Institute Proposal
(1) Can only be one Negotiation linked to each Institute Proposal
(2) Read appendix 2 – is interesting about links (proposals disappearing from Medusa)

h) Back to FR’s – Subaward – does this need to be split to 2 FR’s instead of and/or?

i) Perspectives in Medusa- 2 views

j) Icons may change as UI develops
   i) Click on row & it will expand and give you summary
   ii) On current screen shot
       (1) Display mode will become open document
       (2) Notepad will be notes
       (3) Negotiation – this is here now because of future functionality

k) 4a could potentially be 3 or 4 requirements, need to review (and 4c)

l) Back to Use Case
   i) Normal Course – assumption, user coming in from results screen
   ii) For Use Case, did not matter what module you were coming from.
      (1) N-Clarified 1, Medusa-enabled module (instead of Medusa module) (also make this change in A1)
      (2) N2-Ok-Link to A1, A1 needs a little tweaking
      (3) N6-change expand/contract to expand/collapse
      (4) A3-Notes Functionality – need to add FR about User Permission determining ability to add notes from Medusa
      (5) A4, step 2 – Susan to fix, doesn’t do that if user has turned off the summary
      (6) A5, step 6 – link back to N (among several other links) – Susan to double-check this link back to N
         (a) Link to A6-may need to delete this link as well, Susan to review

m) Back to FR’s
   i) 10-Medusa as a navigational tool- Susan to work on wording here to read more as a FR.
      (1) 13a i, 13a ii to be re-worded
   ii) Permissions – Wendy to double check – Susan to finish this section of FR
   iii) System message – we want to do away with this by not providing action button if no permission for negotiation – Susan may plug into issue section so we can document that we made a conscious decision to get rid of message (didn’t just change it)

**KC_Shared-Notes** – Marcus (Progressing, UCs and FRs ready for review, **Priority 2**)

a) Sync Child and Sync all Children are new functionality
b) Enhancement request to 4.4 for sync to parent – wasn’t clear if push or pull, so what is written here is largely an educated guess of what was intended.
c) Per Jessica at UA, may want to look at linking in Proposal functionality for syncing parents and children. ISU will check with Lisa tomorrow as they are meeting with her about something else.
d) Q on Award Notice from Diane – is that something that goes through workflow? Award notice is something that will print from Coeus (KC).
e) A2, A3 – continued discussion of syncing children. ISU to confirm with Lisa, in proposal, in root level have sync all children button (which is a push from parent to all children). In other situation, when in an individual node, have button sync to parent, which is a pull from parent to one child/node.
f) Next steps: confirm with Lisa how the syncs work. Then this will go the round-up. Will only come back to Awards group if issues or significant changes.
2) New spec for review:
   **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee (will try to post progress Monday, 02/23/09, **Priority 3**)
   What should we do with Action Summary?

   **KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan (will post progress Monday, 02/23/09)

3) **KC Glossary**: Chris • Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: PI (and related: Contact PI, Investigator, Program Director and Project Director), Co-I (and related: Multiple PIs) Payment Basis (alternate definition) and Procurement Priority Code
   a) Question on definition including spouses and children (financial conflict of interest) in Investigator definition
      i) Suggestion – add caveat, for conflict of interest, this also includes spouse and children
   b) Principal Investigator-MSU thinks 2nd half of definition fell apart. All still have same responsibility – the first one is just the contact, but in a multiple-PI proposal all are sharing responsibility- MSU requests to clarify definition in this regard. (1st contact, not solely responsible)
   c) Combine Key Personnel and Key Person- for Key Person, say see Key Personnel
   d) Chris will now make changes that she has received for glossary.
   e) Procurement Priority Code – Accepted, matches data dictionary as well
   f) Payment Basis – accept alternate, change project to award

4) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review**: Diane
   Award/Subawards
   Time & Money/Direct/F&A Funds Distribution

5) **Permissions**: Wendy

6) **Mock Progress/Requests**: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) **Time & Money** hierarchy screen

7) **Enhancement Requests for Review**:

8) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   **KC_AWD-Report Tracking** - **Need volunteer** (target 03/04/09)
   **KC_AWD-Payment** – Susan (remaining issues?, target 02/25/09)
   **KC_AWD-Reports** – Susan (remaining issues?, target 02/25/09)
   **KC_AWD-Create an Award** – Kenton (target 03/04/09)
   **KC_AWD-Funding Proposals** – Susan (rework target 03/04/09)
   **KC_AWD-Budget** – Neil (target 03/11/09)
   **KC_AWD-Print** - **Need volunteer** (target 03/11/09)
   **KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting** - **Need volunteer** (target 03/11/09)
   **KC_AWD-End Of Month Process**– **Need volunteer** (target 03/18/09)

   **Need Structure from Kenton** for **KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint**, **KC_AWD-Report**
   Class Type Frequency Maint, **KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint**, and **KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint**

9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/University</th>
<th>Contact(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Jessica, Julie, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marcus, Marva, Jeff and Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) **KC Sandbox Update to Coeus 4.3.2:**

   Need volunteer to go back and make sure new functionality in old specs. Also, new specs that need to be written (read, ‘Volunteer now!’) are as follows: KC_AWD-Email Notification, KC_AWD-Action Summary, KC_AWD-End Of Month Process,

2) **New spec for review:**

    **KC_AWD-Project Personnel** – Susan (The New Top Priority!)

   a) Most current version is up
   b) For now, we will skip over the narrative sections unless there are specific comments
   c) For references, we are picking up Coeus Enhancement request for effort
   d) Terms and Conditions – Has to do with the glossary items we hope to be getting to today
   e) Narrative Story – Susan realized there was a whole paragraph that wasn’t supposed to be there and cut it out
      i) Let her know of any wording changes
   f) 2 Use Cases
      i) 1st 2 panels in Contacts Tab in mocks – Project Personnel and Combined Credit Split
         (one use case for each)
   g) In a few weeks, hopes to have 2nd part, which is a separate spec dealing with the other 3 panels
   h) Use Case 1 – Maintain Project Personnel
      i) Exception 1 – Kenton previously walked Susan through this. This level of detail has not been in other specs and they have been fine, but it is in this one, so we will see what happens
      ii) Discussion of E2- Should this be here? Not the way Coeus works, but PD/B has it in their spec
         (1) Susan wants group to decide if we keep this in here or not
         (2) When look-up is done in test drive, you can add a University, rather than an individual?
         (3) Susan will test this more
         (4) Is this a valid rule we want to include, anyone brought in as a non-employee must have an individual associated with it
            (a) It would be useful to get reasoning form PD/B. Susan to find out about this – is there something more behind this?
      iii) Alternate 4 reference needs to be removed from N4
      iv) Link to UC2 from UC1- this has not been done before, but seems appropriate here
      v) What happens if a proposal is not linked?
         (1) Then as individuals added to key personnel, they show up in credit split, with zeroes, and you must fill it out because validate adds to 100 if parameter to validate is set
Regarding mock – we had talked about combining these first 2 panels (currently first 2 panels) – Combined Credit Split will be subpanel of Project Personnel. There is a mock jira out there for this
  i) Eventually there will be 4 rather than 5 panels on Contacts tab

Functional requirements

j) Susan to check into details of proposal feed
  i) Perhaps if second or third link may still feed if certain fields were never completed (are still blank after first save)

k) In Proposal, Person Details displays all details from person table. This is a lot of data. Therefore, we did not bring it all forward, but it can be looked up here.

l) For Unit Details, you can either look up unit Name or manually enter Unit Number
  i) Do we want the same thing for Person? Currently you have to look them up (no option to just enter in the Employee ID or something along those lines)
  ii) For example at some Institutions, there are data entry people who have ID #, etc. in front of them
  iii) Terry said it would sort-of be possible to do this with primary key for table. We would need to use existing primary key or select another unique identifier from the table (like user name).
  iv) Does the group think it would be helpful to add this?
    (1) UA-yes
    (2) CSU-yes

m) Row 11- was specific on where User should be returned after look-up because the way the mocks are working now is not efficient

n) Row 13- Person details displayed are different for Key Person vs. PI/Co-I. For Key Person, you need to choose their project role in conjunction with adding Key Person

o) The patch release for Proposal changes the way this works for NIH multi-investigator awards – Susan to look at this in Dev and see what affect this has on our group

p) Row 18- list search as a separate Functional Requirement (separate from default)

q) Do we want Units sorted by name, number, or order added?
  i) For now Unit number. Anybody prefer otherwise? No comments

r) Do we want to be able to do multi-delete vs. deleting people one at a time?
  i) In Proposal, there are check boxes that show up when there is more than one Project Persons displayed.
  ii) If you delete a person from a certain unit should all the unit contacts for that unit be deleted as well? What do we want?
  iii) Rows 27 and 28 go away because we don’t have delete selected

s) Row 33- In proposal, certain fields can be changed at document level (phone, email, etc.)
  i) What happens if change made to person table or rolodex? Are changes made automatically to existing awards? Susan to research.
  ii) Do we want editability of these fields at document level?
    (1) We will leave this in, and be consistent with Proposal

t) Row 34- Do we want to keep this parameter? Yes

u) Row 36 – where did 8 row limit come from?

v) System Messages
  i) Row 43- This is the thing Susan needs to check again
  ii) Row 52- Susan to add clarification that they system itself should not make duplicative entries of Project Personnel when additional proposals are linked
  iii) Row 54-55- Errors for not adding to 100 when parameter turned on.

w) Workflow- new territory to KC because we didn’t previously have this functionality
  i) For Award Investigator Certification
(1) Could bypass this if certification is handled outside of the system.
(2) We don’t want to add a certification panel in Award, there is already one in Proposal. System to put the award automatically on award until certification done?
(3) We will leave as an open issue, but this is something we need to answer. This is new, so there is nobody to ask. The group members need to bring feedback to the group – homework.
(4) Some Institutions require approval from people being taken off and added (unless deceased).

x) Recommendation to separate out section for administrative/table maintenance (put heading like with Workflow and System Messages
y) Data Dictionary- Diane noticed some discrepancies. Some of items Susan listed correspond to changes we will be requesting to mocks
i) Do we want to add the types of credit? No, they are Institutional specific and can be changed.

z) Grouping and sort order – Good to go.

aa) Design Requirements – Do not need to add delete selected

bb) Differences from Coeus
i) need to add a list of the changes of labels
ii) noted combined functionality from different tabs/windows
iii) addition of key persons is different
iv) need to add workflow
v) possibly need to add ability to manually enter EID for person vs. look-up

3) Enhancement Requests for Review:

AW-23 Key Person Details— Renee
a) We want all functionality from Proposal enhancement request to come over to Award
b) Renee did end up finding a Perfect Tracker for this enhancement to Coeus
   i) She has notified proposal group
c) Our request is still a little different from the Perfect Tracker
d) In business need, add the errors that will be there if info. not brought over form Proposal.

4) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
Update on Reports & Payment Mocks/Functionality – Susan. See KCAWD-41 for details.

a) Data dependency- have to select Type which in turn allows you to select Frequency, and ten Frequency Base
   i) We talked about graying out, etc.
   ii) Coincidentally, developer emailed Susan later that day about related issue
   iii) See JIRA for detailed discussion

5) Mock Progress/Requests: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
See changes made:

a) Time & Money
   i) In Coeus have to move $ one level of the Hierarchy at a time, have to often make several moves to get $ where you need it
   ii) Terri has mocked another approach
      1) Transactional approach with From and To where $ can be moved to anywhere in the hierarchy
      2) Columns will be moved to right, and recalculate button will be added
      3) This brought up the question of where else we may need to move columns around
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3 of 4
v) Who would find it useful to have a Total for all Funding Proposals that have been linked (Total Proposed Amount) – All proposals would be linked at root level – Let Susan know
vi) We will proceed with moving dollars to right and switching total and initial columns in Budget details under funding proposal

6) **KC Glossary**: Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: PI (and related: Contact PI, Investigator, Program Director and Project Director), Co-I (and related: Multiple PIs) Payment Basis (alternate definition) and Procurement Priority Code

7) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review**: Diane Direct/F&A Funds Distribution

8) **Permissions**: Wendy MAY have an introduction to the document for us this week!

9) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   - KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting, KC_AWD-Attachments and KC_AWD-Print – **Need volunteers** (example specs in PD/B)
   - KC_AWD-Contacts (in Progress) - Susan
   - KC_AWD-Hierarchy (in progress) and KC_AWD-Copy an Award (to follow) – Neil
   - KC_Shared-Medusa – Susan (in progress)
   - KC_AWD-Budget – Renee (in progress)
   - KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee & Kenton?
   - **Create an Award** – Kenton (still working on this)
   - **Need Structure from Kenton** for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

10) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Julie, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Absent –( Keith no longer active, Neil to have Cali vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marcus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Coeus Awards Subcommittee Minutes
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2009, Time: 12-2pm (PT) / 1–3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (ET)
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1) Opening Comments
   a) All Voting SME members need to send Renee and Susan email with name, email address, and phone number for all active members. They will send an email as well as a few members are not here today.

2) Data Dictionary Update- Diane worked on Field Level Help
   a) Time and Money Preaward Authorizations – Sponsor/Institution Authorizations
      i) Sponsor/Institution Preaward Authorization – sounds good
      ii) Effective Date – ok
      iii) Comments – ok
   b) Procurement Priority Code
      i) Suggestion – remove agreement after award
      ii) Suggestion – change to “purchasing priority” (first line) – remove reference to word procurement
      iii) Is this specific to award or institution? Add note along lines of “Most often applies specifically to federal DoD contracts.”
      iv) Diane to copy combined suggestions typed by Susan on screen.
      v) Chris needs to add Priority Procurement Code to the glossary.

3) Priority Update for Development:
   Terry wants Payment spec for development RIGHT AWAY with Contacts specs to follow!

4) Enhancement Requests for Review:
   KR-22 Notes, Linked Docs Display- Susan
   a) Julie and Susan to coordinate with Notes spec
   b) Narrative sections have not changed, Susan has been working on Functional Requirements
   c) Another thing Susan is incorporating here - IRB mentioned at round-up that we needed to incorporate Notes functionality. Really it seems like he is referring to Comments, but is calling it Notes.
      i) Comments discussion will come up in Round-Up and we need to make sure we are calling the same functionality the same thing
   d) No additional comments given by group – okay to finalize
   AW-23 Key Person Details – Renee (will be posted ASAP, 01/20/09)

5) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC-AWD-Payment – Wendy, Priority 1!
   Also be ready to discuss required Payment Mock changes & default table values
   a) User requirements have been pared down to 2.
   b) Use cases – Changes here not too significant. Mostly editing.
   c) Most changes in Functional Requirements
i) Rather than listing out each individual step, pared down by listing under Data Dictionary reference. Steps 1, 2, 4 now contain what was previously multiple steps. Step 3 has not changed.

d) Need to add issue note about Last Update (Step 6 is subject to change)

e) Added data validation/system messages
   i) Need to flesh these out with what triggers the message, where the user is returned to etc. Recommend looking at a completed spec for an example.

f) Added system does…(calculates, generates, etc.)

g) Discussion item to muddy the water – should we capture invoice due w/in _ days vs. final invoice due w/in _ days (may have less time each month, and then more time for final). Is this worth pursuing?
   i) The Invoice Instructions box can be used for this if we do not find it important enough to add a separate field.

h) Recipient Information changes needed.
   i) In Coeus when you add a report, you select contact type, person, and # of copies, and then Coeus returns message: 1 Copy to: Close-Out Contact John Doe
   ii) Do we want pretty message like this, instead of seeing all the boxes that remain editable?
      (1) The message is not editable for the person already added, have to go through change or add again
   iii) Do we want to re-order our display?
   iv) In Coeus, you choose the type and person as a pair, not a type and then a person
   v) Name/Organization – magnifying glass – should be going to Contacts Table which only includes sponsor contact
   vi) In Coeus, it is one look up/selection. In our mock we have two separate entry points for info.
   vii) You can add ad-hoc people, but they don’t have a contact type. Note: add to Functional requirements.
   viii) We will go with Coeus Functionality and have mock updated.
   ix) Suggestion to show other as contact type (rather than blank) when ad-hoc person is added from rolodex
   x) This will be same as Reports
   xi) Susan will check Reports spec and make sure Functional Requirements regarding recipients are correct.

i) PAYMENT MOCK-
   i) Renee sent in comments and examples for drop downs
   ii) Adding show/hide to schedule
   iii) Add recalculate button for total
   iv) Need to add change Invoice # to Invoice ID

j) We need to address what we want as out-of-the-box table values. Is what Coeus has suitable? Coeus has a lot we may not use, but may be another Institution that needs it, so we will go with Coeus defaults.

k) Note for Wendy: In Func requirements, need to make sure developers know relational tables apply. Good idea to look at reports Func requirements and cross reference to see if anything was missed in either spec.

l) Only open issue can be closed – per last week’s minutes we will not pursue automatic time stamp for Invoice Submit Date

m) After the few changes from today’s minutes are made, this will be pretty much SME Final!!

KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution – Wendy & Renee
a) Being cleaned up for finalization

6) **New spec for review:**

   **KC_AWD-Project Personnel** – Susan (**Priority 2!** 1st part of ‘Contacts’ specs)
   I will probably be updated again before meeting time, but get familiar and be ready to comment. Look at the second and third Use Cases. The first is old and horrible!
   a) To be discussed in detail next week.

7) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   See changes made: Print, Direct/F&A Funds Distribution, Reports, Comments, Closeout, F&A Rates and Details & Dates.
   a) Print
      i) Updates have been made.
      ii) Everything put in ABC order
         (1) In Coeus, Signature Required was off to side, but we are okay with the way it is.
         iii) Horizontal layout instead of vertical
         iv) Sequence No. label and box are not aligned correctly
         v) Do we consistently use No.? We want to make sure consistent. Actually, these should be changed to ID, not No.
         vi) For change report, use: Award Sequence ID, Amount Sequence ID
         vii) Discussion of Version vs. Sequence (LBA’s may override and go with Version) – we need to be consistent – **Susan to bring up at Round Up**
         viii) In Data Dictionary, Diane to change to In Review for outstanding issue
   b) Direct/F&A Funds Distribution
      i) Format of all End Date/Project End Date need to be fixed.
   c) Reports
      i) Refresh – do we like action button to right, or icon next to field?
         (1) With it on right, may not be clear to user which fields are being refreshed.
         (2) If next to field, should be next to frequency and frequency base (not next to type)
         (3) Has to be done in order, type, frequency, frequency base.
         (4) We may need error messages...you must select Type before selecting Frequency, etc. Susan needs to go back and look at Reports Spec in regard to this. (Possibly Payments spec as well).
            (a) OR, box grayed out until you enter prerequisite fields (frequency, frequency base gray until type entered; frequency base gray until type and frequency entered)
         (5) In Proposal, there are only action buttons, not icons. Per Terry, there had not been a need for a refresh, so this should not be inconsistent with Proposal.
         (6) If gray option does not work out, do we want green refresh icon, or refresh action to right.
            (a) Icon preferred by group if gray doesn’t work.
         (7) If Icons used, need to better align data rows
   d) Comments
      i) Think Notes should be default closed, Comments default open.
      ii) In Coeus, Checklist has to do with items that appear on the print dialogue
      iii) Susan will email Rosemary about History button on Comments
         (1) As far as we can tell it does not do anything.
   e) Closeout
      i) For 2,3,4 due date should not be editable. Need to add some missing grid lines.
      ii) Delete button is only shown on one line because that is currently only line that can be deleted. As you add additional custom rows, they also have delete buttons.
iii) For consistent UI, Final Report and Due Date will not be editable once entered. Line will have to be deleted, and start over if changes needed.

f) F&A Rates
   i) Beautiful – Final

g) Details & Dates
   i) Institution – Version vs. Sequence
   ii) In sponsor section, font sizes look different. If they can spread out and re-size some things it may look a lot better. Split may need to be moved to right.
   iii) Need to request change for Prime Sponsor display/look-up to be consistent with Proposals (ID in box, with Sponsor Name underneath)
   iv) NSF Science Code, should code or description be shown first? Coeus sorts alphabetically, and does not display code. At minimum, we need code displayed. UA prefers sorting by code, CSU prefers sorting by description. TBD.

8) **KC Glossary**: Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: PI (and related: Contact PI, Investigator, Program Director and Project Director), Co-I (and related: Multiple PIs). There may be more that Chris will guide us through…

9) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review**: Diane
   Time & Money / Preaward Authorizations / Sponsor Authorization
   Time & Money / Preaward Authorizations/ Institutional Authorization
   Procurement Priority Code

10) **Permissions**: Wendy may have something for us to start reviewing next week!

11) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   - KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award
   - KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting, KC_AWD-Attachments and KC_AWD-Print – Need volunteers (example specs in PD/B)
   - KC_AWD-Hierarchy (in progress) and KC_AWD-Copy an Award (to follow) – Neil
   - KC_Shared-Medusa – Susan (in progress)
   - KC_AWD-Budget – Renee (in progress)
   - KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee & Kenton? Needs preliminary UI work?
   - Create an Award – Kenton (still working on this)
   - **Need Structure from Kenton** for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report

12) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>People Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Julie, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Marcus, Jeff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) **KC Glossary**: Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: PI (and related: Contact PI, Investigator, Program Director and Project Director), Co-I (and related: Multiple PIs), Contact Type, Document Funding ID, Lead Unit, Payment Method, Percent Effort, Renewal There may be more that Chris will guide us through…
   a) Chris has not finished putting together all PI info from glossary
   b) Contact Type- made requested changes. Just need to remove hyphen in subaward.
   c) Continuation – New alternate definition suggested – remove “an initial” – add “a” instead
   d) Document Funding ID – Alternate suggestion – like this, but specify Letter of Credit w/ DHHS Document Number – and write out DHHS (not abbreviation) (will help those who are not familiar with term DHHS Doc No.)
   e) Lead Unit – Delete proposed (suggestion from last time)
      i) Discussion of process for getting Pam to approve for Proposal SME
         (1) We will list suggested alternate, Pam will take to her group for approval.
         (2) Awards and Proposals with both approve agreed upon definition
   f) Payment Method – Accept alternate
   g) Percent (%) Effort – changed ‘the’ sponsored proj. to ‘a’ sponsored project
      i) Proposals needs to approve
   h) These should be in alphabetical order.
      i) Renewal – suggestion to add back mention of award (proposal and/or award) instead of just proposal.
         i) Replace ‘requesting’ with ‘of” so that sentence flows once and/or award is added. “A proposal and/or award of additional funding…”
         ii) A project related to the scope of work for the proposal. Project funded for multiple years, renewal…..Neil to email Chris with this suggestion. Retracted – Neil is okay with it as is.
         iii) Delete “that provided by”
   2) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary** entry review: Diane
      Payment, Reports & Terms/Reports/Report Classes
      Payment, Reports & Terms/Reports/Miscellaneous Procurement/Purchasing
      a) Type
         i) Susan has recommended addition to the current sentence and recommendation to take off current example
         ii) Add: This may indicate if report is due one time or repeatedly (examples..) or reference a specific report format. (May not be Susan’s suggestion verbatim- but general idea).
         iii) Diane to doctor as needed – Diane likes Susan’s suggestion
      b) Frequency –
         i) Recurring, not reoccurring
ii) In Coeus, could be singular (one time) – therefore remove reoccurring altogether

c) Frequency Base – Accept as is

d) OSP File Copy – Alternate suggestion from Susan: Describes documentation that must be provided to the institutional office of record for retention in the official award file. Accepted

e) Name/Organization – Change to: Name of person or organization receiving report.

f) Small Business Subcontracting Plan - Remove extra commas, quotations changed to apostrophe

g) Procurement Priority Code – to look at next week.

h) Diane to make updates as discussed and to contact Susan if clarification needed on any of Susan’s suggestions that are in the Minutes

i) Last week’s changes will not be reviewed again in their entirety unless there are specific questions/clarifications needed.

3) Enhancement Requests for Review:

**KR-22** - Notes, Linked Doc Display - Susan

a) Is there potential overlap in the Medusa spec and this spec?
   i) This acts like a sub-set to Medusa
   ii) Notes is accessible from Medusa

b) Area highlighted yellow is Susan’s work in progress
   i) Susan to finish going through and pull out all Functional Requirements

c) This list will overlap with Notes spec

d) 9-Restricted Notes – Volunteer to test this out with different permissions?
   i) Susan was getting weird results and is wondering if this is a bug or she is just not getting it
   ii) Ron to work on this and will send Susan his observations.

e) Julie and Susan to compare Functional Requirements with the spec she is updating.

4) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

**KC-AWD-Payment** – Wendy

a) Before we get started on the spec
   i) Payment Basis & Payment Type Glossary (Payment Type) does not agree with mocks (Payment Basis).
   ii) We need to pick one (Type or Basis)
   iii) Updated screen shot is in the mock.
   iv) Word tip for Table of Contents - Right click on picture – do caption – then when ToC is updated, quick link will be put in
   v) Basis will be used. Chris to change Payment Type to Payment Basis in glossary.

b) Spec review
   i) User requirements – roughly say what you can do. Does not need to be at this level (where data dictionary fields are listed). Susan to send Wendy some comments on this.
   ii) Index to Use Cases & Functional Requirements – changes were made.
   iii) Mock screens updated

c) Ready for Diane to put terms in Data Dictionary

d) Issues List
   i) Posted Time Stamp
   ii) If used, display of this will have to be in line with what is decided for report tracking.
   iii) If user is later going in to update the Submit Date, may not want an automatic time stamp because invoice submitted outside of Coeus, the auto-time stamp may not be accurate in regard to when the invoice was submitted.
(1) We will close this issue. We do not want automatic time stamp for this due to reason above.

**KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution** – Wendy & Renee

a) Purpose – Spelled out, rather than abbreviating F&A
b) User Story slightly changed based on previous suggestions
c) User requirements – changed verbage to reflect Award Maintainer shall be able to…
d) Index to Use Cases – changed based on previous review and discussions
e) Use Case – Normal Course – changed tab and panel to screen – referenced alternated, made other suggested changes. Removed listing of specific fields, etc.
   i) Exceptions – was more general, specific warning messages to be in Functional Requirements
f) Functional Requirements
   i) Made changes according to feedback and previous group review
g) User Interface Design
   i) Mock has not been updated
h) Tab Order of Fields
   i) Needs to be corrected and more specific information will need to be provided. Especially for the top section
i) User Requirements
   i) These have all been updated. Formatting, Label Changes, Numeric Fields
j) Wendy should check for most recent mocks and make updates accordingly
k) Differences from Coeus
   i) Section has been rewritten
l) Spec is almost close to done!!

5) **New spec for review:**
   KC_AWD-Project Personnel – Susan (this is part of what used to be the “Contacts” spec)

6) **Permissions:** Wendy may have something for us to start reviewing next week!

7) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   Update, new icon for ‘Read Only Comments’: See KRAFUNC-90 for open_detailview2 & 3. Shall we continue discussion about the [Document Status Block](#)?

   a) Read Only Icon
      i) Blue paper background lightened
      ii) Open detail view 2 & 3 are most current version and are much better than original version

   b) What are the most common customizations for Report Tracking?
      i) In Coeus, user determines which columns are in which section of the display. Can also customize the order of the columns. This is tricky to do in a web application.
      ii) Currently in KC there are check boxes for what shows in Group View and Details View. We probably won’t be able to accommodate customizing the order.
      iii) We may have to come up with some customized views to accommodate 80% of our customers.
         1) Ron will try to get focus group of volunteers who use report tracking in Coeus to explore this. We want to know how the screen is most frequently customized.
         2) What we really need to know is what it will mean to users for this functionality to be gone.
         iv) Hide/Show to be used in KC for different options (Final / Invoice / SF269…)
      v) In Coeus can select all and edit selected all at once.
(1) To accommodate this, Bart has given us select check boxes to change multiple fields at once.

vi) Pencil icon to be added for additional room for Comments

vii) For Last Update, Name will be displayed first and then date/time (opposite from current display)

viii) In Coeus – is person a look-up or text box? Is no look up, so think it is a text box, but currently we can’t get it to work right now.

ix) Comments Tab—need volunteer. Our mock does not pick up History button – need someone to volunteer to finds out what it is, how to make it active. Someone needs to find out who can do what with this button. Tara to research this.

c) Is payment mock final?

i) Renee to provide developers with samples for drop downs, etc.

ii) Screen is busy, but so far no suggestions of how to simplify, so we may just have to deal with it.

iii) Susan to ask for name and organization field to be wider. There is enough space that we don’t have to cut it off.

iv) Base date to be displayed under frequency base to reduce # of columns in Payment & Invoice Requirements.

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings

KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting, KC_AWD-Attachments and KC_AWD-Print – Need volunteers (example specs in PD/B)

KC_AWD-Hierarchy (in progress) and KC_AWD-Copy an Award (to follow) – Neil

KC_Shared-Medusa – Susan (in progress)

KC_AWD-Budget – Renee (in progress)

KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee & Kenton? Needs preliminary UI work?

Create an Award – Kenton (still working on this)

Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Susan, Julie, Tara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Kenton, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Marva, Marcus, Maury Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Craig, Laura, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marcus Fricke – New Business Analyst from ISU – welcome to the group!
1) **KC Glossary** : Chris - Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: PI (and related: Contact PI, Investigator, Program Director and Project Director), Co-I (and related: Multiple PIs), Lead Unit, Contact Type, Key Person (and Other Significant Contributor), Percent (%) Effort
   a) These items are shared with Proposal – Chris will need to contact Pam at Indiana (glossary person for proposals) to make revisions because these reference specific items in Proposal
   b) What about other modules? For example, Investigator also used by IRB & Conflict of Interest?
      i) Yes, we want to cover any terms shared with any other modules. If any are left off this list, they should be reviewed as well.
   c) The way things are cross referenced by different groups in different ways
   d) Where there is a cross-reference we don’t want a different definition for each. For example PI and Principal Investigator have different definitions and cross-reference each other.
   e) Review of PI definition
      i) Should we add something about disclosure for COI?
          (1) Change “project or protocol” to “project, protocol, or disclosure”
   f) For next week, Chris is going to review all PI related definitions and boil them down to one complete definition, and group will review
   g) Contact Type – Pam from CSU has suggestion – She is thinking of this more in the context of type of contact across the board, not just for the sponsor, is this a correct understanding? Per Neil, yes, this needs to be a definition of Contact Type, not just a list of the types.
      i) Better describe the functional area/role of the contact.
          (1) “The point of contact for the functional area of responsibility. For example, administrative…” ACCEPTED
   h) Lead Unit discussion
      i) Remove “proposed”
   i) Key person discussion
      i) Remove “proposed”
   j) Other Significant Contributor
      i) What is the distinction between this and “Key Person” – can we combined these two, and cross-reference one to the other? They are different, Other Sig Con does not have quantifiable effort
      ii) For Key Person, edit, “may” also include Other Significant Contributor.
      iii) Decision: with Key Person, add see related term, Other Significant Contributor.
   k) Percent (%) Effort
      i) Discussion of labels, percentages specifically
      ii) To “a” sponsored project, not “the” sponsored project
   l) Should Chris be comparing the glossary to the data dictionary for consistency?
      i) Yes. Susan can add Chris and Diane to get all emails with JIRA comments, or they can check periodically.
      ii) Each new addition to glossary or DD are discussed in weekly minutes, so they can pick things up here too.
      iii) Diane and Chris can work out a system to coordinate these. They don’t have to be exactly the same, but should not be contradictory. Should be in sync.
m) Renee made a list of all glossary items in specs that are not in glossary and will get this to Chris.

2) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane

**Award / Details & Dates / Dates**

**Award / Funding Proposals**

a) In regard to formatting, only rows we are reviewing are displayed.

b) **Award / Details & Dates / Dates**

   i) Institute Proposal ID. Field Level Help – add that this is system generated

   ii) **Lead Unit**

      1) Specify “primary” responsibility. Accepted

      2) Discussion of changing award to “award record” in regard to child accounts / spending accounts. The spending accounts may have different lead units. Term Lead Unit shows up in child record as well, which can be different from Lead at root unit.

      3) We will defer this until we get more familiar with hierarchy.

         a) However, this is dealing with proposal level, we are not dealing with hierarchy at this point?

         b) Suggestion: …Add: of an award or a unit of organization of an award. USE FOR NOW, WE CAN RE-VISIT LATER IF NEEDED

   iii) **Proposed Sponsor** – change “funding” to “supporting” because not necessarily monetary support

   iv) **Proposed Start/End Date - Initial/Total**

      1) Change “funding organization” to “sponsor”.

      2) Change “research” project to “sponsored” project

   v) **Proposal Type**

      1) Suggestion for parenthetical reference to competing continuation, supplement, etc..

         a) And possibly reference code table – in award this is a display, not a drop down.

   vi) **Activity Type**

      1) Change to THAT DESCRIBES THE PROJECT ACTIVITY

   vii) **Title** – change research to “sponsored” and funding organization to “sponsor”.

      1) This is another case where child title may be different.

      2) Add award (or component thereof)

   viii) **Proposed Direct Cost (Total)**

      1) Total gives the context of the label

      2) Delete everything after ….an instructional activity, or any other institutional activity, or that can be directly assigned to such activities relatively easily…..

      3) Rewrite: Proposed total sponsor funding that can be identified specifically with a particular Sponsored Project

      4) Similar changes can be done to Proposed Direct Cost (initial)

   ix) **Proposed F&A Cost (Total and Initial)**

      1) Rewrite: Proposed Total Cost charged to the sponsor for overhead expenditures related to a sponsored project

      2) Avoid going into definition of F&A

   x) **Total Cost (Total and Initial)**

      1) Love it!

      2) Approved as is!

   xi) **Project Start Date**

      1) The date when all technical and financial activity for a project is authorized to begin

   xii) **Project End Date**

      1) The date when authorization for technical and financial activity for a project terminates

   xiii) **Execution Date**

      1) Leave as is

   xiv) **Budget Start Date**

      1) Leave as is
3) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

a) Shall we continue discussion about the Document Status Block?

   Payment choices: https://test.kuali.org/jira/secure/attachment/29960/paymentandinvoices01.jpg
   https://test.kuali.org/jira/secure/attachment/29991/paymentandinvoices02.jpg

   i) KRAFUNC-99 – Payment
   (1) Frequency base
      (a) Do we want to display it underneath, or do we want in its own separate column?
      (b) We want a separate column
      (c) Shows that it’s based on a calculation that you chose
      (d) Everyone agrees that we should create a new column – base date shown under frequency base

b) OK to finalize Preaward Authorizations and Terms?

   i) Review of final versions for Preaward Authorizations and Terms
      (1) Terms Panel
         (a) We have a different subpanel for each type of term
         (b) Code/Description or ID?
         (c) Should be uniformly applied throughout the application
         (d) Code/Description makes more sense
         (e) This is good the way it is!
      (2) Preaward Authorizations
         (a) Under Time & Money Tab
         (b) Sponsor Authorization vs Institutional Authorization
         (c) Everyone likes the changes that have been made

   c) What do you think of Closeout and Comments?
      (1) Closeout
         (a) Mock for Closeout screen
         (b) We wanted to be able to add items that are non-standard
         (c) Additional Closeout Reports that are non-standard can now be added
      (2) Comments
         (a) Comment screen is editable
         (b) Use of the word after Fiscal. Term “Reports” should be removed
         (c) This field is used to highlight items that need to be done
         (d) Comments are more commonly made on general type items and not items specific only to reports
         (e) Shorten to “Fiscal Comments” to cover broader area?
         (f) Fiscal Reports restricts what you can put in the field
         (g) Fiscal should be changes to Financial
         (h) Will be changes to “Financial Comments”
         (i) Susan will make changes to the MOCK
      (ii) This will come up again in Time and Money Specs
      (iii) We will leave this for a future discussion
   d) 2 options for Print: https://test.kuali.org/jira/secure/attachment/30091/print.jpg and https://test.kuali.org/jira/secure/attachment/30092/print_alt1.jpg

      (1) Print Options
         (i) Review these and let Susan know if there is anything you don’t like
         (b) Award Notice missing Sig Box. Susan will add
         (c) Change Report: Sequence Number should be changed to Version Number – still under discussion
            (i) Make sure it’s clear that this is an Award Sequence Number as opposed to Budget Sequence
            (ii) This will come up again in Time and Money Specs
            (iii) We will leave this for a future discussion
         (d) Do we like the layout?
            (i) Award Notice
            (ii) Change Report
1. Change to horizontal layout  
   (e) Everything else will be left as is  
   e) Comment on new icon for ‘Read Only Comments’ on IRB>Status and Dates panel?  
      i) Blue Box with Glasses on it  
      ii) Please review and comment if you like how this field is displayed  
      iii) Would the field look better with just glasses and no color background?

4) **Discussion Topic:** COI finalizing their scope/vision document  
   How should COI be integrated with Award? What information do we want?  
   a) COI finalizing their scope and interest document. We need to think about how we want to 
      integrate the COI module into the Awards module?  
   b) Susan idea is to add a row on the Special Review Tab

5) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**  
   KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution – Wendy & Renee  
   a) Please review and provide your comments  
   KC-AWD-Payment – Wendy  
   a) Please review and provide your comments

6) **Enhancement Requests for Review:**  
   KR-22-Notes, Linked Doc Display - Susan is still working on this 1/6/09…Update?

7) **New Specifications for Review:** This will be ready for next week!  
   KC_AWD-Project Personnel – Susan (this is part of what used to be the “Contacts” spec)  
   a) Integrate Combined Credit Split at the bottom of the Project Personnel Panel? Or Keep Credit  
      Split its own panel?  
      i) Combined Credit Split would be streamlined and would be included on the Project Personnel  
         panel with a hide/show button  
      ii) Panel will be renamed to Project Personnel/Combined Credit Split  
      iii) Contact Type has also been streamlined

8) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**  
   KC_AWD-Permissions - Need a volunteer to work on a spreadsheet - Wendy  
   KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award - Neil? KC_AWD-Subaward Reporting - OPEN,  
   KC_AWD-Attachments – Tara?, KC_AWD-Print – Tara? , KC_AWD-Copy an Award –  
      Neil Need volunteers (example specs in PD/B)  
   KC_AWD-Hierarchy – Neil (in progress)  
   KC_Shared-Medusa – Susan (in progress)  
   KC_AWD-Budget – Renee (in progress)  
   KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee & Kenton? Needs preliminary UI work?  
   Create an Award – Kenton (still working on this)  
   Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report  
   Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid  
   Basis and Method of Payment Maint

9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Pam, Rob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Craig, Laura, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KC Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2008, Time: 12-2pm PT / 1–3pm (MT) / 3-5pm (ET)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002192# . **PIN may be different in 2009!**

**New PIN:** 002418
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”
For this meeting, Renee set up MSU breeze session: http://breeze.msu.edu/award enter as guest, leave password blank

1) **KC Glossary** Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None

2) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary** entry review: Diane –
   Preaward Authorizations, Report Classes and Misc Procurement/Purchasing ready for review.
   Award / Details & Dates / Sponsor
   Award / Details & Dates / Dates
   Award / Funding Proposals
     1. Diane has question about, Sponsor and Prime Sponsor ID fields when looking at mock.
        a. A blank field is there when you add something in KC. Should we make consistent with proposals? Label is Sponsor ID in proposals, and if you don’t know ID, have to do the look-up. Select sponsor ID, and displays sponsor name under sponsor ID.
        b. Diane will go ahead with these changes as there are no objections.
     2. Diane to move ahead with note on concatenating Sponsor Name and Sponsor ID.
     3. Bringing up mocks for Details & Dates- Sponsor Funding Transferred for discussion
        a. Code/Description – doesn’t really have a label here, so Diane was not sure what label to use.
        b. Neil’s suggestion -use ID and Description?
           i. Diane will note in DD
           ii. Renee to bring up at next UGX meeting
        c. Also, this grey line on top of this section is not the right color of grey
     4. Only other fields ready to review today, Date Fields under Awards /Details and Dates / Dates
        a. No issues brought up – proceed as is.

3) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) Only minor changes made. Let Renee know if you see anything that needs to be changed.
   b) Susan/Renee will have a phone conversation w/ Developers in early January regarding layout for Award Hierarchy, Time & Money, Award Budgets. Let then know if you have suggestions.

4) **New Specifications for Review:**
   **KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution** – Wendy & Renee
   1. Wendy to go through. Posted yesterday, and no one has reviewed.
   2. Berkeley suggestion – spell out F&A first time mentioned in Purpose
   3. Next week we will discuss the terms in relation to glossary and update if needed.
a. Renee will get these to Chris.

4. Fed Business Rules taken straight from A-21 – let Wendy know if comments or if you know of additional rules that should be listed.

5. Remove Animal charges from narrative story, or add note that categories vary between Institutions. Berkeley and UA, and possibly others, charge IC on animal charges

6. Important Concepts and Backgrounds - Neil at Berkeley - Discussion of adding something to the effect of how important IC funds / revenue is to Institutions
   a. Wendy does not think this is necessarily relevant to this spec, although it is a true statement
   b. Per Renee, this is handled extremely differently at different Institutions, and we may not want to open this can of worms.
   c. We will move on without including this

7. User Requirements-
   a. Per Kenton, state from Users perspective- User shall be able to…
   b. Combine 1 & 2, add & modify – can be at a slightly higher level (minor point, not a big deal)
   c. 3 is a duplicate of 1, delete 3
   d. Kenton says there is really only one user requirement here. Reload and Delete don’t need to be their own User Requirements.
      i. Add & Modify….is only one needed
   e. Index to Use Cases
      i. Item b is going in the direction of where you add a line out of sequence
      ii. Comment from Kenton – Delete is really not a separate use case – just one use case with alternate courses
   f. Kuali Coeus is not going to have Insert button and will automatically sort, different form Coeus.
   g. Normal Course – need in square brackets 3 alternative courses after step 3
   h. In general try to avoid specific screen elements, panel for example – hard to get away from, but try to stay away the labels. Focus on documentation between system and user
   i. Between steps with User, User, User, need to add what System does
   j. Kenton suggest adding User searches for award, system displays list of awards, User selects Award
      i. Basically want to list what the System has to accomplish
      ii. In some cases may seem trivial, but Kenton says we need to add what the system does in return when the user initiates an action
   k. Don’t be specific about fields in Use Case. Can summarize: user enters required fields. (The fields will be listed in the Data Dictionary).
   l. Wendy to add that system will display messages for required fields that are missing or for invalid fields
   m. Error messages – in use case, can have general statement that system will display appropriate error and warning messages upon data validation, and then list them in Functional Requirements.
      i. Per Kenton this can also go in Use Case and is somewhat a style preference. Depending on the significance of the effect on the use case may or may not need to list it in use case. Putting in Functional Requirements can allow for cleaner use case. In this case should be fine to move to Functional Requirements.
n. Functional Requirements- add that system will put in chronological order
o. Separate Functional Requirement for Insert to be removed
p. Additional warnings and errors to be added
q. Data Dictionary - do we need to include other summary data
   i. No, it is just a header, will be in Time & Money, this header info will not be in KC
r. Enhancements – Discussed hierarchy use – Possibly put into issues section of Hierarchy Doc. Collaborate on Time & Money and Hierarchy

5) Enhancement Requests for Review: Nothing new complete for this week
   **KR-22**-Notes, Linked Doc Display - Susan, This is being written if you have comments send to Susan

6) Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:
   - **KC_AWD-Benefits Rates** – Final pair released to DM
   - **KC_AWD-Closeout** – Susan, SME-F this week! Submit your comments NOW!
   - **KC_AWD-Proposals Due** – Susan, SME-F this week! Submit your comments NOW!
   - **KC_AWD-Payment** – Leads still working on UI, Wendy posted updated spec, please review
   - **KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan, not done yet (still has “the crud”)
   - **KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution** – reviewed and commented on

7) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   - **KC-AWD-Payment** – Wendy?
     Create an Award – Kenton created a use case, more on the way and more work to be done.
     Incomplete as of now with low priority

   Developer Face to Face proposed for Tucson to get new BA up to speed. No date set.

   Discussed Ron’s email regarding eliminating proposal due panel

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   - **KC_AWD-Hierarchy** – Neil
   - **KC_Shared-Medusa** – Susan
   - **KC_AWD-Budget** - Renee
   - **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee & Kenton? Needs preliminary UI work?
   - **KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award** – Need volunteer

   Need Structure from Kenton for **KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint**, **KC_AWD-Report**
   Class Type Frequency Maint, **KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint**, and **KC_AWD-Valid Basis** and Method of Payment Maint

9) Questions and Roll Call
   Talk to you in 2009! Have a happy and safe holiday season!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Ben (Murphy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU (Colorado State Univ)</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU (Iowa State University)</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU (Indiana University)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Craig, Laura, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Ken, Kevin, Neil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Opening Comments:
   a) Renee posted a new Agenda this morning, added a few items.
   b) Terry told Renee yesterday in developer meeting that developers are going to be caught up by Christmas. We need to work on specs!!! They will have worked through our backlog (including the 4 or 5 specs we are currently working on), and will be waiting for stuff from us in January.
   c) Are all specs we need currently on the grid?
      i) For the most part – yes.
      ii) Under drop-down menu, maintain, we did miss Subcontracting Reports
   d) If anyone wants to take a spec, let Renee or Susan know. They will be happy to update the grid.

2) KC Glossary
   Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None
   Chris Ashdown from Cornell has agreed to be our new glossary gal. Thanks, Chris!

3) Mock Progress/Requests:
   Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   KRAFUNC-99 AWD Mock: Payment preview, bring comments & SUGGESTIONS
   Related to AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule – Updates from Susan
      1. Discussed proposed changes / clarifications for labels from CSU including “Amount,” “Person to Submit” (Sorry – note takers computer froze and I lost some of this). No changes were made but items were discussed and clarified.
   KRAFUNC-24 Do we need to display additional text that ‘sync to template’ after award fields populated must be done on individual panel or is help text sufficient?
      1. Majority agree to put this in help text.
      2. Schools will have to make sure proper training is given.
   KRAFUNC-98 What options do we want for Awards in Main Menu & what will they mean?
   All my Awards (results=any KEW status), Awards Enroute (KEW=Enroute), Anything else?
      1. CSU comments- Researchers are most interested in coming here and pulling up recent and active awards. Suggestion for following drop down for My Awards:
         a. All
         b. Primary PI
         c. Co-PI
         d. Key Person
      2. Question from Chris – should we distinguish between current awards and closed awards?
         a. Jeff thinks we should separate closed awards as well
      3. In proposals – takes you to search where you filter. Is this not intuitive enough?
         a. Diane was just thinking of a way to make it as fast and easy as possible for the PIs.
      4. Did Renee and Susan already discuss this w/ Terry?
         a. Sufficient to take you to search screen to select active vs. inactive, and then role?
            i. Cornell wants to have easiest way o differentiate between active and inactive
         b. We need to come up w/ different results criteria specific to award. What will be displayed, etc? Currently in mocks we are seeing proposal info
i. See active vs. inactive
ii. See Role
iii. Be able to differentiate by either of above? Would this be sufficient?
iv. Susan to bring to UGX and tell them what we need and see what suggestions they have to make it user friendly
v. Ron suggestion – Can we have master sort (active/inactive) and then sub-sort?

5. Ron has asked for a cost estimate for Coeus for a simple retrieve by PI
6. In Coeus currently, icon to right of Medusa. Here you can build a multiple sort.
7. This is a technical issue. If we can make UI friendly enough, we could handle in the screen instead of going to separate function.

1. Schools may have separate reporting function – CSU- PI could get full award data from separate reporting system
   a. Berkeley- for long term suggestion……adding filtering to search results screen, not just sorting
   b. In Coeus premium, control click on top of any column, and it makes it secondary sort column

**KRAFUNC-93 Proposals Due mock – is there a better place to include this information? Reports tab?**

1. Only 2 fields on this screen. Does it really need its own panel? Currently 2 static fields that don’t do anything? Do we want it to do more?
2. Would there be benefit in putting this in report tracking?
   a. Agree that this is not high priority-to move to report tracking.
   b. We will leave as is where it doesn’t do anything
3. Do we want to change label Reporting Requirements to Report Tracking?
   a. Functional council called this Tracking when they set up functional requirements
   b. This is where we are checking off status, who needs to due it, when it is due, etc.
4. Main menu talks about Report Tracking – but it is referring to what we are calling Reporting Requirements
   a. In module 3, aggregate of all awards can be combined in one place – but same info as what is shown on this screen. Rather than showing info for one award, in release 3 we will be able to slice and dice, sort, etc.
5. Susan gave demonstration in Coeus of reporting requirements/tracking – only shows info for award that was highlighted from award list.
   a. Under maintain award reporting requirement, and we do all awards, we can print, print selected groups, save as, search, 3 default views (by PI, Award #, sponsor name), plus customized view. Fields displayed are same, but this will be release 3.

**KRAFUNC-68 Preaward Authorization Mock for SME review**
1. Good to go.

**KRAFUNC-102 Benefit Rates Mock for SME review**
1. Good to go.

4) **Enhancement Requests for Review:**
Check out final versions posted for all except AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule

5) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review:** Diane –
Beginning with Account Type from Details & Dates- Institution panel – is where we left off. Also, Preaward Authorizations, Report Classes and Misc Procurement/Purchasing ready for review.
1. Revisit of Ron’s suggestion from last week of Award Version ID.
   a. Berkeley currently uses the terminology in a unique way.
   b. 3 digits after tee dash are the node
   c. The way we currently have it on the mock is fine.
   d. In money and end dates may have to be more specific with different version
   e. Diane updated to just say versions
2. Activity Type – Review of Ken G’s previous suggestion to changes field level help prompt.
3. Account Type – Kenton’s outstanding issue
   a. Valid accounts – this will probably need to be addressed with integration – cannot resolve it here.
   b. No determine made yet by technical council. At this point would be an enhancement request – may need to do in mini-release in conjunction with KFS.
   c. For now just leave note in DD, but does not be addressed unless we hear differently
4. Sponsor ID – change to just Sponsor for consistency?
   a. The DD is more about the data than the display of the data.
   b. Per Kenton, we need to address Sponsor Name, and Sponsor ID separately, although when displaying we are combining the two elements.
   c. In notes column, put note, when display sponsor ID, display together with sponsor name (something along those lines) for both items in the data dictionary
      i. Or another option would be to add a column for display data
   d. Same issue with prime sponsor
5. How do we want to go about reviewing DD?
   a. Diane to identify issues to bring up in meeting.
   b. Diane to let group know when new sections are posted
      i. Group to review and bring up questions
   c. Diane suggests group focus of Help Text prompts; do not need to read every column for every term in DD. Make sure agree with KC Label Name.
6. NSF Science Code – should it be look-up/list? Drop-down list is fewer clicks than look-up.
7. DD should become regular item for review, just like glossary.

6) Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:
   KC_AWD-Reports & KC_AWD-Terms are headed to the Development Team this week.
   1. Terry said look pretty good. Does Diane need to do anything? UA is going to look at them again.
      a. If anyone wants to give last once-over, do it soon. You snooze, you lose.
      Headed to SME final ASAP.
   KC_AWD-Closeout – Susan, SME-F this week! Submit your comments NOW!
   KC_AWD-Proposals Due – Susan, SME-F this week! Submit your comments NOW!

   Terry wants to have these completed before everyone leaves for the Holidays:
   1. Benefit Rates
   2. Proposals Due
   3. Closeouts
   4. Payments
   5. Direct and F&A Distribution
   6. Contacts – can be broken out into the parts that are done.
   7. Reports Terms

   Give comments to authors ASAP

7) New Specifications for Review:
   KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution – Wendy & Renee
   1. Posted hopefully tomorrow

8) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KC-AWD-Payment – Wendy – ABSENT
   1. Per Renee, Wendy hasn’t touched in a couple of weeks because she hasn’t received any comments
   KC_AWD-Benefits Rates – Diane
   1. Has not received comments since most recent version posted.
Create an Award – Kenton
  1. Hasn’t touched for about 4 weeks. Things from MIT face to face regarding version will be added. Other things to be added to spec that developers have already done.

KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan

9) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award – Need volunteer

Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint

Note from Kenton - Come with comments, feedback, approval of current specs available for review. Come to meetings with comments, or email to Susan / Renee in advance to add to agenda. We are in the hot seat.

Is Susan going to write Rice enhancement for Notes? Yes. Notes is on hold for this. Notes is not useful to Terry until this Enhancement is resolved.

Renee to work on budgets.

Kenton to work with Neil on Award Hierarchy

Susan – Medusa next when her time is freed up.

10) Process Flow – Overview by Kenton (not initially on Agenda)
   a) At MIT, worked w/ Susan, Renee, Rosemary, and Ron
   b) Worked on Queue Statuses
      i) If connected to end of box, is completion of process
      ii) Got a much clearer idea of work flow from developers
         1) We have the freedom to inject multiple work flows into the picture
         2) Workflows can be extremely short – so short you sometimes don’t even realize you are in work flow
            a) In work flow there are nodes or stops along the way when someone has to take an action. Also can be like “go directly jail” – it doesn’t stop, it just goes there, and the process ends.
            b) Problem of always saving in web based system every time something is clicked. Each time have separate record, can modify & new version is a workflow record, but when “done” it saves a new record.
      c) Boxes on right are not displaying properly and are not up to date – this is a to-do item
   d) Boxes on right are not displaying properly and are not up to date – this is a to-do item

11) Questions and Roll Call
    Kenton to come up with special structure for combinations of code tables – not high on his list – not incredibly important at this time. He is still deciding where to put these. Not holding up anything per Susan currently, but just checking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Julie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill, Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Craig, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Ken, Kevin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **Welcome UC Schools!** We’ll be joined by UC Berkeley and UC San Diego (both Coeus schools!)

2) **KC Glossary** Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None
   a) Tracey has been pulled from Kuali.
   b) We need a new Glossary Editor, Perhaps a school who cannot write specs – Cornell?
      i) Cornell not on call; will ask them off-line.

3) **Mock Progress/Requests:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   a) Go to JIRA – There is a filter set up for Award; AWD Mocks KRAFUNC
      i) This is how Susan recommends getting to the most current mocks for the time being
      ii) Can sort by any column
      iii) Labeled according to panel names
      iv) From Agenda, you can click on mock names and link to Jira as well
   b) As far as numbers go, we are about ½ way done with our specs
      i) That being said, we have saved the more difficult ones for last
      ii) At F2F next week, Susan and Renee will be representing our group, discussing hierarchy, workflow, main menu to an extent, versioning etc.
         (1) Does Neil have something he can send to us for what Berkeley uses, existing documentation?
            (a) He would be happy to get involved with this
         (2) Also, Susan will get MIT’s input on hierarchy

**KRAFUNC-99** AWD Mock: Payment preview, bring comments & SUGGESTIONS

Related to **AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule** – Updates from Susan

a) Susan started by giving general idea of fields that need to be included and an idea of where they should go. Mock team has marching orders to create this to start the thought process.
   i) Missing final invoice due w/in _ days and Document Funding ID
b) Items that just need to be entered once are at top

2nd section is similar to Reports
d) Show/Hide for Recipients is similar to KC Contacts mock
e) You would have to do a new entry for any one time payment
   i) One entry for recurring payments (monthly, quarterly for example)
   ii) This needs to be entered to generate payment & invoice schedule that is shown below.

f) Any ideas are welcome. This is a starting to point to get something out there.

Q: What is activity date?
   i) From Coeus screens
      (1) Can be entered by PI or anyone who can update Reporting Requirements screen
      (2) Assume in this case that activity date goes with comments (ex: date of status change).
      (3) In any instance would this be different than the last update date? Do we want to get rid of or re-label?

h) Three screens we are working with from Coeus. We want to get functionality in one KC panel.
   i) Other Header (Basis, Method)
   ii) Reports (Invoice, # copies) (Document Funding ID replaced Dfafs No. – this is reference number for DOD when drawing down funds)
iii) Reporting Requirements Screen- This is the enhancement we are requesting – to have this generated rather than entering manually
i) Things to add: Document funding ID, Final Invoice due within x days, Total
j) Q: What about payments that come in automatically w/out an invoice. Do we need to differentiate between invoice due and payment due?
   i) Current Status options are: Pending, Received, Not Required, Due (from Report Code table)
   ii) Instead of Invoice Due, how about Date Due (not specifying invoice or payment)?
   iii) We are focusing on the invoice.
k) Remember – Institution may have separate A/R system. We are approaching this from functional equivalence of Coeus
   i) Getting into A/R tracking, would it be useful to go direction of requesting enhancements? Is this something that should be tracked by a research administration system?
l) Suggestion to add partial pay to code table
m) MIT also uses the Payment Schedule in Coeus to track payments on awards with unusual payments, and also outgoing payments to subcontractors
   i) In Subaward Module, there’s Amount Released tab to capture amount paid to subcontractor
n) Document Status, etc- is that in header? Currently we’re not including header info on KC mocks.
   i) They would like to keep top 2 rows static (document ID, Status, Initiator, Last Update)
   ii) Proposal Also has PI and Sponsor on a 3rd row
   iii) The top two rows have to stay the same because they are consistent across all Kuali projects
      1) We could add additional rows specific to the KC application or even module
o) We will revisit when people have time to digest and make definitive decisions
KRAFUNC-24 Sponsor Template Do we need to display additional text that ‘sync to template’ after award fields populated must be done on individual panel or is help text sufficient?
   a) We added lt. gray note because to address Coeus community concern that template was a starting point, but that award data may no longer resemble to sponsor template
   b) Do we need additional note that if you apply the template after the initial save, it does not overwrite award data? You have to do it on specific panels as desired. (Sponsor Contacts, Reports, Terms, Comments have their own sync to template buttons, so the sync button on Sponsor Template would not overwrite this.)
      i) We could either add a note, or have it in help text.
      1) Berkeley, CSU, Cornell, UA – text
      2) Iowa, MSU Help
      3) Ron, defer to group
      4) MSU – argument for Help is that this is a training issue.
      5) Susan will follow-up with those who are absent and bring it up again or discussion next week
KRAFUNC-98 Main Menu What options do we want for Awards in Main Menu & what will they mean? All my Awards (results=any KEW status), Awards Enroute (KEW=Enroute), Anything else?
   a) JIRA addresses label changes (Award to Awards and Sub-Contract to Subaward)
   b) EDI stuff may go away – technical input will decide
   c) Lora O’Connor’s questions were about the Awards tabs on the Researcher main menu page : Currently there are two choices related to Awards: Awards in Progress and All my Awards
      i) CSU – would this list all the awards the Researcher has access to view – Per Susan, yes
   d) Awards in Progress – What does it mean? Awards not yet active?
      i) In Coeus there is a status field Awards processing technically begins when document is received.
      ii) What will this mean in KC?
      iii) Should we be able to search Awards by Status?
      iv) Change Awards in Progress to Award Status
      v) This is used differently
      vi) Jeff at ISU – have a different link to Awards that have already expired?
      vii) Should we be able to sort by Status?
      viii) Conversation is needed for what we want out of the box
   e) My Active Awards - we are assuming the “Researcher” is named as a PI in the Award? Yes
   f) May be important for a Researcher to be able to pull up all the Awards where they are named as a PI?
      i) What should we name it?
      ii) Is this already in the return results
      iii) All schools should think about this and come with suggestions for next meeting
KRAFUNC-58 Summary, Rename ‘Settings’ subpanel.
Suggestion: Award Features, Components, Elements, Composition, Involves, Includes…
   a) Other suggestions…. 
i) Approval? Not really approved
ii) CSU – Move information under the “Settings” panel to the “Summary” panel and combine the panels
   (1) CSU – Pam Yes. Keep dates and amounts separate
   (2) UC Berkeley –
      (a) Neil - Yes. Agree that should still be renamed
      (b) Ken – Yes.
   (3) Cornell – Chris – All
   (4) UA – Is there a value for separation?
      (a) Rename the subpanel?
         (i) UA – likes Features or Award Features
         (ii) CSU – Dates and Amounts should be separate
         (iii) Cornell – Keep each section separate and add “Award Features”
         (iv) ISU – Keep separate and change panel name to “Award Features”
         (v) JHU and MSU both agree with ISU
         (vi) Berkeley – keep separate and label “Award Features”

b) We are going to go with keeping each section separate and renaming the field to “Awards Features”

KRAFUNC-25 Reports Let me know what the SME's think about locating the "clear content" button in the header and if you have a better name for the "Miscellaneous Procurement/Purchasing" label.

a) JIRA KRAFUNC-25: Reports
b) UXG group conversation about adding button
c) Added “misc Procurement/Purchasing” button on sub-panel
d) What about the “Clear Content” Button?
   i) Move to bottom?
   ii) What does clear content do? Wipes out all information in the panel
   iii) Similar to “delete type” in Coeus
   iv) Ron – Delete – delete’s recipient - Delete Type in Coeus only deletes the report you select
   v) No issue after all and doesn’t require a vote

e) Is everyone ok with Misc Procurement/Purchasing label?
   i) Everyone good with this

2) Enhancement Requests for Review:
   Check out final versions posted for all except AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule
   a) Per Susan, all changes have been posted. Please review and let Susan if any final changes are needed

3) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane –
   Review all fields applicable to Details & Dates panel, all subpanels (Institution, Sponsor and Dates)
   i) Award ID: Outstanding issues? Does anyone have specific comments?
      (1) Susan will fix mock sample to reflect correct format
         (a) “Other Requirements Comments” should be part of help text
   ii) Version ID – Discuss Name
      (1) Change Sequence ID to Version ID
      (2) Award Version ID and Budget Version ID?
      (3) May be necessary to attach “Award” to Version ID
      (4) Drop ID?
         (a) No, ID important – constancy issue
      (5) Change to Award Version
      (6) Neil at Berkeley – restricting to Award Version ID for consistency
      (7) Ron - Labeling problem
         (a) Award Record ID or Award Version ID
         (b) Last three digits will represent the Node in the award hierarchy. Shows it’s position in the Award Hierarchy
            (i) System generated and hard coded
         (c) Silence is assent
         (d) Susan would like to add some formatting so that it prints out nicer. Susan will do this when Diane is done
         (e) We will go with Award Version ID for not
iii) **Account ID** – no comment – considered complete  
iv) **Award Status** – no comment – considered complete  
v) **Project Title** – Needed to be updated in MOCK  
   1) Per Susan, this has already been done  
   2) Pam – would project title be different from proposal title?  
   3) Susan – we would use this based on whatever the sponsor calls this  
   4) Title – hierarchy used  
   5) Task orders under Master Agreement - different project titles may be needed to  
      differentiate between the separate pots of money  
   6) Just use Title – may mean different things in each record  
   7) Removing the clarifier and just going with Title  
   8) Yes. Done  
   9) Susan will make sure the mock update is done and updated in the Spec  
vi) **Account Type** - Integration with KFS? Valid list of accounts  
   (i) Diane working with Kenton on this  
   (ii) We will pick with Account Type next time  
   (iii) NO MEETING NEXT WEEK (12/3/08)  

4) **Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:**  
   KC_AWD-Closeout – Susan, SME-F this week! Submit your comments NOW!  
   KC_AWD-Proposals Due – Susan, SME-F this week! Submit your comments NOW!  
   PLEASE SEND COMMENTS TO SUSAN ASAP so these can be finalized  

5) **New Specifications for Review:**  
   KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution – Wendy & Renee  

6) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**  
   KC-AWD-Payment – Wendy  
   KC_AWD-Benefits Rates – Diane  
   Create an Award – Kenton  
   KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan  

7) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**  
   a) No meeting next week 12/3/08 MIT F2F  
   b) KC_AWD-Hierarchy & KC_AWD-Time & Money – Renee & Kenton  
   c) KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award – Need volunteer  
   d) Need Structure from Kenton for KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint, KC_AWD-Report  
      Class Type Frequency Maint, KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint, and KC_AWD-  
      Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint  
   e) Integration with other Financial Systems.  
      i) Need names and contact information for individuals responsible for data feeds at your institution.  
         Please send info to Kenton and Cc Renee & Susan  
      ii) Key data feed people – Kenton needs to know who to get in touch with at each institution  
      iii) We need to be aware of any specific institutional quirks  

8) **Questions and Roll Call**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Julie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Lora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Neil, Ken, Shelly, Nancy, and Kevin (last name: Phung)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KC Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2008, Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002192#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

Opening Comments:
 a) UC Berkeley will be joining Kuali Coeus, and will be contributing the equivalent of a full-time business analyst (split between 3 people).
 b) “Kuali Coeus” – 2 words, no hyphen is official name we need to use

1) KC Glossary Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None

2) Mock Updates to be Requested: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
 a) Table structure for Contacts has changed. Instead of having single OSP contact, we can have many.
 b) Change to Central Admin Contacts instead of OSP Contacts on tab? We could have OSP, VPR, etc.
   i) Would Administration Contacts be sufficient? No, Dept people can also be considered Administrators.
 c) We could use Sponsored Projects, Financial Services, etc. for Organization and Senior Accountant, Fund Accountant, etc. for Role
   i) Bottom Line - Different Organizations, and different Roles within Organizations would be available under Central Admin Contacts
   ii) CSU, UA, Cornell like this set-up
 d) Individual in charge of mocks suggested we move Combined Credit Split and will come up with a sample to show us
 e) Terminology on Summary (under Time & Money)
   i) “Settings” sub-panel header – any better suggestions? Email suggestions to Renee
      (1) Susan’s initial thought is change to “Involves” – but group to email suggestions.
      (2) Also, need to change Sub Award to single word

3) KC_AWD-Data Dictionary entry review: Diane, Nothing ready for group review yet?

4) Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:
   KC_AWD-Funding Proposals  DM response – Susan, update
 a) Last one you link does the data feed, and overwrites what was previously there.
 b) Are we going to display Institute Proposal Number?
   i) We initially did not include because we did not know if we would have Intermediate Funding Proposal Module
   ii) Per Kenton, it is very likely there will be some sort of Master Proposal Record, like Institute Proposal.
      (1) Data Conversion
   iii) Whatever the label would be (we will use Institute Proposal for now) we don’t capture the Institute Proposal number currently
   iv) Is there something currently to determine/show interconnectivity?
      (1) It is in planning
   v) At this time, we think we should include this key identifier, Institute Proposal No.
      (1) Where would we like to display it?
(a) Under sub-panel Proposal Details works for Cornell, UA, IU, CSU, JHU (majority)
(b) Susan will make the request to update the mock, adding Institute Proposal ID as first item under Proposal Details

**KC_AWD-Subawards** – Renee responding to DM comments, update
a) Subawards and F&A rate, Renee has responded. She currently does not have any outstanding questions to answer.

**KC_AWD-Closeout** – Susan doing finalization, update
b) Susan to reply to DM Comments

**5) Missing Functionality/Misc. Discussion Topics Continued:**

**Sub Plan** – What is it? Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Where should we put it?

i) Last meeting – we were leaning to Reports panel on payments, reports, terms tab
  ii) Wanted to stay with procurement priority code
  iii) Should Susan request a mock with this and then group can review it?
  iv) Should we have below sync to template button? Would it be clear enough that it syncs only the items above the sync to template button?

**Update User/Last Update** – What should it mean?, Where should we display?

i) Did anyone have anything to add?
  ii) What should it mean?
    1. We agreed that this should mean session update as opposed to an update for each tab
    2. Susan will get feedback from technologists if this is not possible
  iii) Where should we put it?
    1. Show consistently at top and bottom of each tab? Is this too much?
    2. Box at top is KC overall status and we can’t change it
    3. Kenton – question will be if we want to add rows and columns to the status box. We would need to adjust this everywhere. It will affect all of Kuali.
    4. If we want changes made to overall status box, it would need to be consistent will all Kuali modules
    5. We (Awards SME) need to decide what we want really soon so that Susan can address in upcoming F2F meetings
    6. Ron at Hopkins suggestion: version number can include user ID and time stamp
      a) Kenton – need to discuss with Terry. His argument against can be a technical problem. Every save would include an update? What do we want this to mean. If anything is changed in the award, do we want it reflected here?
      b) Susan – session update?
      c) Kenton – it’s on the schedule to resolve. Future = we will have the ability to detect when the data has changed. Audit changes?
      d) Susan thinks that when any data element changes and update should be shown

7) Looking at Proposal Mocks – proposal changed version to PI and last updated to created. Status is actual document status as opposed to award status

8) Status is an actual proposal status. Would be actual award status for us
   a) Is based on workflow, but not just the workflow
   b) We’ll need to define these, ex/ maintenance mode, preaward mode, etc
   c) Proposal had these because there was a workflow in Coeus already. We don’t have that luxury in Award.

   d) Award will need version number visible from every page
     1. Susan will bring up in Roundup

(9) Format we want
Kenton – Can we come up with a standard way of handling the versioning?
   (a) If you had to tell an audience why a piece of data is the way that it is. Why are we doing it this way?
   (b) Would you like to have ever change recorded as a version? Feedback from Coeus was that there was a reason they did things the way they did
   (c) If you had the chance to design from the beginning, would you like to have every change you made recorded from the beginning of the award
   (d) Diane – CSU is still discussing and will get back to Kenton
   (e) Susan is checking with UA Audit Coordinator – we at UA may need a change log when change is routed for approvals. When something “significant” changes ex/ PI change has changed. We don’t necessary need to document all changes, especially if they don’t require approval

[10] HOMEWORK – When you are thinking about versioning, think of the changes you make at your institution and when you would like to have changes recorded. What will drive the need to have a new version number assigned? Kenton would like a list from each institution on when a new version number would be needed.

6) Versioning Homework: Volunteer from each school - What data do you really need delta/history on? Is current Coeus versioning functionality sufficient? Be specific and email Kenton 1 paragraph or a couple bullet points justifying/explaining each item needed.

7) New Specifications for Review:
   KC_AWD-Proposals Due – Susan
   1) Federal Business Rules – Susan not very familiar with this process. Please review and send any changes to Susan
   2) Section 3 Business Rules – Wendy recommends changing second sentence. Wendy recommends changing “required by the terms and conditions” to “can be derived from the terms and conditions”
   3) Use Cases – Susan will fix cancel round
   4) Does anyone have feedback on Use Cases? Silence.
   5) Would it be valuable to request enhancement to include proposal due in reporting requirements so status and submission could be tracked in the Award? Should it have its own tab?
   a) This could be done by entering each proposal type as a Report Type (Technical/Management Class). Or are current reports sufficient for your institutions needs?
      i) CSU current functionality enough
      ii) UA agrees that existing functionality will be sufficient
      iii) Cornell good with existing functionality
b) Enter as report and leave proposals due blank? Or would it be valuable to include proposals due in Reporting Requirements as a second point of entry? This means we’d have to enter in twice

c) Susan will get input from Rosemary and get back to the group

6) Functional Requirements

a) Question for Rosemary – are proposal frequencies linked to proposals due? Are the proposal frequencies hard coded?

7) Anyone have any feedback about the order or the design of the mock?

8) Design Requirements

a) Proposals Due Panel and Subpanel = Name both as Proposals Due

b) Frequency Code Table - Do want to see the code and the description?

   i) MSU would like just description

   ii) UA ok with just description

   iii) Susan will change the Design Requirements accordingly

KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution – Wendy (Progress Report)

1) Wendy has written and Renee needs to review and then they will post it

8) Enhancement Requests for Review:

9) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

   Create an Award – Kenton

   1) Kenton has been concentrating on Data Dictionary

      a) Kenton and Diane have made great progress on the DD

   2) Issues List

      a) Business Rules for Required Fields

         i) In Coeus, required fields exist on multiple tabs. For instance, at least one report is required and the user must enter at least one travel term. In KC, switching tabs executes a save so this means that if switching from the Award tab after creating the new Award, a save will cause an immediate validation error for the required fields on the other tabs. Ex/Contacts tab you must have at least one contact, etc

            (1) Are the fields on the other tabs really required to save?

            (2) Should fields be required when creating an award, or should they be required when they are forwarded for approval?

            (3) Ron has the history –

               a) these were made required since these were fields that were often overlooked when an award was created

               b) Some information is subject to change between proposal and award creation. So that the information could be confirmed

               c) Ron will check on this information with Rosemary and get back to Kenton and the group with more information

            (4) Kenton – how will workflow fit into all of this? Will there be exceptions? If so, what?

5) HOMEWORK: Kenton would like to know how each institution would use workflow. What data will need be required and at what point?

6) Kenton – what constitutes a valid proposal to be linked? Susan will research proposal linking in more detail and get back to the group. This issue is more relevant in funding proposals. Kenton will email Susan the this issue to incorporate into the proposal spec
KC_AWD-Notes – Renee, continued discussion of Ordering/Grouping by Topic
KC_AWD-Reports – Susan & Renee, Where to add Reporting Requirements in KC?
KC_AWD-Terms – Team CSU

KC-AWD-Payment – Wendy
AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule – Wendy, We will review with Payment spec
KC_AWD-Benefits Rates – Diane
KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan

FUTURE MEETINGS:
11/19/08 Meeting Cancelled - Kuali Days
11/26/08 Meeting as Scheduled
12/3/08 Meeting Cancelled – MIT F2F
12/10/08 Meeting as Scheduled
12/17/08 Meeting as Scheduled
12/24/08 Meeting Cancelled – Winter Break
12/31/08 Meeting Cancelled – Winter Break

10) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award – Need volunteer
KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint – Need Structure from Kenton
KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint – Need Structure from Kenton
KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint – Need Structure from Kenton
KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint – Need Structure from Kenton

11) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Pam, Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Lora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KC Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, November 5, 2008, Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002192#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) **KC Glossary** Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   Review options for Sponsor Template KC Mocks
   a) Susan showed most visually pleasing of 3 options that we were given, most similar to standard KC format.
   b) Will add text somewhere on panel stating this is the template that was applied, but that changes can be made.
      i) **Action Item:** Group to email Susan with suggested text for this.
   c) Proposal did something similar to this, but Susan can’t remember exactly where off-hand.
   d) Comment from Renee at MSU – is it redundant Sponsor Template n subpanel label, and then another label “select sponsor template”
   e) Ron – why not just call it what it is: template name/title, suggestion: “Suggest Template Title:”. Also, do we want to show both code and template name.
   f) Rosemary- In practice MIT does not generally modify a template. They copy it and then make changes, save it as a different number.
   g) May be useful to show “select … title”, and then system displays number and title.
   h) Sync to template here does not override sync from other tabs, this just means to apply the template you have selected.

3) **KC_AWD-Data Dictionary** entry review: Diane, Nothing ready for group review yet.

4) **Missing Functionality/Misc. Discussion Topics Continued:**
   **Sub Plan** – What is it? Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Where should we put it?
   a) Last week we discussed re-titling this and where to put it.
   b) Susan did not get any emails about this
   c) Ron believes this should go on Reports tab
      i) 3 options from last week
         (1) Leave on details & dates (sponsor sub-panel) – MSU likes it here with procurement priority code (doesn’t have to be here, but the point is they want it together)
         (2) On Reports tab – JHU, Colorado, IOWA like it here
         (3) Subawards – Ruled out pretty much last week
   d) Ron did email Rosemary about choices, they are hard-coded, so this is why we were not able to find a code table
   e) Susan to combine comments to date from the meetings, send out an email, and take a vote
      i) Choice 1, Details & Dates w/ procurement priority code
      ii) Choice 2, Reports tab
iii) The placing could eventually be changed again based on how the mocks look, but we need to make a decision for now

Update User/Last Update – What should it mean?, Where should we display?

a) Did anyone do the homework from Kenton last week (writing narratives about when this would be important? No, doesn’t sound like it.

b) See last weeks minutes for assignment

c) This is a reminder then, to send these to Kenton

d) Rosemary reminds everyone to think of this in the context of the entire life of the award and all actions that are done by all users in all areas of the system – she will send Susan an email with things to consider.

e) Susan will add last weeks notes to Rosemary’s email and send an email reminder to everyone about our homework assignment

5) Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:

- **KC_AWD-Funding Proposals**  – DM response – Susan, update
- **KC_AWD-Subawards** – Renee responding to DM comments, update
  a) QA for 4.3.2 for Coeus – Rosemary has written up some info. which is available on Coeus consortium Wiki
- **KC_AWD-Closeout**  – Susan doing finalization, update

6) Versioning Homework: Volunteer from each school - What data do you really need delta/history on? Is current Coeus versioning functionality sufficient? Be specific and email Kenton 1 paragraph or a couple bullet points justifying/explaining each item needed.

a) Deferred to next week

7) Enhancement Requests for Review:

- **AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule**  – Wendy, We will review with Payment spec
  a) Wendy did not receive comments from anyone
  b) (1st section of enhancement)...Some pmt schedule data is generated when award set up. However, actually have to enter due dates in report panel if nothing set up at time of award set (invoiced monthly).
    i) Can this be described definitely, confusing to some.
    ii) Basically, data can be entered from 3 different data points in Coeus, and we would like this to be combined in a sense so that there is one entry point.
  c) Mock for Payments has not been designed yet. We are not necessarily dealing with 3 entry points in KC.
  d) Detailed Statement of enhancement
    i) 1st section is from payment section in Coeus
    ii) 2nd section is from reports section in Coeus
    iii) Where does the logic come from for what we want KC to do?
    iv) Maybe the group just didn’t understand how this worked
    v) Is payment schedule mutually exclusive from invoice/report? Yes, per Wendy.
    vi) Wendy will outline some brief cases to be more specific and add more detail. Hopefully this will help the group to understand the current functionality of Coeus, and therefore better understand the enhancement request.
  e) Wendy to re-post with changes for group review and we will discuss next week.
  f) Wendy has not received any comment on the spec itself either – please review!

8) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

- **Create an Award**  – Kenton – delayed to next week
- **KC_AWD-Notes**  – Renee, suggestions for Ordering and Differences from Coeus
a) If you put notes in by type of module, you may have to page through 25 notes before finding what you want
b) A better suggestion may be by topic (subject matter), or if possible by module and topic
c) Note topic is text, anything can be entered, and system currently does not allow us to use search function
   i) MSU would possibly export notes to data warehouse and search on it from there
d) JHU – sounds like this is something of a keyword concept that MSU is suggesting
   i) MSU says not necessarily
   ii) Misspelling, different labeling – could these possibly cause a problem in searching?
e) Renee says this is her only concern. Possibly it is just an MSU problem and they can deal with it if they have to.
f) Could we use static topic types and select from a drop down? This would be an enhancement, additional code table. This would enable to us to sort, eliminate typos, and labeling the same thing with more than one name (F&A vs IC vs indirect cost, etc.).
g) Renee will discuss with Lisa to see if they want to pursue further.
h) Next possible way to categorize is by module – for example only want to see notes from proposal development vs award. If we are going to write an enhancement request, Rosemary suggests we include something along these lines as well.
i) What are we linking notes to for them to have value? Document number
j) Do we want this functionality with notes, or comments? (or both??)
   i) Renee was envisioning this just for Notes
k) Comment functionality is to have something as an official part of the award document
l) In regard to feedback Renee sent to Julie - What is restricted view check box? Who is note restricted from?
   i) Where did Renee find this? In proposal development
   ii) Renee checked this box, but everyone could still see it.
   iii) Rosemary will test this out for us, to see who it is restricted from, etc. She will also look into why UA cannot even see the check box to be able to check it when we enter a note
   iv) Per Rosemary, maybe everyone could still see it because of the way our roles/permissions are set up.
   v) This check box is not showing when UA adds a note
   vi) CSU has seen it in the past, but when they went back in it wasn’t there
   vii) Rosemary to email screen shot, Susan pulled it up on email for group to see what it looks like

KC_AWD-Reports – Susan & Renee, Where to add Reporting Requirements in KC?
a) So far our mocks just have just dealt with entering reports
b) Susan will post on Sakai- instructions for making last tab show up in Coeus (Property). In the version we are using as test version, it does not show. It does show in later versions. Not a bug in our version; just wasn’t there in that version.
   i) Change to Y in Generate Report Requirements, and tab will show if Property reports exist
c) Review functionality offline
d) Renee – what is Susan’s role?
e) When you’re in an open award in edit mode, reports are grayed out
f) Renee’s question, when do you enter person? When the report is submitted and complete. It can be the administrator, or the PI, if they submitted the report. Per Rosemary, it’s really based on business practices on how an institution will use this field. Anyone can
type in another person’s name, but the last updated by field will always show the person who updated the field

g) Renee – how do you determine who is responsible for submitting the reports? Rosemary says you can define the roles in your unit hierarchy

h) How do you show that the PI is responsible for submitting technical reports

i) When tab layout and was originally done, we originally included all of the information, including the sync to template. Is this too cluttered?

j) Should we create another subpanel to show reporting requirements?

k) Ron’s suggestion is to create a separate panel with reporting requirements, etc.

l) Subpanel or separate panel all together?

m) Need group input and then Susan will find out if it’s possible

n) Renee is concerned with too much clutter with subpanel

o) Susan suggests subpanel’s within each report type panel

p) Group feels this will be too much clutter to add this information on each report type panel

q) Suggestions?

r) Susan – adding new panel between Reports and Terms panels and calling it “report schedule(s)”?

s) Email Susan with suggestions on name of the new panel

t) Susan will request new panel and we can, as group, decide on a name later

u) Susan will add separate spec for this on the spec grid

v) Rosemary says there is a lot of functionality tied to this piece of award. This all depends on how you open it. Through award search, or through maintain; award reporting requirements. There are two different views for just this piece of functionality. We need to figure out where to put all of these pieces of functionality

---

**KC_AWD-Terms** – Team CSU

**KC-AWD-Payment** – Wendy

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan

9) **New Specifications for Review:**

**KC_AWD-Benefits Rates** – Diane

a) Is everyone ready to review?

b) MSU has reviewed it and is ready.

c) Renee to lead discussion

d) Purpose Statement

1) Reference to ONR is confusing. This is who negotiates rates for MIT. This should be removed.

2) Non-standard benefits rates are used if they differ from the federally negotiated rates and nothing is entered in this screen

---

**Business Rules**

1) Renee suggest Include OMB A21 10.F.2

2) Also include reference to DS-2 for further guidance

---

**Narrative Overview**

1) In plain English, talk about how institutions typically negotiate an agreement…..Renee can help with this

2) State why we need to capture rates other than those that are federally negotiated…”special rates”

3) Capture why we need this. Ex/ some sponsors don’t pay fringe benefits, so we need to be able to enter a special rate, i.e. zero fringe
4) Per Rosemary, there are unusual circumstances out there and this is why Coeus has this functionality

g) Terms and Definitions
   1) Benefits Rates (aka Fringe Benefits, Employee Benefits (EB), Employee Related Expense (ERE))
   2) Vacation Accrual

h) User Requirements
   1) Renee suggests reference to rates tables
   2) Add Maintain Rates Tables
      i) We may need to copy over valid rate issue type stuff (rate pairs) from the F&A rate spec
   i) Issues to bring up from Diane? None at this time

10) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
    KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution – Wendy (Can this be posted by 11/7/08?)
    KC_AWD-Proposals Due – Need volunteer
    KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award – Need volunteer
    KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint – Need Structure from Kenton
    KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint – Need Structure from Kenton
    KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint – Need Structure from Kenton
    KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint – Need Structure from Kenton

11) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None

2) Mock Updates to be Requested:
   Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

3) Missing Functionality/Misc. Discussion Topics:
   Sub Plan – What is it? Where should we put it?
   a) May need to re-label to make clear what it is
   b) We believe it refers to whether or not there is a small business subcontracting plan
      i) Per Ron, this is correct definition, but perhaps defined too narrowly– women owned, minority owned, etc. are also included
   c) We need to decide where to put this field in the KC layout
   d) Should this go under Details & Dates, Reports panel, under Subawards Panel?
      i) At JHU, use for more than just subcontracts
      ii) Iowa, not just for subawards, Air Force contract has requirements for procurement for small businesses
    e) Who is the audience for this report? Should keep this in mind.
       i) For many schools, PI would need to be in contact with University official who handles this (individual in procurement-type office)
       ii) At Iowa, onus falls on OSP accountant
    f) For some Institutions, is procurement report field used for same purpose as Sub Plan, and this is duplicative?
    g) Procurement Priority Code is next to Sub Plan in Coeus. Is there a reason they are next to each other? Are they related?
       i) Procurement Priority Code is missing from mocks currently and needs to be added back in (we cut it out before when we didn’t know what it is). This will be added to Details & Dates.
       ii) It is indicator to procurement department of a dept of defense contract and order must be processed first
    h) Action Items:
       i) Sub Plan should be re-labeled. Suggestions?
       ii) Where will Sub Plan and Procurement Priority Code be in KC?
          (1) Do we agree to add Sub Plan and Procurement Priority Code to Sponsor subpanel of Details & Dates panel?
          (2) Logically, would it make more sense to put with payments reports and terms?
             (a) However, Sub Plan must be done with proposal OR by time award is issued
             (b) Discussion of entering one place, and displaying multiple places, but decided this is not really preferable
          (3) Neither of these may end up working – email Susan suggestions off-line
i) Ron to email Rosemary about source of Sub Plan codes, cannot locate in Coeus. He will copy Susan
j) When funded, procurement needs to be notified, or they will never know to follow-up and make sure it is implemented (if procurement, not PI, is the responsible for this)
k) Could work-flow accommodate sending notice to responsible person if Sub Plan required?
   i) Kenton says this is certainly possible

**Update User/Last Update** – Where should we display? What should it mean?
a) There are 2 issues to look at – our data saving capability in KC can render these pretty much meaningless
   i) Update time will reflect time last saved, regardless of whether or not changes were made
      (1) Every time you move off a tab, will save
   ii) Overall semantics of what we mean by last update – does it mean for panel or entire award
      (1) Presumably it means for entire award if that’s the case there are also technical consideration – reports, for example are stored in a separate table, tracking change and recording that as part of the update
      (2) Need to decide what the meaning of this is and what the scope is
      (3) Is someone on development team looking into this?
         a) For functional side- does it mean award details change, or anything in the award?
         b) We assumed header would represent the session for the whole record. That is what we need to make this useful
         c) We would like to use space for initiator for last update user instead
            i) Per Kenton, this is universal and would effect all modules, so we can’t do this
         d) How is proposal handling this?
            1. They currently do not have last update time and user.
   (4) Header is called status table – what does it currently show. Every time you move from tab to tab, that Last Updated time/date is updated- so this is useless right now.
   (5) What is next step to resolving this?
      a) Spans across modules
b) Ron – from a postaward perspective, there is a fundamental need to see who made changes over the years. For example, if a template was changed at some point, is useful to know who and when
   (1) Is it good enough to know last change? Or do we need a record of all changes. Most recent change may be insignificant, but earlier changes were more significant, so would want to track that as well ideally
c) Is there a currently an enhancement request for Coeus for an audit log for updates?
   a) Currently have this in Money and End Dates in Awards – this just shows time and user, not what was changed
   b) Requests are in for Templates
   c) Subawards module
d) This issue falls in issue of global versioning. Is certainly a difference from Coeus.
e) This is popping up in multiple locations in the application, so make note of where we see it
f) At minimum, we want last update user, and time needs to be time of last session update in which changes are made
   i) How important do we think it is to document which changes were made and in which version
      (1) Per Kenton, this is a much bigger issue to be able to see the history of all the changes
   ii) We need to define our requirements, Kenton wants everybody to think about what we want to track and be able to do.
      (1) Somebody did something and when vs. tracking every single change

g) Delta report captures changes in Award Details and Time & Money
   i) We should do more testing of Delta report
   ii) Does highlight what changed with asterisk
   iii) Doesn’t give before and after, but could print out delta report from previous sequence and compare

h) Update User/Last Update - Open issue for everyone to think about
   i) Feel free to send Susan comments off-line. She can bring them up anonymously next time.
   ii) Homework from Kenton: Write narratives and stories about situations we have encountered where knowing what changes have been made was important, especially in regard to compliance. At a high level, what is the business problem, and relate back to business rules if possible.

Award/Account terminology – Kenton, What do the terms mean? When should they be used?
a) Award Hierarchy in Coeus of money accounts that allow us to track how money is allocated
   i) Top level award when new award record is created. All funding proposals are connected to this award
   ii) Then, child records are created to track how money is spent, etc. There are a number of things considered when this structure is set up

b) Top level award shows total distributable amount. Everything is funneled into the system from here.

c) They are all accounts in the sense they are all used to track money. In some cases these accounts all map to the financial accounts in the financial system

d) Kenton’s questions is this - Do we want to just call them awards? Call them award-accounts? Do we want to refer to the top level award with a special name in order to specify/differentiate?

e) Preference to refer to as awards (leave term account for financial accounts) and then just specify level in hierarchy

f) Kenton basically wants to be able to distinguish the main award at the top of the hierarchy

4) Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:
   KC_AWD-Funding Proposals DM response – Susan, update
   KC_AWD-Subawards –Susan doing finalization, update
   a) Rec’d new DM comments (a few) on this and F&A
      KRA_AWD-Closeout – Susan doing finalization, update

5) Volunteer to be Mentors for New SMEs: Jeff Klein & Marva Ruther
   a) Keith found this very helpful with getting up to speed when Susan served as a mentor to him and recommends it
   b) No volunteers, so Susan and Renee will serve this role
c) Kenton is also available for questions

6) **New Specifications for Review:** None

   **KRA_AWD-Payment** – Wendy
   a) This was posted on Monday
   b) This has been moved over from old template.
   c) Cut out last sentence of purpose
   d) Edited business rules, institutional special cases
   e) Cut out some of 4.1 to make more succinct
   f) Use cases updated – process about the same
   g) AZ and others to review offline and send comments to Wendy

   **Issues List**
   i) Status Description field description – this issue has been closed – this is a text field for institutions to decide use of
   ii) Payment Schedule – If sponsor changes original schedule, will changes overwrite previous entries?
      (1) Would we prefer to overwrite previous entries
      (2) As long as we select award new entry (rather than correct award) we could always go back to previous sequence to see what was done before.
   iii) What do we want in auto-generate payment schedule enhancement request?
      (1) If frequency and frequency base is provided, currently still have to manually populate schedule. Don’t want to have to do this when frequency and frequency base is known.
   iv) Required Fields - Can we make additional fields required only if specific payment method is chosen?
      (1) On Other Header Tab in Coeus.
      (2) Basis and Method are required.
      (3) Original idea of enhancement would be to generate invoice schedule similar to how report schedules are generated
      (4) Wendy to look at 1)Payment Schedule, (from Details drop down), 2)info. on Other Header, and 3)Reports and suggest a starting point for where we could go with this to get something more uniform and useful.
      (5) Field requirements would be similar to those in reports. Type drives frequency and frequency base. If you choose a frequency base, then do we want this to prompt other fields to be required, for example? However, if method is Letter of Credit, then frequency is not applicable.
      (6) Where would we indicate Letter-of-Credit? “Establish ACH mechanism for sponsor”
      (7) Ron says look at Admin>Award Rules – (we didn’t know this was here) Valid Basis and Method of Payment. This lists choices for method of payment based on which basis of payment is issued – this should take care of this issue.
   v) Payment Schedule inaccuracies / Payment past due warning message – flag to indicate payments are not being made on time or not in line with the schedule
      (1) In KFS there is an Aged A/R module that should be coming out in Spring 2009. With this in mind, majority does not wish to pursue these enhancements.
      (2) Close issues 4 & 5
   vi) Timestamp issue – discusses elsewhere as global change
   vii) Wendy should now be able to move on with issues and enhancement request.

7) **Enhancement Requests for Review:** None
8) Spec Review/Issue Updates:

**KRA_AWD-Create an Award** – Kenton

a) Issues List - Required fields exist on multiple tabs. In KC, we have an automatic save when leaving screen. When leaving Award tab, the save will cause validation errors on other tabs because of automatic save.
   i) How about getting a set of warnings on validation page stating that information is not filled in, instead of error preventing you from navigating? This should work.
   ii) Kenton to discuss with Terri at next meeting.

b) Ron’s questions: What about instead making it so that we are not required to enter at least one travel term, at least one report, etc.
   i) We will be able to save at least minimum data (without travel, reports, etc.) we have entered with Susan’s suggestion, because these will be warnings rather than errors.

c) Ron will bring this up with Rosemary as well.

d) What is obligation to Coeus? How much can we really change?
   i) This is a technical restriction, so we have to do something for the system to work. Of course, we still need to honor to intent of Coeus.

e) We will have to come back to this issue.

**KRA_AWD-Notes** – Renee, suggestions for Ordering and Differences from Coeus

**KRA_AWD-Reports** – Susan & Renee, Where to add Reporting Requirements in KC?

**AWD DD** Kenton, all specs. (All SMEs; test structure. Can you understand/fill in blanks?)

a) Help prompts need to be reviewed
b) Issue of keeping these all in line
c) Data Type comes from application to let developers know format, etc.
d) Goal is to have no white space and no question marks (except for KC UI Location)
e) Display format - give feedback to Kenton on if this will work for us
f) Validation Message – use standard message from system, or if you want something different make sure it is here. It is worth defining these now rather than later in QA.
g) Look-ups tab - overview of look-ups, column results, return value, etc.
h) Not responsible for filling in Coeus Location
i) Kenton to hand over to Diane once he works out a few details
j) Help section – this is what will eventually be shown on the field level help
k) Each spec writer will need to go through their sections and work with Diane
l) Susan can add a standing item on the agenda. Diane to let Susan know Friday or Monday which ones to put on weekly agenda for group review while playing catch-up.

**KRA_AWD-Terms** – Team CSU

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan

9) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings

**KC_AWD-Hierarchy** – Renee & Kenton & **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee & Kenton

**KC_AWD-Benefits Rates** – Diane (Can this be posted by 11/7/08?)

**KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Funds Distribution** – Wendy (Can this be posted by 11/7/08?)

**KC_AWD-Proposals Due** – Need volunteer

**KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award** – Need volunteer

**KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

**KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

**KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

**KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

10) Questions and Roll Call

| UA | Susan, Tara, Julie |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Laura, Craig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KC Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, October 22, 2008, Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002192#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) **KRA Glossary** Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   This week we will look at the current status of all mock screens so you have the opportunity to express your opinions. Lead SMEs have made a lot of judgement calls as mocks progress, and this is your chance to make sure we have represented the group well. Susan, Renee and Kenton have done a lot of work on the mock screens. There is a lot of development work being done on the screens, so the format is different. To find the most current version of mock screens, look for the links through the JIRA. An overview was provided for information to our new Award SME’s Jeff and Marva from Iowa State University.

**Award Tab**
da) Document overview:
   i) The description field is the only required field

b) Funding Proposals:
   i) Allows the award to be linked to a proposal or multiple proposals.
   ii) Data will flow only from the first linked proposal.

c) Details & Dates:
   i) KC Proposal has only 6 required fields, KC has more. It didn’t make sense to group them.
   ii) This is a summary of the award information.
   iii) A change will be made to switch Sponsored Funding Transferred with Prime Sponsor to create more real estate.

d) Subaward:
   i) Data has been updated with more reasonable figures.
   ii) Name has been updated on the panel and subpanel to Subawards.
   iii) Kuali standard for formatting will remove dollar signs from the data rows.
   iv) The subpanel will not show if there is no data linked.

e) Sponsor Template:
   i) A single line only will show.
   ii) Changes may show if a template is applied, the template name will be grayed out.
   iii) A “sync to template” button will be added. The user must choose to apply (sync) a template.

f) Keywords: no changes

**Contacts Tab**
   Susan will update this tab once she has an opportunity.

**Time & Money Tab**
a) Time & Money: Not complete

b) Budget: Not developed

c) Direct/F&A Funds Distribution: Not developed

d) Cost Share: Not complete

e) Rates:
   i) F&A Rates is almost complete. The “add” will be changed to the Kuali standard of “Add”.

KC%20Awards%2010.22.08%20Minutes[1].doc
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(1) Rate field header will be changed to Rate %.
(2) The Comments box was widened. There is no character limit in the comment box. The comment box will adjust to screen size as the screen is reduced or enlarged.
(3) The recalculate button is moved.
(4) Terry suggested that the valid F&A rate button be moved to the top gray panel line.
(5) The dates will have four digit years.
   ii) Benefits Rates is not yet developed
f) Summary:
   i) The summary panel was discussed recently. The format has not been decided on. The panel is incomplete.
g) History: Not complete
h) Preaward Authorizations: Not complete.
   i) The general information fields will be eliminated and “refresh” will be replaced with “reload”

Payments, Reports & Terms Tab
a) Payments: Not complete
b) Reports:
   i) The “clear contents” button will clear the contents of that report type.
   ii) Each panel will have a number to indicate content.
   iii) Choose the “show” button by the report type to see the reports.
   iv) Multiple recipients can be selected. Multiple reports can be added. There was a discussion regarding the option to add check boxes to delete multiple reports at once. It was decided there wasn’t enough interest to pursue.
   v) Reports can be synced to template.
c) Terms:
   i) This is similar to reports in format.
   ii) The lookup function will allow the user to bring in multiple terms at once.
   iii) The panel defaults to closed subpanels.
   iv) There is an item count function.
   v) Intellectual is spelled wrong but will be corrected.
d) Special Approval:
   i) This panel is almost complete.
   ii) Approved equipment will be updated to a dollar amount greater than $5,000.
   iii) Approved foreign travel will have the * removed from end date since it will not be a required field.
e) Proposals Due: Not developed
f) Closeout:
   i) Invoice will be changed to Financial Report.
   ii) An enhancement will be requested to add other report types.

Special Review Tab – This is the same as in proposal development. There are no changes planned.

Custom Data Tab – Each institution can create items in this tab that are not available as standard items.
Questions Tab – Similar to Custom Data in which items not included as standard in the application can be added.

*ACTION ITEM*
Everyone is asked to create use cases for the questions tab for development. Example narratives of how you would use this tab will be needed. Please forward a “wish list” of uses to Kenton.

Permissions Tab – This was borrowed from proposal and provides customized role assignments.

Comments & Attachments Tab – Will be updated to Comments, Attachments & Notes Tab
a) Comments: Not developed
   i) Comments spec will need to be written. Request for a volunteer will be postponed until the notes spec is finalized.
b) Attachments:
i) The format is similar to proposal development. It includes versioning as previously discussed. No changes are anticipated.

c) Notes: No changes are anticipated.

Award Actions Tab

a) Data Validation:
   i) A validation check can be activated to determine error or warnings.
   ii) An error will prevent submission into routing.
   iii) Warnings are alerts to examine information but will no prevent submission into routing.
   iv) A “fix: button will take the user to the field to be fixed

b) Hierarchy: Not developed.

c) Print:
   i) Format is similar to proposal development. Allows the user to print an award summary or a notice of award.
   ii) Changes will be made to what we can print. A delta report will be added.

d) Copy to New Document:
   i) Similar to format in proposal development. No changes are anticipated.

e) Ad Hoc Recipients:
   i) Same as in proposal development. No changes are anticipated.

f) Route Log:
   i) Same as in proposal development. No changes are anticipated.

Icons:
Pencil – provides a larger window to type in
Magnifier-lookup
Book-inquiry (similar to look up)

The delete key will not give a warning that the information is being deleted. There is a reload function in the case of an error. The information deleted can be reloaded. The data will be returned to the state of the last save.

Standard buttons include Save, Close, and Cancel. Close will prompt the user to save. Cancel will ask for a confirmation.

3) Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development: **Send Susan any final comments.**
   Status of Funding Proposals DM response - Susan
   KC_AWD-Subawards – SME-F after last week. Susan doing Lead SME clean-up
   KRA_AWD-Notes – Susan doing finalization Susan will incorporate MSU comments.
   KRA_AWD-Closeout – Susan doing finalization

4) Welcome New Iowa State University Awards SMEs: Jeff Klein and Marva Ruther
   **Welcome to Jeff and Marva!** - Kenton mentioned a Kuali mentor for new people to help them become accustomed to everything and assist in finding things.

   Kenton also mentioned that UC Berkeley is also planning to become a partner. They will be bringing resources in the form of three additional analysts. He was unaware of their time contribution or skill level yet. This along with the addition of Iowa State University brings more resources to the project. Their primary charge will be specs for review but it hasn’t been decided on how it will be broken out yet. The idea is one person per module to become as involved as possible. Keith added that he knew two of the Berkeley people and they had been COEUS users for over 11 years.

5) New Specifications for Review: None

6) Enhancement Requests for Review:
   AW-21 Add Closeout Reports – Pam Harrington
   a) It was determined that the initial list of reports included in the closeout panel was too limited. Some sponsors require additional specific reports. A method to indicate what
they consist of is necessary so they aren’t overlooked in the closeout process. The impact is a compliance issue.

i) A vote was taken to determine the priority rating. It was decided that this enhancement should be a high priority.

ii) The enhancement will add one or more lines to the closeout screen. It will include a text field to describe the report and date fields for the due date and submission date. These reports will not link to the “reports” panel so the information will have to be manually entered.

iii) For the financial report – was date or word like “multiple” preferred? It was decided the date was preferred.

iv) There was discussion regarding inclusion of a final payment field. It was decided that it should not be a standard field. It could be added as an “other report” for those who wanted to include it in the closeout panel.

7) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   
   **KRA_AWD-Create an Award** – Kenton updating per DM instruction
   a) Kenton indicated that he wanted to speak to Susan and/or Renee about this spec before bringing it to the SME group. Deferred to next week.

   **KRA_AWD-Reports** – Team CSU, final comments?
   a) Data Dictionary items were added. The “cancel” button was changed to “reload.”

   **KRA_AWD-Terms** – Team CSU, final comments?
   a) Data Dictionary items were added. The “cancel” button was changed to “reload.”

   *ACTION ITEM*
   Review Reports and Terms for review at meeting next week.

   **KRA_AWD-Payment** – Wendy Derby (next week)
   a) Wendy will be ready next week.

   **KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan
   a) Susan is making changes.

   **AWD DD**, all specs (Kenton will finish structure this week, then arrange mtg. w/DD Editors)
   a) Kenton and Diane have been working on the Data Dictionary. Kenton went through the updated data dictionary fields and processes involved in populating them.

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings

   **KC_AWD-Hierarchy** – Renee & Kenton & **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee & Kenton

   **KC_AWD-Benefits Rates** – Need volunteer Diane volunteered to do this spec.

   **KC_AWD-Proposals Due** – Need volunteer

   **KC_AWD-Navigate to an Award** – Need volunteer

   **KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

   **KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

   **KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

   **KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

   **KC_AWD-Direct/F&A Fund Allocation** – Wendy will do this spec.

9) Questions and Roll Call

   No additional questions or comments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Diane, Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISU</td>
<td>Jeff, Marva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) **KRA Glossary** Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: None
   a) Changes from last week still to be made by Tracey – absent this week.

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   Changes have been made to tab/panel structure; Check out ongoing development of F&A Rates sub-panel (Cost Share will be similar in style); Look at new Summary samples; Could Proposals Due content be rolled into Funding Proposals panel?
   a) F&A Rate - Sub-panel header removed, comment box moved to directly underneath rate grid
      i) We will do something similar to cost share in future
   b) Renee and Susan like bottom option better for Summary
   c) Currently Proposals Due is in Pmts, Reports & Terms on its own, and has very few fields, can this be combined with Funding Proposals
      i) This may not be a logical place to look for it
      ii) May be more suitable to have it under Reports somewhere
      iii) There are currently 6 panels, so it may not be too bad to leave it where it is

3) **Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:**
   Status of Funding Proposals DM response - Susan
   a) Still in process
      - **KC_AWD-Subawards** – SME-F after last week. Susan doing Lead SME clean-up
      a) Terry said warnings are Differences from Coeus, not enhancements. Errors would need enhancement requests. If it is just a message that is flashed, then list as Difference from Coeus.
      - **KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel** – Renee finalized?
      a) Cleaning up scenarios for Terry- should be posted tomorrow morning

4) **New Specifications for Review:** None
   - **KRA_AWD-Closeout** – Chris (Kenton will lead discussion), bring your comments!
     a) Kenton has not had a chance to review it. He will have comments next time.
     b) Susan has comments
        i) Keep title short and sweet, can cut and paste form the grid.
        ii) A-110, specify section when possible
        iii) Terms – Archive location – do we need this in glossary? We are using standard definition, not changing it, so do we need to define it?
           1) CSU agrees to remove
           2) No other comments, Chris will remove Archive location
        iv) Business Objectives – to submit reports in a timely manner, in order to comply with sponsor regs. and policies, (not to document…) – take out second part of sentence. Add why we need this, why it is useful.
vi) 4.1-Narrative – It is a useful management tool to record…..Not a necessity to ensure compliance.

vii) 4.2- are not filed.(add in a timely manner)

(1) Suggestion to revise wording “are made a part of”
(2) Suggestion to revise wording “At the point…can”

viii) 4.4 – Do we need second sentence here? This can be cut here; would go in functional requirements

(1) May want to expand on first sentence, add and edit

ix) Use Cases – came up with a number of notes when playing around with it

(1) PR1-move to N, after user opens award

(a) Change populates to displays
(b) remove everything after “part of award”. The report list is static, does not change based on types of reports that are entered.

(2) Move alternate flows to after N3 instead of N2

(3) N3- be more general, User enters data

(4) Do we need N4? – Referring to the fact that the system displays what you have entered.

(a) Would this be a post-condition instead?
(b) Unnecessary here in the Normal Course, can delete it.

(5) N5- don’t specify button name; can change to “User chooses to save changes” or “User initiates save”

(6) A3- Cancel is not accurate. This needs to be Reload action (cancel means cancel entire document). Terry had us change these in the use cases for other specs. An example of this can be found in Foreign Travel.

(7) A1- There is no delete action, so don’t need an alternate course. You would go through edit, and return date field to a null state, so this is not an action with a separate course. It would be included as a part of editing.

(8) A2- keep as alternate course. Add additional steps. Save, etc. Would look the same as the rest of the normal course and include a Post Condition link.

(9) Another Alternate – Close without saving, returned, changes not saved, etc.

x) Labels are static, Invoice, Technical, Patent, Property

(1) Suggestion to change Invoice to Fiscal.

xi) How does Coeus know that an SF270 is an invoice? What is the logic?

(1) Really system is just picking up any Fiscal Report, and labeling it an invoice. SF270 is included as a type for Fiscal Report

xii) Entering a closeout date is not linked to award status, doesn’t change it to closed.

(1) Is this because an award is not necessarily tied 1:1 to a financial account?
(2) Rosemary says we do not want this to change the award status, it should be manual. Otherwise if mistake is made, system administrator would have to fix it.

(a) These fields were put in for MIT for archive process. Archive Location is box number for storage. Closeout Date is date that it was shipped to store. No functionality in having it close the award status. Really, this could be called Archive Date.

(b) Suggestion: Change Closeout Date to Archive Date

xiii) Why is procurement report not reflected here? Cause not used very often? We are fine with this, but see xiv below

xiv) Some schools have reports that are required that are not listed here (CSU & UC Davis, Cornell, UA). CSU to write enhancement request to be able to ass/show more report types here.
xv) Where does due date come from? It is tied to frequency base and somewhere from report screen.
xvi) Due date will display “MULTIPLE” instead of the date if there are multiple reports of a given type.
xvii) Testing Reload in Kuali-Coeus. KC does not prompt User to confirm their delete, because they can always Reload to get back to previous state.
xviii) In Dev, when reloading Susan experienced the following in a proposal
     (1) Entered date in wrong format
     (2) Hit reload to go back
     (3) Gave her an error to fix the date before reloading (but that is why she hit reload, to throw away bad date).
     (4) Kenton says this is a bug and he will look into it.
xix) Functional Requirements
     (1) Check Proposal for format to be consistent, or if you differ it should be intentionally
     (2) 1-Suggestion to change wording. Don’t refer to reporting requirements if you mean data entered on the reports screen
     (3) 3-Permissions – Roles and Permissions are two separate things. A Role is a collection of Permissions. A permission is a right (Kuali use the word permission). If these are default roles, state: the system shall provide the following defaults roles. OR any role that includes the modify award permission…
xx) DD-
     (1) Change Closeout Date to Archive Date
     (2) Change Invoice to Fiscal
xxi) This is as far as the spec has been completed.

5) Enhancement Requests for Review: Susan (will post by Weds, 10/8/08am)

6) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Keith/Kenton updated FRs in progress.
a) Terry wants this to be a little more focused. Kenton to work on, and we will review later.
KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie
a) Document change log – lists what she changed based on Minutes from last time this was discussed.
b) After today’s discussion, cancel changes to reload. System does not return message, “do you want to…..” Look at foreign travel
c) Will still have post conditions for other courses
d) P03 becomes last step of normal course
e) Added sort order under design requirements – most recent note to be added to the top
f) Re-worked whole paragraph in design requirements. Please give Julie feed back off-line
   i) Going to add a header – sample of drop-down to show what we envision
   g) This may come back later for changes because currently Comments vs. Notes is a hot topic
      i) Complete as much as possible now, but just know it may come back for changes depending on the overall direction of Comments vs. Notes
   h) Added Rosemary as contributor a header for User Story
   i) Susan has sample layout from KFS from Terry that we may be able to go from.
j) Note Topic to be changed to Note Type on mocks. Just note this will be changed/change has been requested.
KRA_AWD-Reports – See Team CSU
a) Added links in use cases [A1], etc
b) Needs to change cancel to reload
   i) Can get rid of reload/delete warning/error messages
c) General reminder – permissions. Susan will pick it up when she cleans it up for Terry
d) When reviewing closeout, Susan came across a few things that she wanted to make sure
   are included in Reports Spec (or at least addresses)
   i) Can enter a report type of “None”; and a report type of something else
   ii) Can enter multiple detail line entries for a single report type
e) Kenton- have you developed shoe box for how to document the code tables for reports?
   i) He may have this put in the data dictionary – look-ups and standard maintenance docs
   ii) Hasn’t decided what to do with non-standard maintenance docs

**KRA_AWD-Terms** – See Team CSU
a) Basically same changes as Reports
b) Fill in terms for data dictionary
c) In Coeus, looked like list was sorted by code number as opposed to description.
   i) We would like this sorted alphabetically by description – list this as a difference from
      Coeus. Terry will let us know if not possible.
   ii) In Coeus, you can click on Code or Description – and Coeus will sort in different
      ways. Diane needs to add this to spec.
d) Flexibility to add a new term to the list of available terms – In Coeus each of these is its
   own table – so adding a category is a major overhaul. Talked to Terry about doing this in
   database so that it is more dynamic and does not require code table surgery every time
   something is added. This would be a whole new column in the database.
e) Comment from Ron at JHU regarding Award Template – new series of problems could
   be created by code table re-design. If you are going to combine code tables. Award
   template pulls from about 20 code tables. At Coeus, the consortium is discussing
   offering pre constructed templates. The importing of templates and change in design of
   code tables are not interdependent and relationship should be considered.

**KC_AWD-Contacts** – Susan
**AWD DD** for all specs (meet w/LBA)

7) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   **KC_AWD-Hierarchy** – Renee & Kenton & **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee & Kenton
   **KRA_AWD-Payment** – Need volunteer to take over transfer to new template
   a) Wendy @ MSU to take over
   **KC_AWD-Benefits Rates** – Need volunteer
   a) Will be similar to F&A Rates
   b) Diane will tentatively take, but can’t start until late next week.
   **KC_AWD-Valid Award Basis of Payment Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton
   **KC_AWD-Report Class Type Frequency Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton
   **KC_AWD-Valid Frequency and Frequency Basis Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton
   **KC_AWD-Valid Basis and Method of Payment Maint** – Need Structure from Kenton

8) **Questions and Roll Call**
   a) **New member - Jeff – Iowa State University – Sponsored Programs Accounting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Pam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton, Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Susan, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler, Diane, Pam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

Susan’s update from functional council
1. 4.3.1.1 patch release- will be loaded to KC sandbox – list is in Wiki on release page. Anticipate within the next week this will be done.
2. UI has changed for kuali.org website. Let Jennifer Fouty know of any problems.

1) KRA Glossary Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: See Subawards, Preaward
   a) Subaward- Currently OMB definition vs. definition currently in glossary.
      i) Remove “and OMB circular regulations”
   b) Subcontract – Start with “A type of subaward in which….”
   c) Subrecipient – Tracey to add to glossary
   d) Prime Award – Tracey to add to glossary
   e) EAR – no changes needed (unless compliance requests them later)
   f) FAR – no changes needed
   g) Fly America Act – change contracts to awards
   h) Tracey will pick up glossary items as specs come up for review. If a SME has done research into
      the term, or a suggested definition, they can email Tracey as well.

2) Mock Updates to be Requested: Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.

   Review Reports mock for discussion: What would you like to call this button that deletes all content
   for a type of report? Where should that button be located? What fields should remain editable in the
   list (vs. using add/delete)?

3) Additions to Mocks: Continued discussion of changes

   Cost Share Comments DM input (keep at bottom) & MSU idea: remove ‘add’, center box
      1. If Coeus function is that this is a single comment box, then we have to stick with that or it
         will be an enhancement. (comments for each line would be an enhancement)
      2. This comments apply to enter panel, not a specific line
      3. No character limit
      4. Remove “Add”, Center box, add icon for pop-out to have a bigger box –YES
         a. Susan to ask Tom about moving recalculate button to bottom, under Comments
         b. Or change Add to say Comments and do away with subpanel label - NO
      5. In Coeus, there is a parameter for where Comments are displayed. They will always show in
         Cost Share screen, but also you can choose the have them show on Comments screen
      6. Comments to continue to show until they are deleted

   Percentage – Cost Share panel label
      1. We are going with percentage; the 3 schools that responded chose this.

Last weeks discussion items taken off-line
1. OSP Distribution - Change to OSP File Copy – Cornell, CSU, UA, MSU agree
2. Reports drop-down, alpha sorting is fine
3. Enhancement request to increase speeds – first part behind the scenes. Rosemary will email
   it to Susan
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4. Intellectual misspelled

**Preaward Authorizations** will remain a separate panel

4) **Update on Spec/Mock pairs for Development:**

Responses to DM review of Sponsor Template, Approved Equipment, Approved Foreign Travel, Cost Share, Preaward Authorizations, Summary (and common mistakes).

Working on Funding Proposals.

Awaiting finalization of F&A Rates? Yes, Susan wrote enhancement request but it has not been reviewed yet.

SME review in progress for Reports, Terms, Notes, Subawards.

1. Renee responded to Summary – we are done working on this for now until Terry gives us options. He suggests this be used as an inquiry. It would look pretty much the same.

2. Susan responded to Approved Equipment, Approved Foreign Travel, Preaward Authorizations

3. Common Mistakes –
   a. Be specific in your permissions. Say which permission is needed to make edits, or whatever you are trying to do.
   b. In KC, “Cancel” cancels the entire document, this is different form what Coeus uses Cancel for. Hit save when you finish panel. Reload will get rid of everything since you last saved.
   c. KC standard does not confirm when you ask to delete something (Coeus asks if you are sure you want to delete).
   d. Equipment & Approved Foreign Travel – KC does not have ability to recalculate automatically every time you enter data. Upon SAVE, totals and subtotals will be updated. Otherwise, must click re-calculate.
   e. When writing error messages, consider there may already be a standard error message in Proposal that can be used. If so, use that error message for consistency.

5) **New Specifications for Review:** None

6) **Enhancement Requests for Review:** Susan (will post by Weds, 10/8/08am)

7) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**

   **KC_AWD-Subawards** – Tara

   1. Tara posted a new version this morning
   2. CSU/MSU comments that include possible enhancement requests
      a. Negative Dollars:
         i. CSU wants warning message when negative dollars are requested
         ii. CSU comments did not include specific message language
         iii. Warning message that won’t permit advancing
         iv. Enhancement yes or no?
            1. Susan/UA = good idea to have message in validation
            2. CSU = yes, made suggestion
            3. MSU =
            4. Cornell = yes warning only
            5. UC Davis = yes warning only
         v. Renee said Terry may not consider this an enhancement – Susan/Tara will check with Terry on this and write an enhancement if needed
      b. Duplicate Organization:
i. Both MSU and CSU would like enhancement request to allow organization to be added more than once. Maybe have two
departments
ii. CSU likes the idea
iii. MSU has problems with multiple organizations
iv. May need to create multiple organizations
v. Susan’s example at UA is WAESO’s – multiple departments awarded
under one agreement
vi. Rosemary = unique subcontract ID numbers can be used
vii. More than one sub can be issue to an organization, but all could have
different subaward ID’s
viii. Tara brings up good point – list of other organization monies could
flow to one subaward
ix. MSU would like an enhancement written
x. Susan – this is not an enhancement per se, just would be whether or
not we would agree to allow duplicate subcontracts
xi. Susan – do we agree to allow duplicate organizations in the subaward
panel
xii. We could also downgrade error message to a warning “Duplicate
Organizations Exist”
xiii. CSU likes having a duplicate warning
xiv. Cornell and UA like that idea too
xv. Tara will write in that will be warning and not an error

KRA_AWD-Reports – See Team CSU
1. Diane to look at comments from last week’s minutes. General comments also
applied to terms.
2. Do as much as possible, and post what you have next week even if incomplete.

KRA_AWD-Terms – See Team CSU

KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Review Valid Rate Parameter enhancement
1. Susan did write enhancement – AW20, validate F&A rate parameter
2. Susan has a question-
a. 3rd parameter
   i. Turn on valid rate pair validation
      1. On campus rate, off campus rate, system checks to see if it is a valid
         pair
   ii. Turn off valid rate pair validation
   iii. Validation check when pairs not used. We may want to make this a warning
        instead of a hard error. If you have a waiver or rare sponsor with rate that is
        not in IC agreement, you would have to go back to the rate table and enter
        the new rate. Do we want to have to update the table to include every rate
        for waivers or stipulated rate, or just a warning that says you are using a rate
        that is not in the approved rate table
         1. Cornell, MSU, CSU, UC Davis, UA agree to downgrade this to a
            warning.
3. Please read and give Susan comments about wording, input if you don’t 100% agree with
something that is stated.
4. KRAFUNC23

KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie – Hope to have done next week.

KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan - Nothing additional done, focus currently on mock-spec pairs

KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Keith/Kenton updated FRs in progress.
AWD DD for all specs (meet w/LBA)
1. On his schedule to be completed before round-up next week.
2. Will schedule a meeting with all data dictionary editors from each group once this
   is done.

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   KC_AWD-Award Closeout – Chris (Due Date passed: 10/3/08, last Friday)
     1. Chris will post today or tomorrow – will be on the agenda for next week.
   KRA_AWD-Payment – Need volunteer to take over transfer to new template

Susan to send Rosemary email about inputting award with extensive hierarchy into test
instance.

Things on horizon from Round-up meeting:
2. First priority is completing spec-mock pairs. Then, we will be getting into
   workflow, hierarchy, and versioning.
3. JIRA KRAFUNC64 – regarding help. Will be an update next week.

Upcoming - Susan will need a volunteer to go through and put in values for code tables.

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Pam, Tracey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Wendy, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton, Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Susan, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **KRA Glossary** Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: See Subawards, Preaward

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:** Email Susan w/any updates that need to be made.
   Review Reports mock for discussion: What would you like to call this button that deletes all content for a type of report? Where should that button be located? What fields should remain editable in the list (vs using add/delete)?
   a) Sub-contracts will now be Subawards consistently across modules. Yeah!
   b) Reports Mock – Where to locate and what to call button that deletes all content for a type of report? What fields to remain editable after you get in list?
      i) Required fields are asterisked. You can add as many recipients as you like.
      ii) Action to clear out entire sub-panel. Leave on bar, or add more space and put towards bottom/at bottom of sub-panel?
      iii) Do we want to edit in drop-down, or use add/delete?
   c) Name of Button: Clear Content or Delete Type? (comments made that delete type can be confusing). Group seems to like Clear Content.
   d) Group prefers not to see clear content when subpanels are closed (details not shown) cause won’t know what you are clearing. Move button to bottom of sub-panel.
   e) Group would like content of sub-panel for each type of report to remain editable rather than deleting and having to start over with Add.
   c) Kuali-Coeus generally does not ask, “Are you sure…” when deleting something. Coeus does ask this. Are we all ok with clicking delete and it happening without being asked if we are sure.
      i) Typically Reload at the bottom of each screen. If you do accidentally deleted something you didn’t mean to, you can use Reload to get back to latest version that was saved. (All changes since last save will be lost).
      ii) Group is OK with Delete meaning delete, no prompt “are you sure.” Reload will suffice for accidental deletions.
   d) Time & Money tab- Cost Share Panel – UI design
      i) Where do we want comments box? In-line all the way to right OR separate box, below all other items in sub-panel.
      ii) Coeus puts all comments together; if we put it in-line, we can have a comment about each line separately.
      iii) Chris @ Cornell question - Do we have enough real estate to put Comments box all the way to right on line?
         (1) May just be a matter of more scrolling
      iv) MSU comment – may have a comment that does not apply only to one line, so may want a general place to put it.
v) There are points on each side, so we won’t make a decision on the fly. Susan will send an email off-line to get input from each school.

e) Cost Share, Source Destination required parameter. Developer, at time of implementation, can set up if source or destination is required. Is this something that school may want to change later, and someone in central admin needs to be able to change parameter?

i) CSU, UA, MSU, UC Davis, Cornell would make decision at implementation for this parameter. This is a majority. We will abandon additional enhancement to have this be changed after the fact by institution. Decision will have to be made at time of implementation by each Institution.

f) Cost Share, “Percent” or “Percentage” – Shall we find out default of what Proposals is using and come back to this?

i) Does .5 mean half a percent or 50 percent. UA suggests we put percentage sign to right of box so it is clear what the number means. CSU likes this idea will have them add percent sign on Add line and ask that there be two digits after decimal point.

ii) This is not a required field. Each Institution may decide to use this differently. It is stand alone; does not pull from budget or anywhere else.

g) For project personnel, intentionally vague in not putting percent, months, etc. as an indicator/label because each school may use it differently.

h) Does Preaward need to be a separate panel? Can we combine some of the panels that have little information to save real estate?

i) Susan feels we should keep this separate.

ii) If we did want to get rid of preaward panel, could potentially put in Time & Money as bubble or line items at top of Time & Money (Money & End Dates).

iii) Award, (Sponsor) Template also is low on content, but it has a large amount of content, so we would rather not modify it.

iv) Currently, is collapsed form, this fits easily on a single screen with as many panels as we have.

v) Concern with moving to another panel, User may not be able to readily identify where it is, may be difficult to find.

vi) Susan to send email to group after meeting so everyone has time to think about it.

3) Development Begins TODAY:

Update on final pairs of specs/mocks: Sponsor Template, Approved Equipment, Approved Foreign Travel, Cost Share, Funding Proposals, Preaward Authorizations, F&A Rates, Reports, Terms, Summary, Notes, Subawards

a) Sponsor Template – Pretty much complete. Everything to developers.

b) Cost Share – Renee has responded to developer questions. Mock is last thing holding it up, so Susan will send questions/issues to group via email.

c) Approved Equipment, Approved Foreign Travel – Mocks almost complete. Susan hopes to have everything to developers by Friday

d) Summary – Developer final this week or next. Mock has not been started. If want to pick and choose what will show up on the Summary screen, it would be an enhancement. Would a school have a critical item of custom data that would need to be displayed here.

i) Choice is to show all or nothing, can’t pick and choose. Majority goes with showing Nothing.

ii) Susan has created Jira for mock, but has no content in it yet. KRAFUNC-58. There is a spreadsheet Susan uploaded that shows what she envisions. Look at individually with first iteration of mock.
e) Fundinh Proposals-80% done on mocks. Susan to respond to developer questions next week.

f) Subawards – Close to done. Push for SME final by next week. Mocks about 90% done.
   1) Vote by email, consensus to use “Subaward”

   i) Other spec/mock pairs listed above require more work.

h) F&A – Think it is ready to be SME final. Pending enhancement request for parameter that Susan is supposed to write by next week. Some mock work has been done. In mock, this is being combined with the other Rate panel.

4) Update on Field Level Help Discussion: Susan
   a) Lisa Oliva in proposal group is going to spec out what they are looking for in field level help so we can make a more informed decision. May be scarce resources regardless of what direction we go.

5) New Spec Review Process: Kenton
   a) Functional Home Page - we are making transition to new review process
      1) Create task in Jira – they can then also be displayed in Confluence. Will eliminate need for spec grid.
      2) Can use JIRA to track two main things (spec, enhancement).
      3) Process is reflected in JIRA
      4) Initiate the work in process
      5) When first draft is done, will be sent to analyst for review
      6) Usually SME lead will review
      7) Will then be assigned to someone
      8) And then sent for SME review
      9) Sent to developers and UXG review
      10) Review process is the most effective thing for the quality of the software. Idea is to get another set of eyes and different view points for discussion to improve quality.
      11) This is not a linear process. May be working in parallel with other areas. May work on mocks before spec if finished. May have questions for developers before mocks or specs are completed.
      12) Simple specs are usually pretty cut and dry, for more complicated items developers, LBA, may come to SME with questions prior to SME Final status.
      13) For new authors, that are not too familiar with Jira, fell free to ask your team members or Susan for help.
      14) Kenton to add link to Jira site from Functional Home Page

6) Additions to Mocks: Continued discussion of changes

   Anticipated Funding Distribution? (TDC/F&A breakdown) – Continue discussion of label
   a) Breakdown of Direct and Indirect by award period.
   b) In general, based on comments to Susan, group liked longer title in Coeus: Anticipated Funding Distribution
   c) Rosemary had another suggestion: Anticipated Direct/Indirect Funds Distribution
      1) (or change Indirect to F&A)
      2) This may be too long. How about “Direct / F&A Funds Distribution”
      3) Cornell, CSU, IU, UA vote for this option

   Subawards panel – Issue is consistency with PD/B and the Release 3 Module of same name
   a) Considering this a done deal. “Subaward”

   Preaward Authorizations vs Pre Award or Pre-Award panel label
   a) Using “Preaward”
   b) What will we use for label on panel?
i) “Preaward” alone is probably too concise.
ii) Would like to add another word: Costs? Authorizations?
    (1) Majority chooses Authorizations (MSU, CSU, UA, Cornell…)

7) **Lead SME Roundup Update:** Susan, IRB Notes & Attachments issues (Personnel Attachments placement & Versioning of Notes since deletion not allowed)
   a) IRB is having a similar issue – Notes not being edited
      i) Notes were inherited from KFS in the proposal module
      ii) In proposal world may be commitments. For example, commitment of cost share, don’t want someone to get out of commitment by the Note being deleted.
      iii) IRB will write a spec about versioning of notes. They will still be in the system somewhere, but User doesn’t always have to see them all.
   b) Kenton says versioning in general is a hot topic right now. In Awards is pretty clear where we use Versioning. This issue is popping up all over the place. Can return to some previous state of a document (or whatever is). Not necessarily return to it to change it, but can return to it to view it.
   c) User initiated versioning is the sequence number in Coeus.
   d) System triggered version made when you make a money change and save it. You can always go back and see what the changes were.
   e) In IRB, there are issues with federal regulations. With committee, have to know who is active, who can fill quorum, who is on sabbatical…
   f) Examples for usage of versions.
      i) Compare to newer version for changes
      ii) Copy of earlier version to use it as the starting point for something new.
   g) The developers want to deal with this in a holistic fashion across all modules.
   h) Kenton would like to go to face-to-face at MIT with examples of Use Cases from Awards that use sequencing and of what we would like to version that is not currently versioned in Coeus. May not get it this release, but thinking ahead.
   i) Need to consider if we want to continue with word sequence, or use sequence instead.
   j) We need Use Cases to help address space and maintenance issues with versioning.
      i) When change made to approved travel, do we version just approved travel, or do we version the entire award? At what level do we version? Depending on what is decided, space can be affected in different magnitudes. Performance/space is not really our problem as a SME group.
   k) Susan says for our purposes, for comments & attachments, may be better to have Notes editable, and Comments versioned. Per Kenton, this is true in most version control systems (often only person who created Note can edit it, or only administrator can edit it, etc.).

8) **New Specifications for Review:** None

9) **Enhancement Requests for Review:** Not yet, Susan will write one for Valid Rate Parameter

10) **Spec Review/Issue Updates:**
    KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Rosemary, Q: What do Coeus users do about proposals that can’t be unlinked from Awards created by mistake? A: Unlock Funding Proposal in File menu. This is in Institute Proposal Module, New Award Entry Mode, Under File, can Unlock Proposal, this severs link between proposal and un-activated award.
    a) Will review next week - Keith will try to send something to Kenton today or tomorrow, including revised Functional Requirements
    KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara
    a) Change to “Subawards”
b) Will upload new version. Minor changes only

c) Need to combine Use Cases to one, making Edit, Delete, View as Alternate Courses. Instead of in a separate Use Cases

d) Normal course under Modify will become Alternative course under Normal Course

e) Will combining them make them too large?

f) How would developers prefer to see this be documented

g) Cancel changes are same in all Courses. As well as per and post conditions

h) Take this offline with Kenton. Can these be combined?

i) Tara to send email to Kenton about combining Use Cases

j) Kenton to review and will provide feedback to Tara via email

k) Tara will post leaving Use Cases as is

l) Kenton will get a sense of spec (review)

m) Assign JIRA to Kenton when spec has been posted

n) Tara to paste in current mock from KC

o) Look at definition in glossary

p) Tara used definition from OMB A-110. Can we overwrite proposal developments term.

q) Tracey will use Tara’s definition in glossary

KRA_AWD-Reports – See Team CSU change log dated 8/28/08

a) Susan to send email to Diane with comments for anything we don’t get to today regarding Reports and Terms.

b) 4.4- User Requirements – (4) Generate/Print Report List. Here is says there will be a customizable format, this really fits better in a different spec

c) Use Cases- Alternate Flows floating out there – a t what point do they branch off from the Normal Course?

d) When ID is put in brackets for Alternate Course after a line in the Normal Course, First Step in Alternate replaces step that you put [ ] after. That step in normal course is no longer done, it is replaced entirely by A1.

e) OSP Distribution – Ron found out more about this label for the group. It is the documentation that the person responsible for submitting the specified report must send to the central OSP to document the OSP file. We may want to consider changing this label.

f) Maintenance Specs – Conditional choices of drop-downs

i) Per Kenton, we get out of the box from the framework standard functionality for maintenance requirements. Do they go beyond the default functionality? If not, we don’t need to write anything other than the order we want the drop-down in. If there is additional functionality, we may have to write something. Depending on the length, we will have to make a decision on where to deal with it, will it need a separate maintenance-type doc.

ii) Kenton to take off-line with Susan for more info. To decide what should be done in regard to maintenance for this spec.

g) Group & Sort – UA thinks alphabetically would be more useful than most recent at the bottom

KRA_AWD-Terms – See Team CSU change log dated 9/9/08

KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie

KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Susan to write Valid Rate Parameter enhancement

KRA_AWD-Approved Foreign Travel – (SME-F) Rosemary – update on Coeus bugs issue?

KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan

AWD DD for Reports, Terms & F&A Rate (meet w/LBA)

11) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
a) Subawards, Reprs, Terms, Create an Award: Send Kenton an email, he works on Awards Thursday and Friday. Send email to Kenton with availability Friday or Thurs afternoon for feedback session.

b) KC_AWD-Award Closeout – Chris (Post for SME review by 10/3/08, this Friday)
KRA_AWD-Payment – Need volunteer to take over transfer to new template

12) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Pam, Tracey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Wendy, John, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton, Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Susan, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **KRA Glossary**
   Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: No Glossary review this week.

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:**
   Bring up in the meeting (or email [Susan](mailto:susan@kuali.org)) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.

3) **Development Begins October 1:**
   We need final pairs of specs/mocks for the following: Sponsor Template, Approved Equipment, Approved Foreign Travel, Cost Share, Funding Proposals, Pre-Agreement Authorizations? (was Preaward), F&A Rate, Reports, Terms, Summary, Notes, Sub-Contracts (Sub-Awards?), and maybe Contacts soon after.
   a) This is our notice. Need as many as possible by 10/1. Listed here in priority order based on what is left to be completed.
   b) Sponsor Template has gone to Terry for review. Susan has responded to their questions.
   c) The Spec Grid has changed to provide more concise info regarding status of specs.
      i) Spec Status and Mock Status Columns – 2 separate column numbers with target dates and related Jira’s.
      ii) Using Jira now to create tasks for reviews
      iii) Per Kenton, may do away with the grid entirely and track everything in Jira’s, with list of Jira’s in Confluence. This will allow for sorting, and won’t have additional step of updating grids.
      iv) Susan to add new spec review process to next week’s agenda. This is posted in Confluence on Functional Home Page, Procedures, and Processes, 2nd one down. (This is in progress and Kenton may process slight updates this week – nothing major).
   d) Susan got questions today from the developers on Approved Equip. and Foreign Travel
   e) Renee answered the developers’ questions on Cost Share
   f) Question about spec grid – date posted – YES, update date and initials each time a new version of spec is posted.

4) **Additions to Mocks:** Suggested changes below (Changes are from Face-to Face meeting last week)
   a) Agreed
      Add **Budget** panel to Time & Money tab after **Money and End Dates Panel**
      Add **Anticipated Funding?** (TDC/F&A Breakdown) panel to T&M tab after Budget panel
      a) Diane @ CSU – Cost Breakdown, Funding Breakdown? Anticipated Funding implies additional future funding, and there may not be.
      b) Coeus does say Anticipated Funding Distribution, which is clearer, just doesn’t fit until you open up the tab.
c) Change to Anticipated Breakdown?

Susan is going to send an email with possibilities, and anyone can add additional suggestions to the list. We will re-visit next meeting.

Combine F&A Rates and Special Rate as sub-panels in renamed Rates panel on T&M tab

a) Agreed
Change Special Rate to Benefits Rates panel

b) Agreed

Change Preaward to Pre-Agreement Authorizations panel (anticipating OK to Enhancement)

c) MSU would like to leave as is – will look to see what A-21 calls it (pre-award vs. preaward vs. preaward)

d) JHU - suggestion to keep preaward, but expand on it

e) CSU also would like to keep preaward

f) Decision – keep preaward, look into fed punctuation, possibly add something later in parentheses after preaward, or explanation when panel is opened.

Add Proposals Due panel to P,R&T tab after Special Approval panel

Agreed
Add Comments panel to Notes & Attachments tab at top

h) Discussion of Comments table in Coeus and how comments are displayed.
   i) Some in contextual panel
   ii) Some in general comments screen
   iii) Some in both places and deletion changes override in certain directions

i) Agreed, should be separated, and agreed with prioritization of how they are listed

j) Are we going to change the name of the tab from Notes & Attachments to something else
   i) Preference is Comments and Attachments – if doesn’t fit, we will consider abbreviating Attachments as Attach.

5) New Specifications for Review: None

6) Enhancement Requests for Review: None

7) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee
   a) Open Issue – Possible 3rd parameter setting. Right now ON or OFF for valid rate pair validation. What would 3rd setting be?
      i) Right now parameter in Coeus is whether or not to turn on valid rate pair setting.
         (1) What about validating rate when it is not in a pair? Right now choice is validating with a pair or not validating at all. Arizona would like to validate a single rate (maintained rate), vs. validating a rate pair.
         (2) UA, JHU, CSU, Cornell, MSU, Indiana, UC Davis in favor. (Everybody in favor).
         (3) Let developers decide how this change in validation would affect tables, etc. We basically need to tell them what we want to do. Estimate of what it will take to do this may be affected by whether or not changes have to be made to tables.
         (4) Susan to write up enhancement request

   KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Keith
   a) Revised to incorporate comments from the group
   b) Terms and Definitions, cut down drastically to cut out terms that are duplicated in other specs
      i) Now just “Award Status” and “Sponsor Funding Transferred” (suggested definition here for Tracey to put in glossary).
   c) “Dates and Details” to change to “Details & Dates” several places within the spec
d) Possible changes regarding scope of spec (to include or not include construction of award hierarchy).
   i) Renee thinks it needs to be referenced in this spec, but needs to be its own spec.
   ii) Point is, must be aware of importance of hierarchy when you are creating an award. Still need to decide if this should be completely addressed here or in its own spec.
   iii) Decision - We will have separate spec. Create an Award will specify that this is a new level 1 award and that award hierarchy / child accounts will be addressed in a separate spec so that everyone is aware that it is important to create award at correct hierarchical level.

e) Reminder – for all specs – be sure to test in different modes in Coeus. 3 ways things can be done in most areas. For example award new-entry vs. award edit.

f) Purpose – 1st paragraph, everything after 1st sentence should be covered in narrative or use cases. Unnecessary for Purpose.

g) Business Objectives – Remove reference to recording outcome of each funded proposal
   i) Add billing & award monitoring to last sentence.

h) Business Rules – suggestion to change vertebrae animals to animal subjects to be less limiting
   i) Suggestion for 1. Allocating funds…add: and Monitoring Usage / Monitoring Expense Narrative – User Story – remove “required” in last sentence

i) Note for f-h, Susan to forward CSU written comments to Keith for possible revisions

j) How do we handle award that never should have been created?
   i) Suggestion to add another option in Status, that says created in error or void
   ii) CSU – if not loaded to the financial system, then currently they completely delete it
   iii) Status table is customized by Institution
      (1) Out of the box, inactive is one of the choices
   iv) Coeus does not allow awards to be deleted – MIT changes to Inactive and can change title to “created in error.” In hierarchy will have red flag. If later you do need something at that level, you can make it active again (for example if a child account was created in error
   v) For audit trail, don’t want to have option to truly delete the entire award
   vi) Once changed to inactive, would you have to go back and unlink or change statuses to proposal? Rosemary to look into.

    vii) We will come back to this next week

k) Use Cases
   i) Is this appropriate place (or in functional requirements) to explain make-up of award number and what it means? (6 digit sequential number, and 3 digit node number).
      No, per Kenton just say system assigns unique award identifier and unique. These are not functional requirements or use case details; really it is just how Coeus is. How Coeus works and what numbers are used is important information that should be included in its separate paragraph as an addendum to spec.
   ii) N(1) Shorten to: User Initiates a Look-Up for an Award
   iii) Change indicates “proposal number” to “proposal” – don’t want to be too specific
   iv) System allows you to enter certain data before proposal feed is done. Then prior to save, you may decide to go ahead and link a proposal. What happens to the data that was initially there? It does not update the fields that are already there. Specify this in the use case.
   v) After N (6) & A1 (4), may need to link to E2. E2 is there, but not linked to anything.
   vi) Alternates should not be listed on their own line, should be after another action.
      Example, move items on line 7 to be after end of line 6.
vii) Post Condition Discussion. PO3- System updates time and user – would be final step in normal & alternate course.
viii) Use cases are supposed to be discussion of user and system interaction, not just user side.
ix) What would be Special Requirement? What Keith has here can go here or in pre-condition (user must have role allowing them to create an award).
x) Be aware with use cases, there is more then one edit mode in Coeus, and they may or may not be different. Award-New Entry would create a new sequence number, so that is not covered in these use cases
xi) For Kuali-Coeus, if you have permission to edit, you would automatically be able to make changes, would not have to be in “edit mode,” so don’t need to specify this.
xii) Don’t reference Coeus in use case, change to system.
l) Side note: We will need a spec that covers Proposal Look-Up (or this will need to be covered somewhere – won’t necessarily need its own spec.
m) Side discussion of when you would want to link a proposal to more then one award.
n) Functional Requirements – general question for Kenton. This spec approached this section different than many others. There are a lot of duplicated functional requirements. If func. req. applied to more than one use case, it was duplicated under each use case. Do we need to do this, or just state it once?
i) Can take line 1, and change to create and edit an award (rather than just create) and then list func. req. under that. Then there would be less duplication and each would still be stand alone and unique. Don’t want to talk about more than one thing in each func. req., but also want to avoid duplication whenever possible.
ii) In Kuali, cancel button does something much more drastic than it does in Coeus. It doesn’t just clear out page; it actually cancels entire document and takes it out of work flow. You would have to then copy the document and create a new one if you want to use it. Reload in Kuali is more similar to a normal perception of cancel (wipes out everything since your last save).
iii) Should list be numbered? Yes, far left hand column should have line numbers.
iv) Be more specific on “have the permission.” Should we specify what those permissions are? Not always straight forward. Permissions may be covered in a separate spec. For developers, it is good to see it in the spec., we just need to find the best way to get it in here. Here we can specify the permission as referred to by Coeus, for example permission to Modify an Award.
v) For pre-populated data, note when it will not be overwritten, as discussed with the use case.
vi) Data dictionary does not * required fields, but it does have a field for required yes/no. Data dictionary should not be mentioned in functional requirements.
vii) More specific error messages. Where is user returned?
viii) Side note : Where User ID and timestamp is displayed will be part of the Design Requirements.
o) Notification – How are users notified when a new award is created? Workflow has not been addressed. Should the system automatically notify somebody, and if so, whom?

FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS DELAYED – OUT OF TIME
KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara
KRA_AWD-Reports – See Team CSU change log dated 8/28/08
KRA_AWD-Terms – See Team CSU change log dated 9/9/08
KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie
KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan
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8) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings**
   a) Data Dictionary on Round-Up Agenda for next week.
   b) KFS decided to turn off field level help. When on, displays data dictionary and is technical in nature. Have option to use panel level help, to take you to place in help for that panel that deals with that field. To make field level help more user friendly takes a lot of time and expense for the developer. Panel Level would be less expensive and could be maintained at a less expensive level on lower level.
   i) What is groups attitude towards this?
   ii) Kenton thinks in regard to field level help, generally it is not as helpful as panel level because user likely would want to see info on related topics as well.
   iii) Susan is going to recommend panel level help due to maintenance
   iv) Kuali test drive in CNV and call Susan if you have

   **KC_AWD-Award Closeout** – Chris *(Post for SME review by 10/3/08)*
   **KC_AWD-Hierarchy** – Renee & Kenton
   **KC_AWD-Time & Money** – Renee & Kenton
   **KRA_AWD-Payment** – Need volunteer to take over transfer to new template

9) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Pam, Tracey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Wendy, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton, Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Susan, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane, Pam, Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KC Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, September 10, 2008, Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002192#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: No Glossary review this week.

2) Mock Updates to be Requested:
   Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
   a) Bring suggestions for Funding Proposals, Reports & F&A Rate (see Appendix)
   b) Provide input on Contacts Mock Notes (see spec grid Mocks column for Contacts row)
      i) Susan made sample of what she envisions (see link)
      ii) Susan likes clean view, and drilling down into tabs. Does anyone want to default to
tablets being open? (No comments).
      iii) Proposal development shows rolodex detail, faculty check box, effort in person
details? What do we need? Do we want to specify % effort or person months?
         1) Suggestion to show both % and person months if enough space. (add 3 rd column)
         2) What would each column be? a) percent b) months.
         3) Would anyone use both months and percent? MSU would use either/or.
            a) We don’t want to clutter screen with un-needed fields. Perhaps we should
               leave as is and let schools decide individually to use it.
            b) What pulls over form proposal? Person, Unit, Project Role
            4) Coeus only pulls over PI’s and Co-PI’s. However, in proposal they pull over key
               persons. Would we also want to pull over key persons into Contacts?
               a) Key persons change often, more to up-keep (JHU). Not opposed to
displaying, but doesn’t prefer it brought over automatically. However, could
               delete the ones no longer needed. JHU will defer to the group, those who
               want it displayed.
               b) CSU would like to see them pulled over
               c) MSU sets up effort for any faculty member – would want key people here
      iv) What is source of effort data?
         1) These are just buckets to capture information – not linked as far as Coeus
            functionality. It just captures info, does not link to other calculations.
         2) What is purpose /value then? This information gets distributed to center
            administrators; it is specific to this project, per Ron. It allocates it down to
            specific accounts if applicable.
         3) At Hopkins, do not bring forward effort info from Institute Proposal to Contacts
            Panel
      v) Unit Details Sub-Panel
         1) Pulled directly from Proposal UI
         2) Info. Brought over directly from proposal if linked
(3) Need to be able to indicate which unit is the lead (which proposal captures elsewhere)
(4) Instead of ass, numbered 1,2 etc., recommend Lead Unit check box
vi) Project Role editable for PI and CO-I, but not key person
vii) Office Phone and email pulled from table, not editable
viii) Get rid on numbering of contacts, insert check boxes for multi-select delete function
ix) Unit Contacts
   (1) In KC, moved all roles into 2nd table, Unit Details-You can now add as many of each type of Administrator you want
x) Column header Organization (In Unit, Sponsor, OSP contacts)– perhaps change to Unit/Organization
xi) OSP Contacts- Parameter
   (1) OSP organized by Sponsors vs. Pre-Post Award by lead unit. Pre-populate based on lead unit OR sponsor.
    (2) Susan believes the enhancement for this parameter has already been submitted.
    She will double-check if we have reviewed it as a group or not.
xii) Reload replaces Cancel button
xiii) “Close”, closes entire award, with option to save

3) New Specifications for Review: None

4) Enhancement Requests for Review: None

5) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   **KRA_AWD-Notes** – Julie
   a) Transferred to new template
   b) User Story very good
   c) Use Case
      i) Move pre-conditions to first steps Under Normal Course
      ii) Need to select Note Type prior to choosing to add Notes
      iii) Insert Note Topic (This is a difference from Coeus). Topic is shown on our mock screens currently.
      iv) System captures User and Time Stamp upon save.
   d) Need to add reference to “Notification” for Institute Proposal Note – This may already be in the Proposal Development Notes and Attachments Spec.- see Susan for questions
   e) Permission issues restrict whether or not a User can add a Note
      i) If don’t have modify Award role, was not able to see notes for the award. Still had view access to the award. Susan or Julie to check with Rosemary on why this is.
   f) Functional Requirements -
      i) Need modify permission to add notes
      ii) Record User and Time Stamp
      iii) Issue of viewing Notes with View access – is this working right currently?
   g) UI- Do we care how Notes are sorted? Do we want sub-panels with award at top, then proposal, then institute proposal? Or we could have them all in date order, all types combined, with “Topic” specifying type.
      i) CSU & UA would like them organized in sub-panels
   h) Thinking ahead – Integration points with Notes in Sub-contracts / Negotiations.
   i) Is it possible to re-sort by topic vs. date, etc. This is a technical question.
      i) Susan will talk with Terry and see what will require an enhancement and we will come back to this.
j) Re-visit issue of Deleting Notes
   i) Rosemary had Julie remove “important” form her narrative descriptions.
   ii) Comments can be changed, why can’t Notes?
   iii) Pam @ CSU says they have a very specific purpose for Comments, Mod 1 to increase funding by $50 k, etc.
       (1) However, this functionality is in Money & End Dates Comments, that type of critical information would go in Comments here, NOT in Notes
   iv) UA would like to be able to delete or edit Notes. These are like sticky Notes, Post-It’s that can be thrown away from our paper files
   v) Tyler’s understanding is that this is pulled from Rice structure.
   vi) Both Rice and Coeus do not delete.
   vii) Comments from Money & End Dates are viewable in each audited record
   viii) We previously mis-interpreted the meaning of Notes when considering it an audit trail
   ix) Susan is okay with leaving as un-editable, un-deleteable with status quo of Coeus and Rice
k) Design Requirements - display of notes – Down-size / compact boxes to only be large enough to show what is in box, instead of having extra blank space.
l) If we go with sub-panel design, sub-panel to be displayed only if a document from another module linked or in existence.
m) Would be helpful to have show/hide for sub-panels, with number count.
n) Next meeting, we will get Julie’s input and see if she has any questions for the group.

KRA_AWD-Approved Foreign Travel – Update from Rosemary on Coeus bugs issue?
(Absent)

KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara – Post next week
KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Keith – Post next week
KRA_AWD-Reports – Team CSU writing use cases – Just posted, Potential to discuss for next Agenda
KRA_AWD-Terms – Team CSU writing use cases – Just posted, Potential to discuss for next Agenda
KC_AWD-Contacts – Susan
KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee (SME-F version posted?, Jira )
AWD DD for Reports, Terms & F&A Rate (meet w/LBA)
o) Kenton has gone through what Diane gave him
p) Hopes to have a completely revised version of data dictionary
q) Hopes to have by face-to-face or shortly after

6) Coeus Research Assignment: Money & End Dates
   Copy 1 budget year at a time from linked Proposal to Award.
a) 3-part process: 1)Submit, 2)Approve 3)Post bgt (may need to get Approve budget right).

7) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
   KC_AWD-Award Closeout – Chris (post progress ASAP)
   KC_AWD-Budget specs – Renee (post progress ASAP)
   KRA_AWD-Payment – Need volunteer to take over transfer to new template
   AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule – Need volunteer to take over

   Susan, Renee, Kenton, Rosemary meeting in Ithaca next week.
   Anyone want to lead a meeting next week? No volunteers – No conference call next week.
   Everyone please spend the time working on specs during this time.
8) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Jim, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, Craig, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane, Pam, Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix to Awards Agenda, 9/10/08 Mock Screen Review

F&A Rate, KRAFDBCK-, Created date

*Time & Money tab > F&A Rate panel*

- Change panel header label from Indirect Costs to F&A Rate
- Need add row
- Columns labels: **Campus**, Rate (numeric), Type (drop down with choices MTDC, TDC, TC, Other), Fiscal Year (4-digit year), Start Date (date), End Date (date), Unrecovered F&A (currency), Source (text), Destination (text) and Actions (delete for each row)
- Need Total row at bottom for Unrecovered F&A column
- Need large editable Comments box at bottom of panel
- Need to be able to display Valid F&A Rates. *Any suggestions? Button on panel somewhere?*

Reports, KRAFDBCK-, Created date –

**Does CSU have input after writing Use Cases?**

1) Change Fiscal to Financial to be consistent with terminology in the OMB circulars

*Payment, Reports & Terms tab > Reports panel*

- Each Report Class needs a static sub-panel (Fiscal (change to Financial), Intellectual Property, Procurement, Property and Technical Management)
- Do we want a row count on each sub-panel header? **YES**
- Each sub-panel should have an add row and actions column (delete for each data row) to add a report type & assoc’d data
- Change OSP Distribution column label to **Report Format?**
  1) Ron- OSP in title lets it know that OSP is the one taking the action
  2) Is anyone set up in a manner that someone other than OSP is involved in fiscal report distribution?
  3) OSP is listed in title for all types of reports, for technical reports, this would be misleading
  4) What is this field really? Perhaps it has nothing to do with what is submitted to the sponsor. Maybe it is an indication of what is supposed to be distributed to OSP for the official award file.
  5) Ron has taken notes on discussion. He will talk with Rosemary and report back to Susan with detail on purpose of “OSP Distribution” so we can decide on a more pertinent column label.
- Data columns for each sub-panel should be: **Type** (drop-down), **Frequency** (drop down), **Frequency Base** (drop down), **Report Format** (Coeus called this OSP Distribution) (drop down) and **Due Date** (date) **Should these be editable in the grid?**
  1) CSU and UA like idea- no other input
  2) Obviously can only edit if have correct permission
- For each report type, need to be able to add and display multiple Recipients that will include: Contact Type, Name/Organization (with an inquiry button to view details), (number of) Copies (that go to that person) **Design suggestions?**
  1) Does anyone have a vision of how this should look?
  2) Suggestion: as a sample to that, we can look at “Keywords”
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a) Opt to add by clicking look-up
b) Click Search
c) Check the ones you want to return
d) Click Return Selected
e) This would return contact names
f) In grid you would have to fill in number of copies for each contact

3) We will suggest this to the UGX group as a starting point
   • Need button to delete all content from a sub-panel (delete type)
   • Need sync to template button for each sub-panel (and/or panel?)
     1) If we did this by sub-panel, it would be a difference from Coeus
     2) We are fine keeping it at the panel level
     3) Ron – issue in regard to syncing. Coeus is working on enhancement where parent
        record changes push down to the children- sorting out interrelationship of that kind of
        syncing with template syncing. Ron will get the perfect tracker number and email it
        to Susan
     4) May change Sync to “sync to template.” This would work with future enhancement
        by using something like “sync to template” vs. “sync to parent”
   • Default sub-panels to shown or hidden when panel opened?

Funding Proposals, KRAFDBCK-, Created date

Award tab > Funding Proposals panel
   • Display Lead Unit number and name (consistent with PD/B Required Fields panel)
   • Display Proposed Sponsor number and name
   • Change Requested Start Date and Requested End Date labels to Proposed Start Date and
     Proposed End Date

Award tab > Funding Proposals tab > Proposal Details sub-panel
   • Remove Proposal ID, Sponsor Name, Lead Unit, Project Start Date and Project End Date
     since they are contained in the light gray sub-panel header which is displayed directly
     above Proposal Details
   • Change Project Title to Proposed Title (may not be identical to Award Title given by
     sponsor)
   • The three (display-only) fields left on this sub-panel will be Proposal Type, Activity Type
     and Proposed Title

Award tab > Funding Proposals tab > Budget Details sub-panel
   • No changes! Love it the way it is! – Nobody else has suggested changes
1) **KRA Glossary**  
Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: Nothing new this week.

2) **KCRA Proposal Budget demo** – Lisa Oliva (MSU)

**BUDGETS**

a) We will be working in Mock Environment. Not everything is functional in Dev 2.  
   i) We will bounce around with mock screens to be able to see all current stuff.

b) Budget Versions is a panel that appears on proposal side and budget side  
   i) Proposal module and budget module – 2 separate modules, they are connected,  
      try to make them seam up (Proposal budget) are where they are connected.
   ii) Once you created proposal and get to budget side, a whole new set of tabs pops up

c) Parameters Tab (now called summary page)  
   i) There is a lot of re-naming between 1 and 1.1
   ii) To change proposal start and end date, must go back to proposal, and then come back in to budget
   iii) Must mark Final and Complete so system knows which budget is to be submitted to the sponsor
   iv) Comments are internal, don’t go anywhere
   v) Total Cost Limit – Is not a hard limit, will just get a warning if exceeded
   vi) You can add, delete, and adjust budget periods
   vii) When you first begin a budget, the system default is to add budget increments in 12 month periods based on start date. You can adjust these, but some rules.  
      Periods can’t overlap; budget period start date can’t be before project start date.
   viii) You can generate out years using different inflation rates for different categories/object codes

d) Rates Panel - System is flexible with rates.  
   i) Some proposals require modified rates that are not in line with Institution’s standard rates, and system allows these to be entered.
   ii) The changes made here are only applicable to the proposal you are working on.  
      Whatever you give up here, will be captured in unrecovered F&A.
   iii) Vacation, etc. panels, will only show if your institution uses them

e) Non-personnel Tab  
   i) Panels labeled in same categories as Grants.gov
   ii) Select object code – will only see options related to equipment in drop-down for equipment panel. This will function correctly if code tables set up correctly during implementation
iii) Qty and total base cost are not mathematically linked. You are calculating the total cost yourself (not entering a unit cost for system to calculate total based on qty)

iv) Overview panel gives start and end dates for budget period
   (1) You can put more specific dates in the individual panels (for example if you know you will buy the equipment in a certain month, you could enter the dates if desired). This is more useful in the Personnel section

v) Have to go into line item details to enter cost share. You have to seek this item out because we don’t want users accidentally committing to cost share.

vi) Within the panel for each category, you can also choose to apply to later periods.

vii) “Sync to cost limit” will adjust (inflate or deflate) the category to meet the total desired for the category. You can adjust several categories one at a time.

viii) Line item counts are given for each panel, so you can see whether or not you need to review each category

ix) You can apply (or not) inflation and on/off campus at line item level

x) You can put budget justification notes for each item to later compile and copy and paste into Word to complete budget justification later. It is a tool to writing budget justification, won’t write it for you.

f) Personnel-Tab
   i) Choose budget period
   ii) Project Personnel – UI complex to work with because of vast functionality of Coeus. (KCRA only has one version, unlike Coeus which has 2 versions)
   iii) Personnel names will be there from proposal. All people have to be here for a detailed budget. You can add TBA, additional named employees.
   iv) Job code may not be applicable to all institutions
   v) Roles (PI/Contact) is only used for NIH. For all other sponsors, PI, Co-I and key person are used.
   vi) If you integrate with an HR system, appt type, base salary may auto-populate.
   vii) Can also get job code to auto-populate if integrated with HR system
   viii) Salary effective date will populate based on proposal dates
   ix) You can account for raises. Set up with base salary as of certain effective date.
   Then enter a new salary effective date, with the increased salary.
   x) You can set up for inflation to be effective as of different dates
    (1) Example – salary inflation as of 7/1, supplies inflation as of 1/1, etc.
   xi) Budget overview looks same in personnel and non-personnel
    (1) Totals shown update as you are budgeting
   xii) In detailed budget, you will have personnel detail tab, will be able to select individual that was listed in project personnel. If validation set to on, the table will only show you applicable object codes for personnel items
   xiii) “Group” is optional
   xiv) UI changed to be person specific rather than object code specific
   xv) Once you add person, then you will get the sub-panel
   xvi) System will calculate salary and fringe for you
   xvii) With personnel, start and end date is very important because it drives the calculation of salary and fringe
   xviii) Difference between percent effort and percent charged goes into cost share bucket
   xix) Personnel budget details tells you person months, unrecovered F&A for individual’s salary, cost share amount
   xx) When you add another person, you can select same group or different group
(1) Group details gives you aggregate amounts for everyone in group. Cannot do sync to total for this part of the detail budget. Too many calculations involved.

xxi) When you click inquiry on total F&A foregone for Group, it will give you the detail amount

xxii) In 1.0, you don’t have to do a detail personnel budget, you can choose summary, can change start and end date, but percent effort, percent charged, and period type become N/A. Here, you would be entering requested salary amount; system would not be calculating it for you. This is quite a bit different from 1.0.

g) Summary Tab-
i) Click Edit, will take you back to pertinent tab to make changes. Cannot edit directly on the summary.

ii) Summary shows total DC, total IC, Total Costs. Would like to have a line showing MTDC base, but do not know if we will get it.

h) Distribution and Income (Cost Share, Unrecovered F&A, Project Income) - There is a parameter setting; you can either require or not require. If set to required, cannot route anywhere unless this is completed.

i) Project Income – anticipated amounts would be entered if applicable (obviously nothing to enter if not generating income)

i) Modular Budget Tab- Can tweak budget that is generated. A lot of fields are editable. Some names/labels have been changed vs. Coeus, but the functionality is the same.

j) Budget Actions
   i) This is where you can combine all of the budget justification notes

   ii) Sub Award budget – need to upload a form. Grants.gov has to give Coeus/KCRA a patch to fix this. Haven’t been able to test yet with the patch.

   iii) Budget is using Sub Award (not sub-contracts)

k) Work to do on 2.0 – haven’t touched it yet – earliest end of September. Will need work on Institute Proposal.

   i) For 1.0 never had a clear timeline – In Jan. started scrambling – doesn’t recommend that!

PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT

a) Tabs to be re-ordered

b) Document Overview
   i) What is Org. Doc#? Lisa recommend we don’t spend time trying to change it, we will inherit it. Org. Doc# is original document #, no functionality, you can reference something. Just a text fill-in field, does not validate.

   ii) Description is required; this is what shows in workflow. The actual project title is not what shows.

c) As long as document is editable, you can make changes. During workflow only a few items are editable – you institution can customize this. Once proposal is submitted to sponsor, nothing is editable.

d) Sponsor and Program Information- A lot of this is not required

e) Applicant Organization must be selected. This table is controlled by central administration. Everything else, including Congressional District, is filled in automatically when Applicant Organization is selected.

f) Delivery Info- not required. A lot of the time may not even want to bother completing it.
g) Key Personnel, different drop-down for NIH vs. Non-NIH. For Non-NIH, must have ONE PI to go into workflow.

h) Current JIRA for 1.1 – Panel currently always closes after you add a key person

i) Special Review – you can build business rules/routing rules

j) Custom Data – If you have data you need to capture, and it is not captured anywhere else in this system, this is where your school sets it up.

k) Permissions – Can set up at a higher level in the unit hierarchy, or can assign to individual proposals. You can delete someone who shows automatically from the unit hierarchy. Permissions lock in when you submit it to workflow.

l) Types of things that can be edited once proposal goes to workflow are proposal type items, such as a typo in the Project Title. Permissions not something you would want to change after something goes to workflow.

m) Can have different access to see/modify attachments. Individual may be able to modify proposal, but not modify attachments for example.

n) You can delete yourself from having rights to proposal. (You can’t remove yourself if you are the only one on it).

o) Grants.gov tab – this is where you search for / link to your opportunity. If you had filled in opportunity number or cfda number in proposal tab, it will populate on the Opportunity look-up.

p) Proposal Actions

i) Data Validation – How close am I to getting this proposal submitted? 
   Everything you are required to fill out to submit this to workflow will be listed.
   You will get a list of errors/warnings/grants.gov errors. 7 errors on key personnel, etc. It will list all 7 in detail. These are the same errors that are showing up on the individual tabs. This page compiles all errors on one page, rather than having to go through panel by panel.

ii) Upon fixing an error, you are returned to data validation screen.

q) Kept most errors Coeus has, but they show up at different times. Rather than stopping the whole show to complete one panel, the validation error shows up later and must be corrected before the proposal is sent to workflow. (Only specific instances allow changes in workflow). Example: A narrative has to be uploaded prior to workflow. Once in workflow, you may allow PI to replace the narrative with a revised narrative. The proposal would have never made it to workflow if a narrative had not been uploaded.

r) Hierarchy – will be for release 2. Has to do with center grants

   i) Kenton: At kick-off meeting will need to address all the hierarchies for consistency

2) Coeus Research Assignment: Money & End Dates OUT OF TIME

Copy 1 budget year at a time from linked Proposal to Award.

a) 3-part process: 1) Submit, 2) Approve 3) Post bgt (may need to get Approve budget right).

3) Mock Updates to be Requested: OUT OF TIME

Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.

a) UXG meeting update – Susan

   i) Meeting next Monday – email comments to Susan off-line

b) Bring suggestions for Funding Proposals, Reports & F&A (Indirect Cost) panels

4) New Specifications for Review: None

5) Enhancement Requests for Review: None
6) **Spec Review/Issue Updates: OUT OF TIME**
   - **KRA_AWD-Approved Foreign Travel** – Update from Rosemary on Coeus bugs issue
   - **KRA_AWD-Reports** – Team CSU writing use cases
   - **KRA_AWD-Terms** – Team CSU writing use cases
   - **KRA_AWD-Contacts** – Susan (post update ASAP)
   - **KRA_AWD-Notes** – Julie (post update by 9/7)
   - **KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts** – Tara (post update by 9/7)
   - **KRA_AWD-Create an Award** – Keith (post update by 9/7)
   - **KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel** – Renee (SME-F version posted?, Jira)
   - **AWD DD** for Reports, Terms & F&A Rate (meet w/LBA)

7) **Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings OUT OF TIME**
   - **KRA_AWD-Award Closeout** – Chris (post progress ASAP)
   - **KRA_AWD-Budget Versions** – Renee (post progress ASAP)
   - **KRA_AWD-Payment** – Need volunteer to take over transfer to new template
   - **AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule** – Need volunteer to take over

8) **Questions and Roll Call**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Tracey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Lisa Oliva, Craig, Laura, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Kenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Julie, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) **KRA Glossary**
   Be prepared to review/approve the following definitions: DFARS, FAR, FDP, Frequency Base, ITAR
   a) DFARS - Tracey was not sure how specific we should be.
      i) Accept
   b) Do we need to add a definition for FAR supplements?
      i) Yes – Tracey too add.
   c) FAR – To make shorter remove last 2 sentences, starting with: The FAR is divided into 53 parts…
      i) After these 2 sentences are removed, mark as accepted
   d) FDP – Remove reference to # of participants, the numbers might change and then definition would be out of date.
   e) Frequency Base – Accepted
   f) ITAR
      i) change “states” to “countries”
      ii) Remove second sentence – don’t want people to assume this sentence is all encompassing, as it was intended for an example. Remove altogether.

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:**
   Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
   UXG meeting update – Susan
   a) This past week the UXG team met to go over changes we requested in June and prior
   b) Process has changed
      i) We will be creating Jira’s to give to the UXG team for mock updates / design requirements
      ii) Approved Equip and Foreign Travel Jira submitted
      iii) Sponsor template Jira submitted
      iv) Data collected for sub-contracts – Susan will submit that
      v) Renee working on cost share
      vi) The JIRA’s are on the grid if looking for them

3) **Kuali Days VII: See Kuali Days VII page on Confluence**
   Updates from Susan? Update Confluence page if attending KD7 or SME Workshop.
   a) The workshop can help make us all more efficient and better spec writers
   b) Update Confluence if attending
   c) Hotel expected to fill up soon

4) **Coeus Research Assignment: Money & End Dates**
   a) As we discover bugs, what is the correct process?
      i) Send to Rosemary. She will investigate with her team and add to perfect tracker if needed.
   b) Update on possible bug in Money & End Dates
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i) Copy 1 budget year at a time from linked Proposal to Award.
ii) 3-part process: 1) Submit, 2) Approve 3) Post bgt (may need to get Approve budget right).
iii) Is there a bug; Obligated amounts doubled? – update from Rosemary & Ron
   (1) Ron could not replicate
   (2) Rosemary has not had time to research
   (3) Ron now keeps spreadsheet of variables from one test to the next. Ron feels it may be better to work on it individually (Ron and Renee) and then bring it back to the group

c) In Coeus Consortium instance, in the very near future, there will be other new instances with stable environment of current release, which will make everything more stable for testing and demonstration

5) New Specifications for Review: NONE

6) Enhancement Requests for Review: NONE
   a) List of enhancements is out there, but per Functional Council meeting, will not be voted on soon.

7) Spec Review/Issue Updates:
   **KRA_AWD-Approved Foreign Travel** – Update from Rosemary on Coeus bugs issue
   a) No update
   **KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts** – Tara (posted 8/1)
   a) Tara has looked into duplicate entries – we should be able to enter duplicates, per Rosemary. Tara is still getting error message if duplicate is entered.
   b) Rosemary will investigate why this may be happening
   c) Tara – related error message – getting SQL error – Rosemary will look at print screens and look into the issue.
   d) Feedback from schools (MSU & CSU)– thank you!
   e) Tara will update Federal Business rules based on feedback
   f) Enhancement requests will be reviewed to see if possible
   g) Tara hasn’t updated spec with changes discussed
   h) Tara will update sections 8 (User Documentation Notes) and 9 (Differences from Coeus)
   i) Based on the comments provided, Tara should have spec close to finished
   j) Glossary items – Subcontract and Subaward – will need to cross-reference if both are left in glossary
   k) Group input needed: Mock screens in KC – if second half of screen is not in use, do we want it to appear – if no subcontract module, then this panel would not appear?
   l) How does this work in Coeus? Per Rosemary, Space is blank if module doesn’t exist.
   m) Kenton – our question should be who will this affect? Only awards? If so, we can change parameters. Let Kenton know and document on KC sandbox change log. Page is unlinked. Kenton will find and add to KC sandbox page.
   n) Ron – will there be schools that won’t use subcontract module?
      i) Susan – that’s what we need to find out
      ii) Per Rosemary, this is a sub module of Award
      iii) Per Susan, this will be handled in Release 3
   o) Tara needs to find out what is current functionality in Coeus and incorporate group preference, which is to allow duplicate entries
   p) Tara will add label changes in Difference from Coeus section (2 weeks)
   q) Only thing left will be enhancement requests, if there are any
   **KRA_AWD-Create an Award** – Keith (posted 8/15)
a) Some schools are still working on comments / review and will be sending them to Keith
b) Keith has incorporated Rosemary’s changes, but has not posted updated version yet
c) In general, terms- a lot of these items will go in other specs. If they are in Awards spec, then they will be duplicates
   i) One problem with this spec that Keith had is determining where the boundaries are. Where do you put the fence around it?
   ii) Kenton said to address duplicity as we go. There may be some duplication as specs are related, may need to do some cross referencing.
d) What is the Org. Doc. # in the Kuali Document Overview?
   i) Could it be the same as the Document Id?
e) If we are using the same terms, duplicates in the terms and definitions is fine, this may help the user
f) Duplication in the functionality should not be common
g) Susan will let Keith know which other specs are covering the functionality associated with specific terms that are included that are duplicates
h) There is a spreadsheet showing where items are shown geographically in Coeus, and then where we have them in K-C. Susan can show this to everyone.
i) Keith’s question regarding sub-contract in section 1.5 will be covered in sub-c spec
j) Project Title vs. Title....Award Title vs. Proposal Title
   i) At UA, the title entered for the Award is what the sponsor uses. Proposal title that PI entered on proposal may be slightly different.
   ii) Renee thought Proposal Title was being changed to Proposed Tile – (In Funding Proposals panel). Susan to double check? Chris who wrote the spec delaing with proposal also recalls this being changed to Proposed Title
k) Sponsor ID vs. Sponsor – Change field label to Sponsor, but list both Sponsor name and ID. If this is consistent with what proposals did, then this is what we want to do.
l) Business Objectives- this section should describe why the business should spend money on this, what they are expecting to get out of it.
   i) These need to be in complete sentences
      (1) what was Keith referring to with #2 (record outcome of each proposal)? The way UA interpreted this, #2 is not an accurate a statement of an objective Awards module
      (2) This objective is satisfied by the Proposal Status in Proposal module.
      (3) Or change wording to outcome of each FUNDED proposal
      (4) Kenton can see that this is a business objective, although a very broad business objective, do want to state something if it is important for you to track the outcome
      (5) Keith is fine with taking it out as long as Coeus proposal serves the purpose of what UC Davis is trying to accomplish, which it should
m) Business Rules – Re-word to make clear that regulations may apply to award from other sources besides institution and sponsor (i.e. state, etc.)
n) Narrative – Should be in lamens terms
   i) This narrative may be too detailed and technical
   ii) Paragraph starting “As a general rule..” reads like more of a usage note in Susan’s opinion
   iii) Kenton says write like you are telling a story of what you did today, what hoops you had to jump through to get this award created. The stuff that is a pain to do because it is not automated, etc. Can include usage note type stuff, bout shouldn’t be the focus.
   iv) With re-wording to shift the point of view this information is coming from, this could be worded from the SPO point of view.
v) This is a business process story, a little generic, not what you specifically do at your Institution. Something worth noting specific to you institution should go in Institutional Special Cases.
o) Errors and Warnings – we do in fact have a combination of these in K-C.
p) Kenton to update functional home page with link to dev and dev2 environments, which will make things easier to test because you don’t have to put in data from scratch every time.
q) Concepts and backgrounds- Keith included listing of fields and if they were required not – this should end up in data section / functional requirements. Kenton may get rid of this section entirely. It is sort of an extension to the narrative. At this point in the spec we are not mentioning screens or data at all. We are still at the level of the User experience / story. One of the most common problems with the spec is getting too detailed too soon or worrying about stuff we don’t know yet.
r) Suggestion of additional user class. Really Campus Admin/Dean would all view the same thing as Unit/Dept. It is a different level of unit, but they are viewing the same data even if it is for a different reason.
s) OSP Admin – detail has been added. OSP Admin in Post or Pre Award. This table has been modified, but needs to be updated in this spec.
t) We so far do not have a need to break these 4 out further, but Susan is keeping track of comments and they can be broken out at a later date if determined appropriate.
u) User requirements – User shall be able to
i) items included here that give system generated messages, etc. should be moved to functional requirement
ii) Show/hide buttons would go in design requirements
v) Functional Requirements – System does this
w) Design – How system does the functional requirements.
x) Kenton discussed in/out of scope for Use cases. Developers look at if some things are actually enhancement requests or how much time / resources it will take. For use cases, the in/out of scope is really for resource management. We can pretty much ignore this.
y) In use case, don’t discuss specific element of a screen (button, drop-down, etc) – this is an implementation detail.
i) Don’t have to provide specific language, but state that the system warns user they didn’t save
ii) Error text / system messages would go in functional requirements – document what generates the message
z) In the end, functional requirement is the developers checklist
i) If you have a long list of messages, you can put them at end of functional requirements in a separate table
ii) Differentiate between warning or hard-stop error
aa) Comment from Rosemary - Post condition- Coeus puts time stamps for transactions. This spec is only for new awards, but not editing awards. Will a time stamp be put on each panel, or at end of award creation? Will there be 15 time stamp saves in course of setting up awards? Even when award is edited (and sequence number NOT created), Coeus puts a time stamp, which is important to know that changes were made because a new sequence is not assigned. Kenton not sure where it will be displayed, but it will be captured. Per Kenton, as a post-condition of saving, the system will capture the time stamp. This should be in the use case and functional requirements per Kenton. (but of which spec???)
bb) Kenton feels we should expand this spec for look-up, modify (existing sequence), and award new entry (generate new sequence of award)
KRA AWD-Notes – Julie (posted 8/23)
Next week – out of time

KRA AWD-Contacts – Susan (will post by 8/27)
Next week – out of time

KRA AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee (SME-F version posted?, Jira)
Next week – out of time

AWD DD for Reports, Terms & F&A Rate (meet w/LBA)

8) Goals/Planning for upcoming meetings
KCRA Proposal Budget demo – Lisa Oliva (MSU) next week 9/3
KRA AWD-Award Closeout – Chris (post progress ASAP) – Hope to post by Friday or next Monday
KRA AWD-Budget Versions – Renee (post progress ASAP)
KRA AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene (post progress ASAP) – Relieved, someone else will have to pick up this spec
AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule – Tracey & Arlene updated?

Kenton to update links to test instances for proposal modules KRA Dev and KRA Dev 2 on Confluence

Update KRA to KC (Kuali Coeus) on specs KC_AWD…..for file names of specs

KRA AWD-Reports – Need volunteer to write use case
KRA AWD-Terms – Need volunteer to write use case

9) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU</th>
<th>Tracey, Arlene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Laura, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Kenton, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Julie, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Diane, Betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Functional Council Meeting Update:

- **a)** Andy let us know Kenton will be setting aside time to help us review/write specs to bring us up to speed and hammer these out fast. We need to shift into high gear.
- **b)** On 9/3- Lisa from MSU will join us to demonstrate proposal budget. WE need to start doing research and thinking about this.
- **c)** JHU, current Coeus proposal module user, is going to be implementing Coeus Awards. John @ JHU will be able to share his experience with us as they implement
- **d)** Renee and Susan to meet with UGX regarding mock updates, etc.

1) **KRA Glossary**

Be prepared to review and approve the following definitions: ITAR, FAR, DFARS, FDP…

Tracey absent - delayed to next week

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:**

Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.

- **a)** UA has changes and questions for mock screens for Notes

3) **Kuali Days VII:**

Registration open if you plan to attend.

Any need/desire for Awards F2F time before or during KD7?

- **a)** There will be breakout rooms for spec writing, etc.
- **b)** Is anyone who is planning to attend? If so, are you able to stay an extra day or two to work on specs F2F?
  - **i)** Diane at CSU is attending
  - **ii)** Kim @ CSU is attending and stay an extra day
  - **iii)** Rosemary may be there (potentially)
  - **iv)** Renee is attending – has not made reservations, etc. yet

4) **Coeus Research Assignment: Money & End Dates**

Copy one budget year at a time from linked Proposal to Award. See Confluence SME Reference Materials.

- **a)** 3-part process: you have to 1) Submit, 2) Approve and 3)Post budget so you may need to get Approve budget right from your school’s KCRA System Admin.
- **b)** Is there a bug with Obligated amounts being doubled?
  - **i)** Ron Schultz and Rosemary will look into this, see if they can duplicate issue, and determine error.
- **c)** Sandbox has been updated to 4.3.1, and now they can get in to Princeton budget Functionality. They are having issues and are wondering if this is User error on their part. They would like as many as people as possible to test this, put in budgets, and see what happens.
5) **New Specifications for Review:**

KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie, initial review in new template

a) Updates to mocks needed.
b) Julie to work on additional documentation/detail for differences from Coeus
c) Julie tried to stray away from multiple variations of the term Notes (want to consistently use Notes, not notepad, not comments)
d) Julie will make references more clear, to reference specific sections, rather than just providing links.
e) Business Requirements/Rules challenging. It is a useful tool, but want to get a stronger statement of why this is important.
f) Narrative to come.
g) User requirements
   i) Question for Rosemary – is there a character limit in the Notepad feature in Coeus
      (1) Rosemary is not aware of a character limit. It is a free form text that just keeps going as far as she knows, but she will let us know if she finds out otherwise.
h) When a user saves without text- there is an error that comes up. This is in functional requirements, but Julie needs to tie back to the Use Case (4.6). Other than that, please review and give Julie your input on the Use Cases.
i) Decisions made by Proposal SME, we need to find out the reasoning behind certain decisions.
   i) For example, the mock in Awards, looks like the mock in Proposal, but the mock in awards is not the same as Coeus
   ii) Per Rosemary, in Proposal Module, the system automatically generates certain entries into the Notepad. This functionality does not occur in Awards Module.
j) Currently, we need to change grouping and sorting order.
   i) KC is putting most recent notes at the bottom
   ii) Coeus puts the most recent note at the top – this is what we want to have
   iii) Does anyone have a preference to have the most recent at the bottom? No Comments
k) User Interface- will update with screen shots
l) Design Requirements – We like the way Coeus is laid out, but realized KC cannot work exactly like this with our panel design.
   i) At very least, we need to add another column to show what type of Note the Note is
      (1) Another option would be to have sub-panels
   ii) Rosemary thinks it may be confusing for the Proposal Notes to show in Awards.
   iii) Susan says there may be relevant info, to be passed form the Proposal reviewer to the Award reviewer.
iv) At MIT, pre- and post- award are not separated, one administrator does it all. They do not use many notes in the Awards module
   (1) Hopkins separate
   (2) UA separate
   (3) MSU – separate for the most part (some do both depending on funding agency)
v) Per Rosemary, at MIT they hardly use notepad at all – designed to serve the purpose as a Post-It note.
vii) In Awards, we want to only be able to add Notes to Awards (Notes from other modules would only be displayed).
vii) Do we even want blank sub-panels to show up with (0) notes? No. Only sub-panels should show up that contain an entry.

KRA_AWD-Award Closeout? – Chris (absent, we’ll review 8/27)

6) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:**
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7) Spec Issue Updates:
   KRA_AWD-Approved Foreign Travel – Susan (SME-F version posted?, Jira?)
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel – Renee (SME-F version posted?, Jira?)
   KRA_AWD-Terms – Fed Bus Rules (Finalized)
   KRA_AWD-Contacts – Susan
   KRA_AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene (Any sections updated?)
   KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara (send Tara comments on all sections prior to Use Cases)
     a) No Comments have been received – Renee expects to have some this week
     b) We will review next week
     c) Keith is making sweeping changes
     d) Susan will try to get Kenton to attend nest week
   KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee (SME-F version posted?, Jira)
   DD for KRA_AWD-Reports, KRA_AWD-Terms and KRA_AWD-F&A Rate (meet w/LBA)

8) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
   KRA_AWD-Budget Versions – Renee (hope to have a new spec to begin review 8/27/08)
   KRA_AWD-Reports – Need volunteer to write use case for 8/25 – no volunteers today
   KRA_AWD-Terms – Need volunteer to write use case for 8/25 – no volunteers today

9) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Tara, Julie, Susan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Diane, Betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU</td>
<td>Ron Schultz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **KRA Glossary**
Be prepared to review and approve the following definitions: Capital Equipment and Property cross-referenced to Equipment, Foreign Travel updated – now OK to accept?
1. Capital Equipment and Property cross-referenced to Equipment – Tracey has marked as Accepted
2. Foreign Travel updated – Tracey will now mark as Accepted.
3. ITAR, DFAR, FAR – terms added, but definitions not yet listed. Tracey will work on these this week.
4. Susan is wondering if we should add the following:
   a. EAR
   b. Fly America Act
5. In how much detail do we want to go with having regulations in the glossary?
   a. Chris suggests a brief description and a reference to where it can be found
   b. (Note: reference will be listed in individual specs)

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:**
Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
None

3) **New Specifications for Review:**
No brand new specs for review this week
None

4) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:**
AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule – Tracey & Arlene – post by 8/8/08 for review 8/13/08

5) **Spec Issue Updates:**
KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Keith
1. To post in a few days for review next week
2. It is hard to draw a line of where this spec should end (what it should encompass). It affects a lot of other screens/areas.
3. In comparing terms used in application to terms in glossary, he has come across terms that he thinks should be in the glossary
   a. Email the term to Tracey, include proposed definition if possible. (Example, non-competing continuation)
KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara
4. Waiting for comments
   a. Renee, MSU has reviewed, but no time to give feedback yet
KRA_AWD-Approved Foreign Travel – Susan (will post final updates 8/12, SME Final?)
5. Not yet posted, to be posted soon
KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee
6. Has rec’d comments from Cornell, hopes to upload revision soon
KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel – Renee
7. UA to send additional comments directly to Renee
8. Should Julie update, listing links to DFAR clauses for specific agencies?
   a. Tracey to add FDP to the glossary
   b. Julie will make mention of FDP, with links or appendix for agency specific
guidelines
   c. Julie wants comments on what she has, and will work on making it more detailed
   by adding appendices

KRA_AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene – post by 8/8/08 for review 8/13/08
KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie, new template – post by 8/8/08 for review 8/13/08
KRA_AWD-Contacts – Susan (User Rqmts, Use Cases, Func Rqmts in progress, not done)

9. Broad scope, has asked Kenton for help (he is on vacation)

DD for KRA_AWD-Reports, KRA_AWD-Terms and KRA_AWD-F&A Rate (meet w/LBA)

10. Susan and Diane to meet with Kenton separately for guidance

6) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
   a) Update from Renee on meeting with voting SME’s
      i) Time is the biggest constraint for everyone
      ii) Learning new template and learning Coeus is very time consuming
      iii) Susan recommends schools set aside time for reviewing and working on specs on
           a regular basis. Renee says most schools are trying to do this, but again there
           are time constraints for some.
   b) Susan to post agenda Monday for next week, listing specific sections for each spec to
      discuss in our conference call
      i) Chris will not be at next meeting, will try to have first few sections of closeout
         spec done and posted by Monday
      ii) Each time Susan posts a new version she will accept in the track changes, so that
         everyone is not reading the same thing again and again
      iii) Reminder - look at the section listing the changes made to the spec if you have
           already reviewed that spec once
      iv) Tracey and Arlene to have at least one section for next week
      v) Renee/MSU – working on budget (Monday morning they will be concentrating
         on this)
      vi) Keith won’t be here, but will have something posted for Awards
      vii) UA/Tara- need to email Rosemary for specific use case questions. Please review
           everything before use cases if you haven’t already and provide feedback

7) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Julie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Laura, Renee, Wendy, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey, Arlene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) **KRA Glossary**
Be prepared to review and approve the following definitions:

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:**
Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.

3) **New Specifications for Review:**
No brand new specs for review this week

4) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:**
   
   **AW-18 Require Cost Share Source Dest Parameter** – Renee (Go to attachments tab of Enhancements page to see both versions of doc – express your preference during meeting)
   1. Content not really changed. Susan revised to have a greater emphasis on business focus.
      a. MSU-no preference
      b. CSU- version 2
      c. Cornell-2
      d. UA-2
      e. UC Davis- 2
      f. Indiana - Absent

   **AW-19 Require F_A Source Dest Parameter** – Renee (Go to attachments tab of Enhancements page to see both versions of doc – express your preference during meeting)
   2. Same types of changes – content same, geared toward business need, focus on answering each question posed
      a. No additional comments, we will post 2nd version, as with the Cost share source enhancement request

   **AW-17 Generate Payment Schedule** – Tracey & Arlene – post by 8/8/08 for review 8/13/08

5) **Spec Issue Updates:**
   
   **KRA_AWD-Reports** – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
   **KRA_AWD-Terms** – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
   1. Fed Bus Rules (Reports) - Originally 4 pages, shortened down to a summary. Will add appendices with OMB excerpts
   3. FAR clauses – add additional sentence that contracts follow FAR clauses as well. Then put reference/link/ and/or appendix for FAR clauses.

   **Data Dictionary F&A Rate** - Diane
   **KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts** – Tara (User Rqmts, Use Cases)
1. Multiple organization entry should be allowed, per Rosemary. May be test instance.
   a. Send Rosemary detailed trail of how you arrived at error and she’ll research
2. Add modify notes and issues to functional requirements
   Document what happens if subcontract module is not installed
3. Unlink subcontract mod (via Kenton) and test what happens. What would this looks like with no s/c module in place?
   a. Any need to see screen if not automatically updating?
   b. One more thing to maintain if we have to manually update
   c. Downside = people viewing list that may not be accurate
   d. Add note – heading won’t exist if module is absent
   e. No one wants to see inaccurate information
   f. Rosemary – space is there, it’s just empty.
      i. May want to have a way to blank out if s/c module is not active
      ii. Ex/ custom data tab does not display if no custom data – poll IU group for info
4. Sorting going on with s/c, but Susan is not sure how?
   i. Not alphabetical
   ii. Also not sorting according to table data
   iii. Rosemary…how sorting? May be taking info off organization tables that’s taking precedence.
   iv. Per Rosemary, we are ok to make our suggestion. We won’t be running over a decision Coeus made for sorting.
   v. Sort alphabetical by subcontractor name
5. Mocks: changes previously requested are in spec, but they haven’t been made.
6. Tara will update differences from Coeus.
   i. Note tab order changes too
7. Any outstanding issues from the group? No response!

**KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel – Diane, new template**

1. Purpose – add “by sponsor” at end
2. Terms- may need to add ITAR
3. Business Objectives- add reason why we are documenting this (expense allowability, etc.)
4. Fed Bus rules - add FAR
5. Institutional Special Cases – State may have additional requirements, most restrictive out of state, fed, or sponsor would have to be followed
6. Add Fly America Act somewhere in business rules
7. Narrative Overview / Concepts & Backgrounds- added mention of ITAR, Fly America, and additional detail on what items may be restricted (destination, traveler, dates, etc.)
8. UA added user requirements “user shall…”
9. Index to use case – changed description
10. Use Cases
    a. Want to ask Kenton if normal course and A1 can be combined, or should be kept separate
    b. Bugs – Asked for Rosemary’s help to determine if these are known bugs, or what is going on
       i. Enter name, save, when you come back the name user entered is overwritten with PI name and drop-down box then becomes available.
1. Rosemary will see if she can re-create the situation and check on status (UA didn’t find anything in Perfect Tracker)
2. Susan to send Rosemary an email with details with “bugs” we are experiencing and Rosemary will research
   ii. Duplication Error – Is this an
c. In Exceptions- Remove “required fields” just leave as Error or Error Messages (E1)
11. Functional requirements
   a. 2- change user to maintainer
   b. 2a – remove “if sponsor…”
   c. Error messages
      i. Need to add one for the duplicate entries (name, destination & date from all match) – Gives weird message Cost Sharing – exception code 1607 – what does this mean??
      ii. Consider changing the wording of error for date format. Statement that it does not pass validation test is vague. We suggest providing message informing user of correct format.
12. Sorting – UA could not figure out how this is sorted. Rosemary thinks it should be most recent date first. She is not 100% sure on how Coeus sorts it, but can find out if we want.
   a. We suggest sorting by date (most recent at top) then by traveler name (alphabetically)
13. Screen shot – update to include multiple trips so that it shows how it is sorted and how Coeus provides total
14. Tab order – not accurate, need to revise by removing sentence referencing Differences from Coeus section.
15. UI Mocks, Susan has requested some updates, but they have not been completed.
16. Differences from Coeus- we think these are Pam’s old suggestions that were never discussed as a group
   a. Remove sentence about Enter key (not accurate)
   b. Remove sentence about warning message – the group previously decided against this enhancement request.
   c. Terminology - group decisions
      i. Person Name – change to Traveler Name
      ii. Destination – Leave as is
      iii. Date From – change to Start Date
      iv. Date To – change to End Date
      v. Amount – Leaves as is
      vi. Approved Foreign Trips – change to Approved Foreign Travel
   d. May need to note difference regarding who is in drop-down list – However Coeus test instance may just be acting up, Rosemary has put in a request to see what is going on. If Coeus works how Rosemary described, then a difference will not need to be noted.
17. Issues – These items are not things requiring decisions, so they should not be in the issues section.
   a. 1st issue about drop down- may not be issue, currently just isn’t working right in test instance
   b. Eliminate issue regarding entering city and country vs. just the country
   c. Remove comment about using save instead of ok
   d. Based on Susan’s inquiry……this one can be removed, just an old comment
e. Inconsistent Terminology – already taken care of in differences section
18. Susan to update spec with these changes and post it.
19. Data dictionary- Susan, Diane, and Kenton to work on off-line

KRA_AWD-Contacts – Susan (User Rqmts, Use Cases, Func Rqmts)
KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee (on vaca)
KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel – Renee (on vaca)
KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Keith

6) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie, new template – post by 8/8/08 for review 8/13/08
KRA_AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene – post by 8/8/08 for review 8/13/08


2. Diane to focus on Data Dictionary, pick that up for all specs. She will do this from scratch. Individual working on spec can just send her a list of filed names to indicate she should get started.

3. Susan to update approved foreign travel spec and post it

4. Keith to have something for next week’s agenda? He will need to learn how to route a proposal.
   a. We need route map. Rosemary will look for information on map building. Building business rules. Build map first. Then route. Maintain maps and tweak business rules, etc. Rosemary will look into this and get back to us. Biggest part is creating the map.

   Create map
   Create business rule
   Apply map to business rule
   NOT INTUITIVE at all!!!
Rosemary will see what she can do by tonight.
How many test instances?
Susan - each institution needs to be able to do in their own test instance. Not a whole lot of documentation on web. Rosemary will find info and point Susan to it. Rosemary may need to do a demonstration.

7) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Laura, John, Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Chris, Diana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2008, Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 002192#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) **KRA Glossary**
   Be prepared to review and approve the following definitions: Proposed Total Cost, Property Report
   a) Property Report
      i) Is there a reason we are only referring to the title to the sponsor?
      ii) Changed to sponsor OR Institution.
      iii) Accepted.
   b) Proposed Total Cost – added note (not including cost share) to be more specific.
      i) Discussion: Add cross-reference? Make definition to Total Cost, then for Proposed Total Cost use a cross reference.
      ii) At UC Davis, terms used are total sponsor cost vs. total project cost (2nd includes c/s). How specific should we be for this glossary item?
      iii) Review of mock screen and discussion of where this term is actually used. This is under proposal section, so we can possibly get rid of “proposed” altogether.
         (1) Under proposal details, want to be specific that this does not include cost share.
         (2) Under Budget details, drop “cost” and add “sponsor”
            (a) Change Proposed Direct Cost to Proposed Sponsor Direct
            (b) Change Proposed F&A Cost to Proposed Sponsor F&A
            (c) Change Proposed Total Cost to Proposed Sponsor Total
   (3) Decision- Change glossary term / label “Proposed Total Cost” to “Sponsor Total”
      a) Keep definition
      b) Add term Proposed Sponsor Total, have cross reference to Sponsor Total.

2) **Mock Updates to be Requested:**
   Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
   a) Field label changes for proposal funding amounts, under funding proposals panel in awards tab https://test.kuali.org/mocks/kra-coeus-awards-MR/aw-awards.html#
      i) see above (KRA Glossary, b, iii, 2 and 3)

3) **New Documents for Review:** (Kenton will post 07/29/08)
   Awards Module Feature List
   a) Under Resources in KRA-Coeus Awards Subcommittee
   b) No discussion today
   Awards Process Flow
   c) Under Resources in KRA-Coeus Awards Subcommittee
   d) Reason Kenton is putting this together is to educate developers and Kenton and everyone else about the process – so we don’t miss anything.
   e) On right side is a narrative that goes with the process.
   f) Look again later, Kenton is still making slight changes to link names, at least one error currently.
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i) Let Kenton know if any of the wording does not make sense or if we have a suggestion to change wording.

g) Rosemary suggestion – branch at section 3, award set-up may automatically generate financial account.
   i) Maybe there would be an additional branch in the decision-tree here OR a different type of line (dotted line) to show these can be related.

h) Discussion of practice of not always receiving official notice of award as first step.
   i) May receive un-official intent to fund, which is when preaward approvals may take place…..should this be noted in flowchart?
   ii) Many institutions have internal forms that allow the PI to set up award prior to receiving something official from the sponsor.
   iii) Kenton will make a change to flowchart.
      (1) This would result in “advance set up needed?” having an arrow going back up before “Receive Award Notice.”
   i) Side note: award Status, can search by category in Coeus
   j) Get rid of “setup financial system data feed “and combine with “Final Setup Award Setup” (in Final Setup section to simplify)

k) Monitoring- idea is to manage the whole affair – make sure you are getting paid and required reports are being complete.
   i) Add something in regard to Maintaining the Award, but keep Monitor Award
      (1) Maintain award would be for things like NCE, sub-c, re-budget, monitor expenses vs. payments and awards
   ii) Suggestion: for 5, add a 3rd item (have payments, reports, compliance)

l) 6- Reminders and Instructions & Financial Review – Add Unit as well as SPO for these.

m) 7- Final Reporting may include more than just SPO, depending on types of report and how Institution is set up.

n) 8- Sponsor Audit- Broaden to internal or external audit

4) **New Specifications for Review:**
   No brand new specs for review this week

5) **New Enhancement Requests for Review:** - Out of time. Will review next week.
   AW-17? Payment Schedule Generation – Tracey & Arlene
   AW-18? Source_Destination_Required Parameter - Renee

6) **Spec Issue Updates:**
   KRA_AWD-Reports – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
   KRA_AWD-Terms – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
   Data Dictionary F&A Rate - Diane
   KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel – Diane, new template
   KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara – To be completed. Post by 8/1 for review 8/6/08.
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel – Renee
   KRA_AWD-CREATE an Award – Susan
   a) 1st question from Keith: When you link an award to the proposal, is the budget brought in?
      i) Rosemary: No. Not all proposals are created in Coeus. You are linking to institute proposal. Proposal, institute proposal, and award all came before proposal development. However, Award Budget functionality is that the budget can feed through, but we (Awards SME) do not know exactly how this works yet – not in current version of Coeus
In money and end dates, if you have correct role, you can select “copy”, and system will allow you to select budget form proposal and line items will come through. Then you can make changes if needed.

(1) Rosemary plans to document this so it is a clearer process.

(2) If sponsor cuts award, budget can be sent to dept for changes, then dept routes back to OSP for approval or rejection. This will then show as budget.

(3) Is a calculate button, use on command, not automatic.

(a) There are times when award is received and not allowed to re-budget sponsor approved total indirect cost amount. So at times, you may want to calculate with current IC rates and at other times you may not.

(b) Calculate button will use current maintained rates for the period unless you have inserted rates for the award which are different, in which case it will use the rates you have inserted.

(c) Some roles can insert budget, but not approve. Can set up roles differently due to business rules.

(4) Rosemary: In 4.3 there have been some modifications. Does Awards SME want to capture this?

(a) Susan: Yes, we want to stay current.

(b) Rosemary: Should wait to test for 4.2.3 release due to changes in process, screens currently are not very stable.

b) New question- after Coeus does updates to increase features / functionality, is new feature available with all existing awards or only awards created from then forward?

i) Per Rosemary, available to ALL.

c) Keith- 2nd question: Will any of certain specified fields that are required be parameterized?

i) Some we may be able to downgraded to a warning instead of error, some may have reasons they have to remain as required.

ii) For something to be parameterized would be an enhancement request.

d) Keith #3: when would you link more than 1 proposal to a single award?

i) Per Rosemary:

1. Revision – example: reduce or increase funding for year 2, need to submit a revised proposal for that year

2. Supplement – example NSF supplement for graduate student or REU

3. Award requiring annual proposal budget submission

ii) Susan question- in some of these cases, wouldn’t there be a new sequence number that the individual proposal is linked to? Yes, there would be a distinct sequence number.

e) Keith #4: Should a use case be added for linking the wrong proposal to an award? How would the link be broken so that the proposal could be linked to the correct award in the future?

(1) If we (Susan?) send Rosemary an email, she can investigate this and give us more info.

ii) Should use case be added to delete an existing award?

1. An award can be inactivated, but not deleted.

(a) Why? This is a standard database practice, and for audit records.

2. What is the effect of an award being inactivated? When user immediately recognizes that award was created in error (has not even fed to financial system), basically you are stripping it of anything of value, deleting any data. You are abandoning it. You would likely put a title that the award was set up in error.
(3) Rosemary suggests Kenton write out scenario/questions and get input from Steve Doughty (spelling?).

7) **Goals/Information for upcoming meetings**
   - KRA_AWD-Contacts – Susan – Use case for review next week
   - KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie, new template – post by 8/4/08 for review 8/6/08
   - KRA_AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene

   **Ending Notes/Comments:**
   Awards is now in the front lines, more work and attention coming up for us!
   Susan updated estimate for percent complete for mock screens on spec grid. Let her know if we disagree/want changes.

8) **Questions and Roll Call**

| UA          | Susan, Tara, Julie |
| MSU         | Laura, Renee, John, Craig, Wendy |
| Cornell     | Chris, Bill, Kenton |
| CSU         | Chris Carsten |
| IU          | Tracey |
| Coeus       | Rosemary |
| UC Davis    | Keith |
Discussion prior to moving on to Agenda.

1. There is a data dictionary on Coeus wiki- Rosemary will take a look at it to see what is there.
2. Kathy (extramural funding) and a member form OSP (Andra Stevens) from UC Davis are potential new members.
3. Next meeting cancelled for orientation.
4. Renee will serve as co-lead for award SME once proposal group releases her from testing duties.

1) KRA Glossary

Be prepared to review and approve the following definitions: Equipment, Proposed End Date, Proposed Start Date, Proposed Total Cost, Capitalization, Property Report, Procurement Report, Small Business Report and additional words to be added from Reports and Terms specs

a. Equipment
   i. Accepted

b. Proposed End Date, Proposed Start Date, Proposed Total Cost
   i. Cross reference – accepted for Proposed End Date and Proposed Start Date
   ii. Proposed Total Cost – narrow down definition to make it clear this does not include cost share- Tracey to update

c. Capitalization
   i. Accepted

d. Property Report – Ready to accept after two changes – Tracey to update
   i. Change “Federal government” to “sponsor”
   ii. Change “bought” to “purchased with project funds”

e. Procurement Report
   i. Accepted

f. Small Business Report
   i. Accepted

g. Question from Rosemary: Is this glossary pertinent to all modules?
   i. May want to narrow down definitions to pertain only to award module, to leave room open to add glossary items for other modules.

2) Mock Updates to be Requested:

Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.

None at this time

3) New Specifications for Review:

None at this time

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
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?AW-16 Populate OSP Contacts – Susan  
a. Hopes to post by 7/11

?AW-17 Payment Schedule Generation – Tracey & Arlene  
b. What is status of Enhancement request? Do they know where to find it? In confluence and perfect tracker. (Rosemary will be covering in orientation – where we find info. For example, Wiki, Perfect Tracker, Documentation (.org), hints to where good sources of documentation are.  
i. Wiki-Committee-Post award-child section-cases posted that will take you over to perfect tracker.

c. Rosemary to send us MIT input guide, base of what everything is and what is used. She will contact steering committee to see if other consortiums have their own internal guides. Rosemary is planning to put together a comprehensive guide for users of Coeus awards module.

5) Spec Issue Updates:  
KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel – Chris – finalized & Jira posted?  
d. Absent again

e. Susan has not received a response to the email she sent her last week. She will try contacting her again.

KRA_AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene  
f. Working on – need more to time to write it and understand how it works.

g. Group members can take a look and give comments on what is posted, more formal review deferred.

KRA_AWD-Reports – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)  
h. Fed Bus Rules – Julie testing - delayed

i. DD

1. What are theses data types?
   1. Precision is number of digits
   2. Scale is number of digits to right of decimal point
   3. This detail is not necessary, we can put: use Coeus

2. Items in Coeus that may be helpful for data dictionary
   1. Coeus – Admin - Code Tables
   2. Coeus – Admin – Award Rules

3. Discussion of Invoicing in the Reports Tab.
   1. MIT does this different- Coeus not used to generate invoice reports. These are in their SAP environment. Coeus is capable of this, but MIT does not use it for this. They used Technical/Management in Coeus. Property dept uses combination of Coeus and their own system. Intellectual Property uses Coeus. Use Fiscal reports mostly for Finals.
   2. MIT doesn’t have a lot of documentation on how to create invoice reports from Coeus because they are creating an additional document in SAP (financial system) that their sponsored billing office uses. If an award has a scheduled invoice (set dates and amounts), Rosemary will put amounts in schedule in Coeus. With cost-reimbursement, will not put in a schedule in Coeus.

3. Where in Coeus do you get functionality to print a list of what accounts need to be invoiced? This is what UA
expected to be able to do. Were other schools expecting this? What about payment schedule?

a. Arlene – IU- has system they use now for invoices that they would prefer to replace with Coeus

4. Side note: Tracey’s group trying to combine payment schedule and parts of money and end date for spec.

5. MIT/Rosemary says we are playing on current functionality and Coeus should be able to meet our needs of generating a report listing what invoices need to be done.

6. DD
   a. Reports, Required? Why does it say N/A - means conditionally required. (i.e., yes, if new row added). (After yes, hit F2, and you can continue to add text to clarify)
   b. Diane to go through and clarify items that say N/A

KRA_AWD-Terms – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
   k. DD – One item
      a. No comments

Data Dictionary F&A Rate – Diane
   l. No discussion

KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee
   m. Susan sent 3 pages of comments to Renee
   n. Renee needs to review comments and continue working on spec

KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel – Diane, new template
   o. Ready for everyone to look at for next week so we can finalize

KRA_AWD-Approved Equipment – Susan – SME-F/!
   p. In same status as last week

KRA_AWD-Contacts – Susan
   q. A lot to be done

KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel – Susan posted Jira for review?
   r. On Susan’s to-do list

KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel – Renee
   s. Done, except for decision on destination/source requirement.
   t. Discussion of email from Rosemary regarding parameterization
      i. Renee’s input – reviewed other schools using Coeus to see what they are using. All other schools put in dummy information from Renee’s point of view.
      ii. Rosemary says that other schools have existing data, they could have a migration issue if they decide to use Kuali
      iii. Susan’s understanding - we can’t take away functionality. Other schools may be depending on that data for reports (even if most schools don’t use it). We can enhance it and turn off the requirement, but need to be able to make it required as well.
      iv. Renee to write enhancement request to parameterize (hopefully for meeting in 2 weeks)

KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Susan
6) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie, new template – post by 7/11/08 for review 7/16/08
KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara, new template – post by 7/11/08 for review 7/16/08

a. Renee to write enhancement request to parameterize (hopefully in 2 weeks)

b. Orientation
   1. Any objections to cancelling next weeks meeting in favor of an orientation/training during this time us? No
   2. Susan to send out email to award listserv and individuals interested regarding next week orientation – info from Rosemary may be useful to everyone. Encourage existing members to attend at least first portion.

7) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Julie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig, John, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Arlene, Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Susan’s Announcements
1) Kenton has updated Grid
   a) Final New Spec Template
   b) User Guide
2) KCRA Release 1.0 is out and Test Drive is available
   a) We can see UI for proposal / budget
   b) This is the module that will feed ours

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared to review and approve the following definitions: Proposed Total Cost, Property Report
   a) Next week

2) Mock Updates to be Requested:
   Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
   a) None

3) New Specifications for Review:
   KRA_AWD-Sub-Contracts – Tara
   a) 1.5 Terms- Just list Sub-Contract – in this spec means the same as sub-award, sub-grant.
      Insert note in spec: Sub-contract aka sub-award, aka sub-grant, etc.
   b) 3.1-Fed Business Rules- ok to refer to “subaward” as this section is paraphrasing OMB A-110, which uses the term subaward.
   c) Institutional Special Cases- Leave as is. No parameter issue.
   d) 4.6 Use Cases
      i) Should these be combined (at least some of them)? Susan may be able to get Kenton’s input.
      ii) Avoid sub-contract “tab” – be more general in regard to UI. Can use navigates to sub-contract screen.
      iii) Need to list alternate course or exception for an organization not being listed in the rolodex
   e) Error message for duplicate Organization
      i) System generates error message, not allowing user to save when there is a duplicate entry and User deletes second entry
      ii) If user deletes 1st entry for duplicate organization (or both entries), this error does not occur and user is able to save
      iii) Tara to test in both instances of Coeus. We may need to email Rosemary and ask if still happens. Also can check perfect tracker for bugs, etc.
      iv) May want to be able to enter duplicates.
         (1) Cornell, same prime award, multiple sub-c to same organization, may need to enter duplicate organizations.
v) MSU- 2 sub-contracts w/ 2 different colleges or dept at same institution.
vi) Need to ask Coeus what logic is behind this. Some institutions issue new sub-c for each year of the prime, with a changing sub-c number. Is it possible to have same organization in different sequence numbers of same award?
f) Discussion of possible warning for zero and negative dollar amounts. These are allowed w/ no warning in Coeus. Will revisit later. Need to conserve legacy data.

4) New Enhancement Requests for Review:
AW-16 Populate OSP Contacts Parameter – Susan
a) Any suggestions
b) Shows OSP contact(s) based on lead unit or sponsor (currently only one OSP Contact shown)
c) Susan to follow-up with Kenton, he said there is some parameter info out there
d) Chris- Are we also planning to have option to override the 2 parameter settings.
   Someone in the office may cover some odd award for some reason, when the award normally assigned to someone else. This is current functionality. No need to add to enhancement request.
e) Susan will post to Jira for DM critique

?AW-17 Payment Schedule Generation – Tracey & Arlene
a) Nothing yet posted
b) Per Arlene, Tracey hopes to post Monday (Tracey absent today)
c) Please post what is done even if not complete, so we can start addressing questions as a group

5) Spec Issue Updates:
KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel – Chris – finalized & Jira posted?
a) Updated version posted. Should be ready for finalization.
KRA_AWD-Payment – Tracey & Arlene
b) Hopefully to be posted Monday
KRA_AWD-Reports – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
KRA_AWD-Terms – Discuss Fed Bus Rules (Julie) & DD (Diane)
c) Delayed to Next week
Data Dictionary F&A Rate – Diane
d) General Data Dictionary /Coeus info.
i) Coeus wiki – Coeus Data Dictionary
  ii) Log-in w/ full email address and assigned password – same as Coeus wiki, perfect tracker log-in and ID
  iii) Data Dictionary is under Documentation section in Wiki
      (1) Displayed in 3 sections, may be useful to combine into one excel sheet
      (2) Number is parentheses (precision, scale----number of digits, number of digits after decimal)
      (3) Not null – required?? – basically means something has to be filled in, can’t be blank
e) Diane Absent-more detail review delayed to next week
KRA_AWD-Complete the F&A Rate Panel – Renee
KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel – Diane, new template
KRA_AWD-Contacts – Susan
f) Not complete, does have questions for group discussion
  i) No federal business rules come to mind
  ii) Unit contacts - may be something to add
iii) Coeus does not bring forward key personnel- not an item in institute proposal. This would be an enhancement request.

iv) Coeus uses indicator boxes PI (box) Multi PI(box) Faculty (box) (what is faculty box used for-unclear on why it is there?) Do we need faculty box displayed?

v) We gave up percent effort info on main display screen in order to get quick view of contact info. Discussion of show details buttons to get percent effort info. Will this show on the budget? We don’t know.

vi) Does anyone not require approval for change in PI and Co-I? No. Will go with assumption that always required.

vii) Combined credit split? Does anyone not require approval for this?
   1) We assume this is handled on paper outside of Coeus – may be a question for Rosemary. It is not Coeus functionality to handle this in workflow/routing.
   2) Anyone who would not want routing to be used for credit split changes – do we need to parameterize? Existing Coeus institutions may not want to route.
   3) May need separate routing map for this vs. routing map for entire award.

KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel – Susan posted Jira for review?
KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel – Renee
KRA_AWD-Create an Award – Susan

6) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
KRA_AWD-Notes – Julie, new template – post by 7/28/08 for review 7/30/08
?
AW-18 Source_Destination_Required Parameter – Renee
   a) Will this be one or two requests?
   b) Would anyone require one and not the other? Example, Source required but not Destination, or vice versa? Probably would not make much difference for time/cost for developers.
   a) We will go with 2 separate (but very similar) enhancement requests.

1) Questions and Roll Call
   a) Princeton Budget – Does Renee have status?
      Last time she checked it wasn’t fixed and she has not heard back from Coeus help desk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Tara, Julie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Craig, John, Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler, Kris (taking notes for Diane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Arlene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Keith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.

2) Mock Updates to be Requested:
   Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
   a) No updates to be requested today
   b) As you write your specs and see how the mocks should change, email Susan and let her know
   c) Otherwise, Susan is just going to pick a panel a week (or so) and make changes

3) Outstanding Issues:
   a) We haven’t been meeting our goals and this needs to change. Need to update the grid
   b) Time and Money Budget Versions
      i) Renee will let Susan know how long its going to take
   c) Complete the Cost Share
      i) Is posted
   d) Contacts Spec
      i) Heather will have done by 5/16
   e) Closeout Panel
      i) When can it be done?
      ii) Chris says it can be done by 5/16
   f) Pam is willing to take a spec
      i) Heather’s have been reassigned
      ii) Renee will probably need help from someone
      iii) So Pam will take Special Rate Functionality
   g) Subcontracts
      i) Probably won’t be completed until July
      ii) So someone else needs to do it
      iii) Tara from Arizona will do it
      iv) Subcontracts may link to another module
   h) Cancel the next two meetings
      i) Kuali Days
      ii) Then Face to Face Testing
      iii) Anyone want to meet during that time?
         (1) If we cancel two meetings in a row, we better have some output!
         (2) If someone wants to get together and show Susan specs or go over things, she can
              be available during that time
         (3) MSU has no one doing testing
(4) So that meeting time can be used for a spec workshop

KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Julie
a) Still trying to finalize screen shots
b) Will be starting on the new spec template
c) Question: should we update the notes panel to be called note pad?
   i) Decided some time ago that KRA would use Notes not notepad
d) Issues have been resolved
e) Will do one final review of screen shots
f) Will have it by the end of tomorrow in the old spec
g) Has started in the new spec
h) Post it with the old spec and make it available to people for review
   i) Putting it into the new template will bring out a lot of holes on its own
   j) If anyone has comments, send to Julie
   k) Everything’s pretty much been updated, just needs a final look over
   l) This old spec is final
m) Julie will start plugging into the new spec

KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam
a) When MSU tested the Foreign Travel panel, they chose a person from the “Find Person”
   lookup, entered travel info and saved. In going back in, the person name changed to PI
   name.
   i) Email:
   ii) help@coeus.org
   iii) They’ll help deal with it
b) So the spec needs to be updated and than can be considered final
c) Can be updated in the next couple of days
d) Yea!

KRA_AWD-Person Lookup (Shared) – Susan (see Email to Awards SME)

a) Currently includes all possible choices
b) Criteria
   i) Person id, Last name, first name, user name, email, home unit, unit name, directory
      title, faculty, research staff, grad student staff (checkboxes,) office location, office
      phone, school, active indicator
   ii) Skipped
      (1) 2nd address, cell phone, commons user name and many more
   iii) What does school mean?
      (1) Not sure but it would cause confusion
      (2) In Coeus, it actually has the institution’s name
iv) Add in mobile phone number?
c) Results
   i) Person ID, Full name, user name, email, office location, office phone, school, home
      unit, directory title, active indicator
d) What does school mean?

KRA_AWD-Organization Lookup (Shared) – Susan (see Email to Awards SME)

a) MSU – no need for the other stuff
   i) As long as we can get the rest of the info in a drill down
b) We really need Coeus user input
c) It seems like people are trying to use the system to collect data and do data mining
   i) But that’s not the purpose of KRA
   ii) Why do people insist on using it that way?
d) Proposal group would like congressional district but wouldn’t throw a huge fit if it were gone

e) We can look at the details but once we do, we do limit the way searches are performed

f) If the devs can have it go to the top of search results list after doing a search, it doesn’t matter how many lookup criteria we use

g) So maybe we should limit the return columns to what is most usable by everyone but make as much as we can searchable

h) Susan will run this by Terry and see what he says and also Coeus help
   i) See why the decision was made to include so many
   ii) We may be restricting Coeus functionality a lot because the design isn’t very good

i) From results, cut F&A Rate Agreement Date and Cage Code
   i) They will be available in the drill down

j) Add human subjects

KRA_AWD-Sponsor Lookup (Shared) – Susan (see Email to Awards SME)

a) Should we skip discussion of lookup criteria and go straight to results?

b) Search criteria is ok as it is per MSU

c) Results

   i) Did we talk about having Code and Sponsor name all in one field
   ii) So we don’t have the choice of concatenating fields

d) We for results

   i) We have Sponsor Code, Acronym (if we have room), Sponsor Name, Sponsor Type (can go in the drill down instead of here), State, Country Code, DUNS Number, DODAC, CAGE Code, Owned by Unit

   1) Can we cut Owned by Unit

     a) Once it is used – it all goes to the same anyway

   2) Get rid of Dodac and Cage Code too

   3) Get rid of country and keep state

   4) Keep Sponsor Type if there’s space

   5) DODCA and Cage Code keep if there’s space

   6) See sponsor type, not sponsor type code

   ii) That’s it!

KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) – Renee

a) Emailed Coeus help on the account validation

   i) They do not validate anything

   ii) Only validate that the source and destination are different

   iii) They have no linkage set up between Coeus and their other system

   iv) This has to do with the enhancement request

   v) Is this an enhancement worth pursuing?

     1) If they choose to take KFS as a package

     2) If they have KRA but not KFS, how would KRA write it so that it would validate the other system

   vi) Peter – issue that integration team is worried about

     1) There should be advantages to schools that implement both KRA and KFS but not in a way that makes things un-operational for schools without KFS

     2) Deal with it by parameterizing it

     3) Talk amongst ourselves to see if it’s worth the enhancement request

     4) We’ll come back and talk about it later

     5) Last item in this spec

KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris

KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron

KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Heather, new template, no update this week
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KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) – Josh, new template, no update this week
KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – Tracey & Arlene, new template no update this week

On Hold:
KRA-08 Enhancement – Advance Account – related to KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel spec (Awards) – Tracey (on hold for FC review of KRA-08)

4) **New Functional Specifications for Review:**
   KRA_AWD-Complete the FA Rate Panel (Awards) - Renee

5) **Goals/Information for upcoming meetings**

   **Upcoming Spec Due Dates:**
   - KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
   - KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards) – Susan, Due 5/16/08
   - KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
   - KRA_AWD-Budget Overview Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
   - KRA_AWD-Complete the Sub-Awards Panel (Awards) – Julie, Due 03/21/08
   - KRA-_ _ - Cost Share Requirement Met? (Awards) – Pam/Renee
   - KRA-_ _ - Cost Share Source/Destination Validation (Awards) – Pam
     a) Not written yet
     b) Have it within the next two weeks
   - KRA-_ _ - Payment Schedule Generation (Awards) – Josh

6) **Questions and Roll Call**

   a) Roster List – updates
      i) Becky Eckert’s phone number should be changed
         (1) 970-491-1554
      ii) Bill Payne’s phone
         (1) 607-255-0750
      iii) Pam Plotkin’s phone
         (1) 607-254-8329
   b) Needed because Kenton is going to do an orientation for new members
   c) Download Heather’s Create an Award Spec (she will post it as an update today) and take out her stuff so that you have the updated instructions
      i) Kenton is expecting to have the instructions fully done by Friday
   d) Heather will post the data dictionary template page
      i) When you're writing, download the data dictionary
      ii) Use a blank tab and just copy and paste the template to it
      iii) Fill it out for all terms for your spec and then email it to the person maintaining the data dictionary
   e) Next week and the following week – have a meeting?
      i) Will be missing 4 people
      ii) So still have the meeting on the 21st?
      iii) Yes lets meet
      iv) Ask that everyone who has a new spec assignment give the new template a try and if nothing else bring questions about the spec template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Tyler, Pam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Bill Payne, Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey, Tina Noonan, Josh Cummins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Laura, Renee, Craig, Peter, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Tara, Julie, Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>No one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

KRA_AWD – Create New Award (should be posted in Confluence by 5pm MST Tuesday, 4/29/08)
   a) Layout and such is finished but Instructions are not finished
   b) Very first thing about the new template – reason we’ve done this
      i) First problem
         (1) Requirements are the foundation of any project
         (2) If you don’t know what you’re going to build, you can’t do it well
         (3) You don’t what’s going to happen later
         (4) So you need to try to anticipate as much as possible up front
         (5) We’re in the process of building something and if you start before you know what you’re
             wanting to build, you’re going to end up with strange things
         (6) So it’s good to have an architect to give you feedback about what you’re doing and can help
             make sure you end up with what you want
         (7) Over time it becomes harder and harder to manage change (look at Microsoft!)
         (8) So we’re looking long term and a small step to get there is making sure that our requirements
             are individually identifiable so when we do change something, we know what we’re changing
   c) So we want strong foundation and want project management
   d) A lot of issues will come up
   e) There is a natural flow
      i) Primary purpose is copying Coeus
      ii) Start with something small and it explodes into many fascinating things!
   f) Requirements
      i) Business rules – compliance
         (1) Very inconsistent between groups so part of template goals are to define this
         (2) Also to show the natural flow
         (3) Increasing detail – starting at the high level:
            (a) Business Rule – Compliance
               (i) High level things that require you, the user to do things
                  1. It could be federal law, intsititutional policy, a regulatory agency rule
                  2. Anything that says, this shall be done, but doesn’t specify how it has to be done, just that it has to be done to comply
                     a. These spawn the requirements
                     b. So if you have a rule that you must have an internal audit once a year, you
                        suddenly have a rule that you must follow – so that’s the high level but then it flows down into details
            (b) Business Requirements (objectives)
               (i) Why are we doing this? What do we want to achieve
                  1. So to go along with the rule, we should make it easier for the user to deal with
            (c) User requirements
               (i) What the user wants to do with the system
(ii) This is the user wish list – what you want the system to do for you
(iii) Track which proposals are used for which award, use it to write reports… those are
user requirements – the “Give me this stuff please”

(d) Functional Requirements
(i) What must be built to satisfy the user requirement
(ii) So we know what we want, this is where you state what must be built to make that
happen
(iii) What are the devs (software people) going to have to do to make this work for us
(iv) Don’t get bogged down in the how – all the tech details – all we have to say is what
we want the system to do, not how we want to do it

(e) Design Requirements
(i) Interface
(ii) Technical
(iii) This is some of the how

(4) It may sound linear but it’s not quite so easy to make a statement about functional
requirements without considering design and often as we look at these, we can get mixed up
and we go backwards and forwards until we come up with what we want

(5) But once we do that, we come up with a natural progression from very general to detailed and
we can move forward from that

(6) So we’re copying another system: Coeus
(a) Has advantages
(i) Already have a huge wealth of experience to go on
(ii) People have worked out a ton of detail
(b) Disadvantages (for spec writer)
(i) Tendency is to dive into implementation
1. How it’s done
(ii) Instead of what the user needs

(g) Template also tries to address readability
(i) It’s one of the key criteria for a good requirements documentation
(ii) It’s readable to someone who is not necessarily an expert
(1) Experts easily take things for granted that someone who is not experienced will not
(2) So it’s up to us to describe this unambiguously and easily

(h) Traceability
(i) The fact that a requirement has an impact all the way through the project
(1) So you could draw a picture and connect some business rule to user requirement(s) to
functional requirement(s) to design requirement(s) – it’s a flow down
(ii) At Design – we may have hit a juncture where we have some development and screen mocks
(iii) We need to be able to say everything can be tested so we can prove that when we’re done, it can
be tested on
(iv) Required by Devs, by QA, by documentation folks to say what the application does

(i) We’ve discussed long term goals, natural flows, readability, traceability
(j) Final thing – provide better instructions around requirements so that maybe more people will
understand and feel comfortable
(i) Note – instructions are not completed yet

(k) Kenton will be doing one on one training sessions and will offer office hours for more one on one
reviews

(2) Questions
(3) The Spec
a) Format
(i) There’s a full set of styles
(1) All text used named styles
(a) Requires just a tiny bit of knowledge of word
(b) Look has improved, making it more readable
(c) Use document map
b) 1. Introduction
(i) 1.1 Purpose
1. High level synopsis
2. Functional description equivalent

1.2 Review
   (1) Who will be reviewing it (major reviewers)

1.3 Document Revision History
   (1) Different that the old template
   (2) We only want to document major changes
   (3) If you have minor changes – it can be listed at the very bottom (to track changes between versions)
   (4) So version 1.0 should be the first SME final

1.4 References
   (1) Anything you’ve used – documents, websites…

1.5 Terms and Definitions
   (1) Just list terms, don’t have definitions here – stored in Data Dictionary

2. Business Objective
   (1) You may not use this in individual work
      (a) We’re not doing this very much even in cases in KRA now because we didn’t take these into account

2.1 Federal
   (a) Write them down or we’re likely to miss them
   (b) You can reference where they come from (if they are federal regulations… link to websites..)
   (c) Don’t have to be too much detail here – is there to remind everyone that there may be things that we need to revisit, rethink

3. Business Rules
   (1) 3.1 Federal
      (a) Write them down or we’re likely to miss them
      (b) You can reference where they come from (if they are federal regulations… link to websites..)
   (2) 3.2 Institutional Special Cases
      (a) To put anything that is institution specific

4. User requirements section is where you spend a lot of time
   (1) 4.1 Narrative Overview – also similar to document purpose – may need to specify what is needed there (Kenton will do some work)
      (1) Not required – depends on your needs
   (2) 4.2 Important concepts and Background
      (1) Closely related to Narrative
      (2) Things to highlight and things to keep in mind as you read the rest of the document
      (3) Provide key information about what it means to link to a proposal and why you do that
      (4) Your story of your work, what you do
   (3) 4.3 User Classes and Roles
      (1) Before we really try to get into it, we need to know whose story we’re telling
      (2) This lists our actors – who will interact with the system – actors
      (3) This is very important not to lose track of as you write user requirements
      (4) It’s easy to be blinded by our own specialties and forget other groups
      (5) We don’t always have these groups represented in our group
      (6) Important to know who you’re writing requirements for and when you start talking about functionality and you start asking questions for each of these groups, what does the functionality mean to them – keep them front and center in your mind
   (4) 4.4 User Requirements
      (1) For every requirement you have a short name (which will be used later to create a short ID)
         (a) Used to make sure that as we go through QA and such that we can make sure we’ve tested for those and assure that requirement has been met
         (b) Create a scenario or test to agree that the requirement has been met
      (2) These are short statements – usually no hierarchy (no sub-levels)
         (a) Unlike functional requirements
      (3) One level deep
      (4) Then use it to make a wish list – what would it look like if we had a system to explore
   (5) 4.5 Index to Use Case
      (1) Build off 4.4 to figure out use cases
(a) We have Coeus to go off of
   (i) But we’re not following it blindly
   (ii) We have a different interface
   (iii) Things in Coeus need to be changed
(2) So what we want to do here is explore these out further
(3) We may have too many user requirements – should be a one to one between the User Requirements to Use Case Index – may also have it so that you have more requirements than cases and that’s ok too – you may look to see if you can combine some things.. but it’s an explosion of info in requirements, tapered down in use cases
(4) So the Use case index tells you what’s coming so you know what’s coming next
(5) Also a way to explore – as you’re writing your wishlist, you fill it out and note here are the use cases that I’m going to need to develop
vi) 4.6 Use cases
   (1) How the user interacts with the system – how’s that going to look
   (2) It was called the main success scenario in the old template
       (a) Also known as the Happy Path!
   (3) So you have the main flow
       (a) And then listed under it is the Alternate flows
           (i) The different paths that you can take
   (4) Main difference is that you don’t inter-lead the main success scenario with the alternates
   (5) Here we also make it quite clear what the exceptions are
   (6) Also have some post conditions
   (7) Questions?
       (a) Stunned silence
   (8) So we have this so what do we tell the developer that we want… these go into functional requirements
f) 5. Functional requirements
   i) Some duplication
      (1) We want to say here what we want the system to do
          (a) Not HOW!
      (2) Just say what we want the system to do
      (3) You can have hierarchical
          (a) These are atomic
              (b) If you start writing and or starting a new sentence, you need to stop and ask yourself if it should be a sub thing
  
g) 6. Data Dictionary
   i) 6.1 Grouping and Sort Order
      (1) The data dictionary
          (a) Lists defining attributes
              (i) Has some predefined lists – use drop down menus as they’re available
          (b) Can’t be sorted
          (c) Hopefully will be put on line in some iteration to allow sorting
          (d) But you can search for things in Excel
          (e) You want to maintain things in one place – so there is a field that has a “Where it’s used” field – requires some overhead in that if you change the name of spec, you’ll have to come and update the list
h) 7. User Interface Design
   i) State more accurate what you want things to be
   ii) 7.1 User Interface Workflow
      (1) Paper napkin designs – give feedback to developers so they know what we have in mind
      (2) When devs do it without our input, they get it wrong
      (3) The functional requirements and all is written without thinking about how it’s going to look
      (4) You may need to have some overlap and do some user interface design before you completely finish the functional requirements – you may need to think about how it will work – you can go back and forth some between the two sections
      (5) We can prepare better by having some sense of what we want
ii) 7.2 Design Requirements
   (1) Make suggestions about colors and stuff
   (2) Leave yourself room to make suggestions
   (3) Requirements are much more firm and formal – provide guidelines for the mock group to
       make the process more efficient
   (4) But feel free to make suggestions outside the box

i) 8. User Documentation
   i) Things here that may not be obvious that you want to note here
   ii) Things not obvious from the above spec

j) 9. Differences from Coeus

k) 10. Design and Implementation notes
   i) More for the technical people
      (1) May list… we can’t do such and such because…

l) Issues list, Document change list, Instruction Guide come at the end

m) Changes will still be made

n) Heather likes the new template – is easier to use, allows for it to be more thorough

o) Susan loooves the data dictionary
   i) Needs to have the lists worked out
   ii) But it requires us to know a lot less – easier to do a multiple choice than to write essays

p) Data dictionary – terms listed from the terms and definition belong in glossary
   i) There is also Data Dictionary section (6)
      (1) This will probably have duplication between the two (and probably should)
      (2) Reserve the glossary for items that are necessary
      (3) So Kenton will add another table under 6.1 for terms that are listed in the Data Dictionary
         a) Action. Note – may have conditionally required fields
         b) But the data dictionary provides more info
            (i) Help text – text to help the user
            (ii) Values, etc.
         c) The instructions should be updated
      (4) The data dictionary will work like the glossary – we will only have one person maintaining it.
         a) The spec will only list the terms
         b) The spec writer can keep a copy of the template of the data dictionary and update it on
            the side then send it to the keeper of the data dictionary to maintain
      (5) With instructions, we’re about a day of solid writing plus review and editing and maybe two
          or three days out – but Kenton is short on time
      (6) Hope is that the template will be up soon
      (7) We need to have some more organization
      (8) Since we’re looking more top down and looking at they why and what users wanted, because
          we’re doing that, it does take a little more time that might have been put into Coeus working
          from the bottom up
      (9) Overall this will be better
      (10) Kenton will walk through things with us
      (11) Read it please

q) No more questions so that’s it from Kenton

r) Are we going to convert existing specs to the new template
   i) Not blanket wise – not going to convert everything
      ii) On a case by case basis, when it goes to LBA review, or if you feel like you’ve got holes in your
          spec, you can convert your specs to the new one
      iii) Julie has written the notes spec in the old template and is using it as a basis for learning the new
          template and see how they compare – so no verdict on that yet
      iv) So no – as a rule, we’re not redoing everything
      v) Unless the group, author, or LBA see a need

s) Just got word in the functional council meeting that devs in the next couple of weeks will start
   reviewing release 2 finals
   i) They’ll tell us if we’re giving enough detail and if we’re meeting their needs

t) Any other questions?
i) Pam likes it design wise – much easier to follow with the spec this way in the way it’s laid out
   (1) Particularly as they do the use cases
   (2) More logical

ii) Susan still has reservations
   (1) Heather started out writing details and dates spec
   (2) But it ended up being Create an Award spec
   (3) We’ve done it geographically
   (4) So we may have to re-evaluate how specs are assigned
   (5) We’re not sure how things should be broken up
   (6) So we’ll see how it pans out
   (7) But until we run into a problem, we don’t really know what solutions to use
   (8) Hopefully Kenton will give us a little more guidance
   (9) As mentioned we do need to do some polishing still before it’s ready for use by everyone
   (10) Heather has other specs and Julie is working on one to test the template before it goes out

iii) How do you know where to put things
   (1) There is a lot of duplication so you have the same thing but from a different angle – from user
       perspective, from system perspective, etc.
       (a) Cut and paste!

iv) Extra features
   (1) At the bottom – there’s table templates and callout icons
   (2) There are also set Styles to allow for consistency

v) More stunned silence

4) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   a) Foreign Travel
      i) Tracey will write something up – stating what the general definition is but that an
         institution/sponsor may have a different definition

5) Mock Updates to be Requested:
   Bring up in the meeting (or email Susan) any updates that need to be made to the Awards Mock screens.
   a) Done awards tab, proposal info panel and details and dates
   b) So if you want to know what Susan told the Devs, its on Confluence under KRA changes from SME
      groups
   c) Trying to do at least one panel a week so we can get the changes on the road

6) Awards SME Roster Update
   Email Susan contact info. (name, institution, email, phone) for any new Awards SME members ASAP.
   a) Do it!

7) Outstanding Issues:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam
   KRA_AWD-Person Lookup (Shared) – Susan (see Email to Awards SME)
   a) Get input to Susan asap!
   KRA_AWD-Organization Lookup (Shared) – Susan (see Email to Awards SME)
   KRA_AWD-Sponsor Lookup (Shared) – Susan (see Email to Awards SME)
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) – Renee
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Julie, no update this week

   On Hold:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Heather, new template
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) – Heather, new template
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – assign to IU?, add general payment info.
8) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings

Upcoming Spec Due Dates:
KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards) – Susan, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
KRA_AWD-Budget Overview Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Complete the Sub-Awards Panel (Awards) – Julie, Due 03/21/08
KRA_-_ - Cost Share Requirement Met? (Awards) – Pam/Renee
KRA_-_ - Cost Share Source/Destination Validation (Awards) – Pam
KRA_-_ - Payment Schedule Generation (Awards) – Volunteer to take over for Tyler?

a) Due dates
   i) What is a realistic expectation for achieving due dates
   ii) Either tell Susan now or email her ASAP!!
   iii) Action Item: Email Susan if you have a past due date or an ASAP due date
        (1) Send email to Susan by next Tuesday
        (2) Need volunteers from schools who are getting additional resources
        (a) Any new participants – need name, email, and phone emailed to Susan so the roster for our group can be updated?

b) Reassignment
   i) Tyler is overwhelmed – need to reassign his
   ii) Heather is moving – need to reassign hers

9) Questions and Roll Call

a) Susan went to Coeus help and asked if it would be ok to get rid of vendor code from search lookup for org.
b) Also to see if we could get rid of procurement priority code – trying to get feedback from users first
c) Also asked MIT questions – trying to get user input
d) Also pursuing with Kenton’s help getting user input from UCSD – not sure yet how UCD will be able to participate at the meeting level
e) In light of the validation issue associated with Foreign travel – would the same apply to the cost share source/validation on the cost share panel
   i) Does it need to remain an enhancement or can it be handled the same way the travel is being handled
   ii) Coeus right now only confirms that the source and destination accounts are valid accounts
   iii) So is the question – whether it would be appropriate for it to go further so KRA could have the ability to allow it to reach into KFS account numbers and check to see if they are valid, open, active account numbers – so is that going too far and crossing the bounds of validation in KRA itself and is that an enhancement?
(1) Whoever’s writing cost share spec needs to do checking
   (a) Coeus checks to make sure it’s a valid account number – don’t know if that’s to see if it’s in the possible range – don’t know if it checks to see if it’s open and active – may need to ask Coeus help
   (b) Anything more than what Coeus specifically does would be an enhancement
   (c) So we think this would be an enhancement
(2) Foreign travel – brief comment under questions and issues
(a) We had gotten some info that said that based on the validation and business rules in Coeus that this was something we could pursue
(b) If each institution can customize terms, then how do we handle this validation item? How is it going to be able to search through the list and determine whether foreign travel is allowed or not
(c) You would either have to write custom business rules or approach from a more broad perspective – if you have approved foreign travel that you get a warning message that you need to check with the travel terms and that once you hit ok, the system will pop you back to the travel terms section
(d) So Pam did a warning message – will edit the message
(e) The system won’t be able to read the institutionally defined travel terms – so the warning will be more broad and just make you look at those terms
(f) Something should remind the user of that link – just can’t accomplish it at the level we were hoping initially
(g) Keep the comments coming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cornell</th>
<th>Pam, Bill, Chris, Kenton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Laura, Peter, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Arlene, Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Julie, Heather, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Tyler, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bill from Cornell is a new member
Arlene from IU is a new member
Diane from CSU is interested in the reports part so she’s sitting in and learning and she may become a part of the group but isn’t as of today
IU will have some more new members to come in the next couple of weeks (Tracey will send the info on to Susan)
Kuali Research Administration Awards Subcommittee Minutes

KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   a)

2) Outstanding Issues:
   a) We’re going to have an outstanding issue to have mock update requests
      i) So that the mocks look like they should
   b) Proposal and Budget
      i) Have reviewed Sponsor and Organization specs
      ii) They didn’t confirm where in their module the look up is to be accessed
      iii) Lookup Criteria
          (1) Copied from Coeus
          (2) With all possible choices
          (3) They thought this was our opinion so they didn’t take anything out but they requested that there be a duns number searchable field
          (4) Having ones in there that we don’t use only becomes a problem when we run out of space
          (5) So shorting the list gives us a shorter search list… but makes it less flexible on how you can search
          (6) Duns number is important
          (7) What about org of list when it comes up?
             (a) Susan’s list is how Coeus is listed – changes?
                (i) Name first?
                (ii) Address
                (iii) Contact Address
                (iv) Id (rolodex number?)
                (v) Ask around
                (vi) If we make changes, will it impact proposal?
                   1. Yes
                   (b) They didn’t change the order
                   (c) Doesn’t Coeus usually put everything in alphabetical order except maybe not the top two fields?
                   (d) Leave org name, ID, Fed ID? (indifferent), Duns (Duns + 4 or just Duns?)
                   (e) Putting the select button on the right, not the left?
                      (i) Good reason to stay within the width of a page
              (8) Any changes to the results list?
(9) First thing if you have an active indicator but the results should be at the top? Because if they’re not active

(10) On coeus, you have the option of searching on each of these fields

(11) Test.kuali.org/kra-reg/portal.jsp
(a) Current reg environment – list isn’t long but it’s not the same list as Coeus
(b) We don’t have acronym on our list
(c) Several search fields shown (in ABC order except for first one or two) on kuali test site – more than what is shown on our list. Active not even on list.
(d) When results are returned you can sort by column heading either ascending or descending.
(e) Cannot do a secondary sort- can only sort by one column at a time.
(f) Why is there so much stuff as result of search? Also a lot of blank space in certain fields.

(12) Task at hand is to come up with our list. What fields, in what order, etc.
(a) We should make more user friendly.
(i) Don’t have a prob with org id before name
(ii) Anyone need to see it?
(iii)Going to show the screen with the results list again
(iv)Write down – looking for concrete lists
(v) Possible fields – what order and which fields
   1. Acronym? Do we want that?
   2. What is agency symbol?
      a. Don’t know
   3. Sponsor lookup has acronym
   4. Definitely:
      a. Org ID
      b. Org Name
      c. Address
      d. Duns No
      e. Duns + 4
   5. Cage/Dodac?
      a. Does anyone use them?
         i. Part of the registration process for the registration processes
         ii. Does it need to include all fields? Put them in order of priority
              – further ones would be available by opening up the record
   6. MSU suggestion: get a short fixed return and then get a spot to access more data – this is what we’re trying to do
   7. You can click on address links – it would be more useful to have a contract address instead of just a contact id
   8. This is taking too long – come back with a list or send your list to Susan offline.
      a. If no input, Susan will just make decisions

(c) Sponsor lookup
   i) Primary key seems to be listed first in both Coeus and KRA
      (1) Code, acronym, name, (mock indicates that sponsor type code, state, country code, zip code, rolodex id, create user, active indicator) so any additions or columns that should be removed?
      (2) See the sponsor lookup in reg
         (a) Is alphabetical
(b) Owned by unit – which unit in the user hierarchy created and so owns the entry – in Coeus, if it’s created, it gets reverted to being owned by the Coeus admins after it has been used once
  (i) So if the creator still has questions, they can be addressed
(c) They have both type and description
  (i) So sponsor type code could go away
  (ii) Could we not show the DODAC in results?
(d) KFS limited theirs to 8 plus the action
  (i) Have description instead of code for agency type
  (ii) Included roll-up in hierarchy
  (iii) Have active indicator
  (iv) Search criteria list is really short
(e) So do we want to look the spec and email to Susan or bring next week?
  (i) Do it!

(d) Everyone knows where to find these?
  i) Confluence, Look up and Maintenance docs, Obvious from there

(e) Person lookup
  i) New spec – just give a brief intro or just read/interpret on your own?
    (1) Take a quick intro
      (a) Different approach
      (b) Listed all possible fields
      (c) Highlighted ones that should be searchable
      (d) Then screenshot showing source of information
  ii) Questions and issues – be great if KRA turned user to the top of the search results instead of to the top of the search criteria
  iii) Error messages
    (1) Place holder – KRA says something different that Coeus
    (2) Someone should compare that at some point – check spelling and are informative and stuff
  iv) We may want a multi-select in this spec – so you can choose more than one person

KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris

f) Had trouble with Coeus in relation to institute proposal
g) How detailed do we want to get with terms and definitions
h) Are we being consistent if need be?
i) Add terms and definitions section
j) Was the spreadsheet used? Thought terms were used that were for the new proposed version

k) Susan started sending Laura mock updates starting with this one
l) Lead Unit, Proposal, sponsor – are in the glossary but not approved by us
m) End date and start date – are in the glossary but not really how its being used in this panel
n) Scrolling over field names should give a clue to what’s really going but need to be specific

Test.kuali.org/confluence/display/KRACOEUS/KRA+UI+Changes

p) Changes to different thing
  i) Changes to funding proposal details
  ii) Hopefully the developers will make some of our suggested changes to the mocks

q) Glossary
  i) Define total costs
  ii) Specify what kind of start and end date
(1) IU group may change how they state the labels
   iii) Chris will send any others that need to be added to Tracey
r) That’s it for today until institute proposal can be added
KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) – Renee
a) Enhancement request to Susan
b) Susan will post it
c) It has the two fields thing now
d) Think it’s done so it’ll be posted so we can all see it
e) Cost share type
   i) Renee will make an executive decision
KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam
a) Absent
KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron
b) Absent
KRA_AWD-Person Lookup (Shared) – Susan
c) Already discussed – see above
d) Send lists otherwise Susan will just make a decision
KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Julie, no update this week

On Hold:
KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Heather, new template
KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) – Heather, new template
KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – assign to IU?, add general payment info.
KRA-08 Enhancement – Advance Account – related to KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel spec (Awards) – Tracey (on hold for FC review of KRA-08)

3) New Functional Specifications for Review:

4) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings

Upcoming Spec Due Dates:
KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards) – Susan, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
KRA_AWD-Budget Overview Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Complete the Sub-Awards Panel (Awards) – Julie, Due 03/21/08
KRA_-_- - Cost Share Requirement Met? (Awards) – Pam/Renee
KRA_-_- - Cost Share Source/Destination Validation (Awards) – Pam
KRA_-_- - Payment Schedule Generation (Awards) - Tyler

5) Questions and Roll Call
   a) Next week we should be introducing the spec template
   b) We should have an entire set of data and context to look at the template with
   c) Questions?
      i) Do you want more talking time?
   d) Glossary
      i) Foreign travel and sponsor template – decide if we’re ready to approve or not
         (1) Add in Mexico
         (2) Tracey will double check too
      ii) Foreign travel – looking to see if Mexico is foreign or not (since Canada isn’t)
         iii) Susan did ask about the ability to validate foreign travel allowability to the terms associated with foreign travel but no response as of yet.
iv) Sponsor template – preset standard terms and conditions that apply to an award from a specific sponsor
   (1) It could be sponsor award program
   (2) Go with:
      (a) Standard terms and conditions associated with a specific sponsor award program
   (3) Destination account – any new input?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Ron, Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Renee, Peter, Laura, John Maturo (visitor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey, Arlene Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Julie, Susan, Tara, Heather</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC Davis may join us (they are Coeus users)
Contact Marissa to see if anyone at Brown could do it?
1) Award Reporting Requirements Update - Release 2 or 3?
   a) Scope doc re-write – the email Susan sent out
   b) Status of award tracking?
      i) Further discussion next week
      ii) Other groups still need to work on their sections
      iii) Phil McKown's initial response was that if it is part of the awards module we should
           list it as part of release 2 but if there’s functionality that can’t be done yet based on
           resources, we could defer
      iv) This is clearly something that can be deferred for a while
   c) Susan made a new list of things to do
      i) List is in Oncourse
      ii) Blue levels are new
      iii) Item sent in email is the award reporting requirements
      iv) We’ve claimed it
      v) We’re making recommendation to FC and then make final decision as to where it
         goes
         (1) Prefer in release 2 but may be release 3
      vi) So the list is stuff that we need to keep in mind as we write our stuff
   d) Limbo items:
      (a) Institute proposal
         (i) Part of proposal or its own module or in KRA
         (ii) Susan argues that it’s own module or result of proposal development
              module
         (iii) So if you have opinions about Susan’s opinion… say so, so we can be
              represented at the FC
      (b) Medusa
         (i) Susan thinks it’s very integral to awards so is willing to claim it but we’ll
             see what happens
   d) Any comments about this topic?
      i) Looks good
      ii) Nothing else to add

2) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as
   time permits.
a) Terms that we could discuss… but it might make more sense to do it after we review these specs

3) Outstanding Issues:
KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Julie did spec re-write
a) Revisions made
b) Functional description
   i) A lot of playing around with notepad feature in Coeus
   ii) Pam – Can we call it notepad?
      (1) Coeus has for 13 years so we’re probably ok
      (2) Its been renamed notes in the mock mocks but that was just an arbitrary decision
      (3) Avoid ambiguity so need to say that you can push the button and view it from anywhere so developers can know that it should be accessible
c) Business rules
   i) Add in character restrictions?
   ii) Length restrictions?
d) Screen shots – still a work in progress
e) Assumptions
   i) Can’t modify/edit it
   ii) Word edit is not correct
   iii) Julie will change – edit is not current functionality
f) Data dictionary Preview
   i) Largely what is now in the labels and definitions
   ii) Multiple choice questions instead of essays
   iii) Provide all tools to adequately describe data element
iv) Data field, Required?, Describes entity/functionality, Data type (what our choices are as non-technical people), Help text prompt (what user will see), Values, format, length (if we don’t know or have no strong opinion, LEAVE THIS BLANK!!), default value, validation, behavior, coeus table/lookup, notes/issues (not a group input issue but like a “I need to double check Coeus first” issue), where it’s used
g) Questions and issues
   i) Some have been archived
   ii) Error messages?
      (1) Nothing in there now but do we want any?
      (2) Pam – if the field can’t be deleted, there shouldn’t be a delete button.. so there isn’t really anything but add – so nothing
      (3) Tyler – to have one that note info can’t be blank if you hit add
         (a) This should be added to the differences to Coeus
         (b) But wait – it is that way in Coeus, it says “enter comments” when you try to add a blank comment
         (c) Can you add a blank note in Coeus?
      (4) Can you make a note in view only?
         (a) No – options not available
         (b) Wait it is working
            (i) So it depends on your rights
            (ii) Julie had view access previously and she couldn’t add a note
            (iii)But Susan can add a note in read view
            (iv)So it has to do with rights of the user, not the view status
      (5) Proposal vs. Award in screen shot
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(a) Toggle back and forth between the two
(b) Is basically the medusa tree
(c) $ means its an award
(d) Not much in the KRA instance
(e) If you highlight $ that means you’re highlighting notes for award
(f) Double paper is the institute proposal
(g) The one below it is kinda weird is the development proposal (it’s funky)
(h) We should describe that icon indicates which e-doc something is related to
(i) Whether or not you’re able to add or view depends on who has the right – look at unit hierarchy maintenance table
   (i) Right was to modify award
   (ii) So modify award role has right to create/modify/view award
   (iii) Viewing notes related to that award is attached to that role and right
(j) So the toggle between proposal and award just changes the order that they appear in – proposal to award or award to proposal
(i) Reference manuals
   1. Perdue
   2. ASU
   3. Dartmouth
   4. Rutgers
   5. Icon cheat sheet on coeus documentation but which? Stuff is scattered a bit
   6. Rhonda tip: if you’re unsure, just google it!
   iii) Mock screen is a basic view
      (1) View notes associated with award e-doc but in Coeus you have medusa style hierarchy tree to click easily and see note pad related to this doc
      (2) So how do we deal with that ability?
      (3) We need to document but developers and UI really have to figure out how its done
      (4) Make a note and move on
   iv) Issue three
      (1) Medusa functionality
      (2) Separate spec doc
      (3) Documented with screen shots but that’s going to be another spec so it’s really just mentioned here
   v) Modify and delete?
      (1) Just a training issue?
      (2) Do we want to have edit options?
      (3) This has been hashed out previously
      (4) Reasons for not allowing deletion
      (5) Proposal development had the discussion already
         (a) They did not want delete function
         (b) Coeus does not have delete function
            (i) They don’t want someone to be able to delete someone else’s note
            (ii) They wanted the record
            (iii) Felt no need for audit-ability and such to delete the notes
   h) Julie is going to do more exploration and make more edits!
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) – Renee, Q&I update after 3/31/08
   i) Posted revised spec
j) Enhancement:
   i) Have as of date for cost sharing
   ii) CSU – don’t always have fringe (if time commitment is committed) post to the cost sharing so even though there’s an account to track it, have to go out to calculate fringe
      (1) Also doesn’t post unrecovered IC
   iii) MSU – same boat – tracked via spreadsheet
      (1) Tack on fringes to certified salary
   iv) MIT has companion accounts for cost sharing
   v) Hierarchy works well as long as all the attributes of companion account is the same as the main account – but if you have any differences (have a child account under a different Co-I) the companion can’t be tied to it
   vi) So state in our reason – that these fields have other uses
   vii) Renee talked to Lisa about it
      (1) A few schools in proposal weren’t happy about how proposal turned out
      (2) So maybe we could do a joint enhancement between sub groups
   viii) So do we want to request the date field?
      (1) Might as well!
      (2) Ask for what you want
   ix) Enhancement number – selected next available number
   x) Enhancement process is pretty unclear
   xi) Susan has to create a Jira for the enhancement request so it may have to be re-numbered

k) Populate drop down for cost share
   i) If we refer to the fact that the choices for the field are in xx table, each school can customize for their own tables
   ii) So what we’re doing is looking at what is best out of the box
   iii) Action item: Schools send recommendations for out of the box drop down items for cost share type

KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – Tyler, add general payment info.
l) Is Indiana going to take this over?
   i) Not sure

m) Waiting to hear from Kenton; maybe too busy

KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather

n) Working on major re-write

KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) – Heather, Q&I update (Awd Rpt Rqmts)
o) Since working on above re-write, no changes to this

KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris

p) New spec uploaded today – no other input received except Renee

q) Update from meeting and Renee’s comment
   i) Issues – should it stay active so the developers can be aware of them?
   ii) Referring to need to have mocks updated?
      (1) Do a drawing or picture of how the mocks should be changed
      (2) Our mock test.kulai.org/mocks/kra-coeus-awards-MR/aw-awards.html
      (3) We need to tell them what’s wrong with this – itemize, draw a picture, whatever
      (4) Do we want to be able to sync on this tab to have a specific proposal override what’s already there based, is there a way to indicate which is the “lead” proposal
         (a) Need to do some research
         (b) Susan hasn’t tested yet
(c) We need to know what Coeus does – that’s our task
(d) Chris will tell Heather (and vice versa) if anything else gets figured
(5) Pretty sure that the first proposal linked has the default data.. but not sure if we can override existing data with new proposal link

KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam
r) Revised spec posted
s) Track changes or not?
   i) Whatever
t) How to know where things will go
   i) Don’t stress about it – just do the best you can
u) One business rule wasn’t current Coeus functionality
   i) So was put in to Q&I
v) Determining where something will appear IS NOT OUR FOCUS!!
   i) We document functionality
w) Error messages clarified
   i) Make sure we document in differences from Coeus
   ii) Might put it in the same spot to say that this is what it is and this is what we think it should be
x) Terms and definitions
   i) Foreign Travel
      (1) Need to have a definition based on school classification of foreign travel?
         (a) UA Action item – email Tracey with the definition (Tara will do it!) based on the OMBs and NIH
            (i) NIH: defined as any travel outside of Canada and the United States and its territories and possessions. However, for an organization located outside Canada and the United States and its territories and possessions, foreign travel means travel outside that country
            (ii) Fly America act?
y) Got drop down list and it was blank
   i) What populates drop down list?
   ii) Do we need to worry about it?
   iii) It seems to be there sometimes and sometimes not
   iv) Ask Coeus help?
v) Default focus is on the add button and the first time you come in, there’s nothing
vi) But difference between this and the other one, the other had a list with Susan as a traveler so maybe that’s what initiates the list availability?
vii) What happens if you add a person to this now?
   (1) To the investigator tab
   viii) If terms say travel’s not allowed, have a validation error that says that terms say no foreign travel, warning that there’s a conflict
      (1) What is the general opinion about this?
      (2) Who wants it?
      (3) Warning is reasonable
      (4) Check with the developers to see how big of an issue this would be to add it in as an enhancement
ix) Question about stating city and state and/or country? The text box is free-form so we can do whatever
   (1) So just say that it’s free form
   (2) Field label definition states city and state so that’s why the question
x) Definition – see above
xi) Error about saving travel people
   (1) Try to duplicate and make screen shots
   (2) Done with the spec for now!
KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron

On Hold:
KRA-08 Enhancement – Advance Account – related to KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel spec (Awards) – Tracey (on hold for FC review of KRA-08)

4) New Functional Specifications for Review:

5) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
Upcoming Spec Due Dates:
KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Person Lookup (Shared) – Susan, Due 04/21/08
KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards) – Susan, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
KRA_AWD-Budget Overview Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
KRA_AWD-Complete the Sub-Awards Panel (Awards) – Julie, Due 03/21/08
KRA-__ - Cost Share Requirement Met? (Awards) – Pam/Renee
KRA-__ - Cost Share Source/Destination Validation (Awards) – Pam
   a) Renee has stuff to bring up about this today
KRA-__ - Payment Schedule Generation (Awards) – Tyler

6) Questions and Roll Call
   a) Susan’s working on person look-up spec for review first
   b) May 21 – Colorado testing
      i) Tracey - going
      ii) Julie - going
      iii) MSU will be available
      iv) UA will be missing members
      v) Is on the radar, ask a week or two later

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Susan, Julie, Tara, Heather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler, Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Laura, Peter, Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coues</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuali Research Administration Awards Subcommittee Minutes

KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, March 26, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   a) Decide on definition of destination account
      i) Does anyone have any opinions?
      ii) Everyone seems to be satisfied with it
      iii) The only concern is with cost share – the institutional account where cost sharing expenses are recorded
      iv) So cost share is the modifier – is there a more general term that we could include in there
      v) We’ll have this discussion in the context of the FA spec when we get to that review
      vi) So accept the definition now and we’ll review it later
      vii) Source: cash resources to cover the expenses that post in the destination account
      viii) So can we just say the destination account is: account in which expenses post that are covered by the cash resources of the source account?
      ix) Cost share is the problem
      x) How can we restate cost share?
         (1) Portion of project costs not covered by the sponsor
         (2) What’s a general term of how we’re using those terms

2) Outstanding Issues:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather
      a) No update
   KRA_AWD-Apply a Sponsor Template (Awards) – Tracey, SME-F
      a) Issues were resolved, posted revised version
      b) Only changes were that it says sponsor template instead of template
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) – Heather, Q&I update (add maintain)
      a) No update
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – Tyler, add general payment info.
      a) No update
   On Hold:
   KRA-08 Enhancement – Advance Account – related to KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel spec (Awards) – Tracey (on hold for FC review of KRA-08)
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Julie in process of re-write
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) – Renee, Q&I update after 3/31/08

3) New Functional Specifications for Review:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris
      a) More sets of eyes – Renee looked at it
      b) Concern is about limited authorities in Coeus so not sure how it all flows in Coeus
c) Proposal info page is a table that shows what info is linked to awards

d) Functional description of the spec – made reference to sequence number – but that’s an award thing not proposal – that’s talking about the award sequence number – header info that was so close to the data in the proposal section but is not really part of it.

e) The info on the proposal table is not modifiable but the data in the locations to which it links is editable.

f) So what info do we really to show on the panel and what we have proposed is appropriate or whether there is additional information that people want.

g) Questions

i) Need to have a search capability on that panel

ii) Different proposals associated under different sequence numbers

1) Mock that we currently have doesn’t fit the need
2) The spreadsheet addresses some of this
3) It has been incorporated – the second proposed mock screen – 1 and 2 are trying to address the new version that we want to see for our mocks

iii) Need indicator button to show what proposal originally pre-filled the proposal
1) Everyone likes it

iv) Which should be our main success scenario
1) It should be from the ideal situation
2) So from the point of a proposal to linking to new award...

v) In mocks – all fields except proposal number are editable – but it shouldn’t be that way and isn’t that way in Coeus
1) We don’t want this display field to be editable – it’s just informational – you just plug in the number
   a) Agreed no dissension
2) But after a proposal has been linked, those fields are editable in the award module

vi) Since this is informational only – don’t need to be marked required – they are just displayed so remove required notes in the spreadsheet
1) Proposed revised mock screens on the spec
2) Want sync and have proposal fill the award records or does it pre-fill automatically
3) The lead indicator is UA’s idea – do we really want it?
4) Assumption was that pre-fill may or may not happen
5) Can we just assume that the top one did the data feed?
6) Or if you want to change that – you delete the one at the top and add them in such an order that you get what you want at the top at the top?
7) Do we want the functionality to delete a proposal?
8) No we only care about deleting the link
9) Along what lines are we thinking to handle the ordering of the proposals?
   a) Everyone think about it

vii) Proposal must be submitted to be able to be awarded
1) Do these take into consideration institute proposal
2) What this is getting at is that a proposal shouldn’t be linked while it’s pending... it must have submitted status/fully approved status

viii) Add fields to proposal information for PI/Lead Unit
1) We picked this up
2) Note that it’s an enhancement and note that KRA will take the enhancement

ix) Funding proposal
(1) It shows proposal for the whole award – the proposal may cover multiple years and so we might not have multiple proposals
(2) So there is a proposal sequence number – what is it?
(3) This needs to be researched through either Coeus help or documentation regarding linking proposals to an award
(4) Is it because there is another award associated with that proposal?
(5) Susan can give herself permissions

h) Questions from Renee
   i) She will update on the spec for next week.

KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam

a) Pam had a hard time uploading the revised version 1.1 – on the attachments and on the grid now
b) The mock screens’ directory has been messed up a little
c) Need additional comments – so everyone please review!!

KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron

a) Didn’t have access to mocks when this was started so just did it from Coeus
b) Came up with question based on that

c) Need feedback!!

d) Questions
   i) Sync button seems to go back and reload the template
      (1) If there award already exists, you have to load defaults when you’re already on this screen
      (2) This spec is related to the templates
    (3) Modify templates
       (a) Maintain/Modify Templates – allows you to modify, add delete
       (b) Under award hierarchy
       (c) Find your institution
       (d) Find user maintenance (brown guy)
       (e) So then click on the one you want and click on right roles and it tells you what you can do with that role.
    (4) Can we have the sync button inactive when the template doesn’t have information
    (5) Have a sub-panel heading and then a counter – so you know if it’s worth your effort to show (like in contacts header)
       (a) We currently have an error that there has to be at least one – so if they were all zero’s you’d know to just add one
ii) Should we load “none” as a default so that you have a starting point?
    (1) That defeats the safety that they built in when they made it required
    (2) It’s a pain to enter it in but it makes you stop and look
       (a) Should it be for each category?
       (b) Yes Coeus requires that now
       (c) Do we use the code or is the description sufficient?
          (i) At MIT, the form is filled out so that the code is there for them and the data entry person actually types in the two-digit code number
          (ii) So we should try to maintain that in KRA
             1. Just note it as a point of caution
             2. Be aware that if we want to change this, we need to think about why it was done that way
             3. Didn’t test ability to enter in a term by code
             4. When you add you just have to select it – it lists the code and the title
5. so are we just wasting the screen space by having the code number?
6. Bring it up to the UI subgroup
7. If you have an opinion but it in the spec as a note
8. any strong opinions?
   a. No
9. There’s a code table for each of the different term categories
10. It would be easier to have this all table driven to give you that flexibility
   (d) Mock screen for these?
   iii) Add a date and time stamp to show when the last update was?
       (1) It exists in notes section
       (2) If you’re negotiating – do you want to know when they were last updated?
       (3) How do you know when it was added – like if billing or reporting is impacted?
       (4) Question for coeus user input
   iv)
4) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
   Upcoming Spec Due Dates:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
   KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards) – Susan, Due ASAP
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
   KRA_AWD-Budget Overview Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Sub-Awards Panel (Awards) – Julie, Due 03/21/08
   KRA___ - Cost Share Requirement Met? (Awards) – Pam/Renee
   KRA___ - Cost Share Source/Destination Validation (Awards) – Pam
   KRA___ - Payment Schedule Generation (Awards) - Tyler
5) Questions and Roll Call
   a) Misc
      i) Scope is a rolling scope for taking in changes made in Coeus to add into our KRA
      ii) So we need to pick up changes to the last possible moment
   b) Susan will update the grid and if you look at that you can see what’s coming up, when
      things are due so you can review
      i) It’s too hard to try to do an agenda two weeks ahead
      ii) But this way, you can go through at review mocks and see what’s in the queue
      iii) It does include the date on which
         (1) The ones with early due dates will be reviewed earlier
   c) Focus on getting more specs written and in the queue
   d) New Orleans trip
      i) Susan, Renee, Peter, Laura, Ron

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Ron, Tyler, Pam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Wendy, Laura, Renee, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Julie, Susan, Heather</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, March 19, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   a) Destination account can be updated after we discuss it

   Need KRA Awards volunteer presenters: Tracey, Renee, Pam?
   a) Renee has confirmed that she will be part of the team
   b) Pam will likely be at the event… she will be part of the presentation
   c) Great – want more institutions to be involved in the Kuali days process

3) Outstanding Issues:
   KRA_AWD-Complete_the_Contacts_Tab (Awards) –Q&I update, Heather
   a) Kenton is at UA and has a new template so UA has been working with him. It looks it will be a better system, it won’t necessarily require that we re-write old ones – will use developer feedback to determine which have to be redone
   b) Word tip of the week
      i) Go to View
         (1) Document Map – click on headers
   c) Question
      i) Co-I’s and Key Personnel are not required fields
         (1) Heather will archive
      ii) Routing
         (1) This will be documented in workflow use cases
         (2) Heather will archive
         (3) We need to make sure that we’re picking up all the Coeus enhancements
            (a) KRA Coeus Homepage (in Confluence)
            (b) Functional
            (c) Coeus Release Items
            (d) Check there for anything related to your spec in the issues section – whether or not we spec it depends on whether or not it has been approved or if it has been included in the MIT test instance
         (4) Do we have a version of Coeus that we’re cutting off to making updates and changes?
            (a) Susan will check the scope document or bring it up to the functional council
            (b) She thinks it’ll be cut off whenever we run out of time to make the updates
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(c) Write the spec and once the developers do their work, our updates will be more limited

iii) One entry point for Key personnel – on the awards panel or on the contacts panel
   (1) Tyler votes to see it stay on the contacts tab – just cause that’s where it all is
       (a) Display on PI
   (2) Vote
       (a) CSU: Contacts
       (b) MSU: Contacts
       (c) UA: Split
       (d) Cornell: Contacts
       (e) IU: Contacts
       (i) But should be displayed on the awards panel
   (3) Heather will archive and it will be on the Contacts panel only
   (4) Tyler’s suggestion:
       (a) If we don’t have a PI because we’re not linking to a proposal, can it default to
           just say that it should be entered on the contacts tab
       (i) It’s a training issue, the OSP office will be fine knowing to input on the
           contacts tab – but we do want to make sure that we include a soft error that
           the PI will have to be inputted

iv) Sync button location
   (1) On the tab or on the panel?
   (2) In our module we had discussed the possibility of having sync buttons on the panels which would pull up a new window showing what the values are and what they will be
   (3) So we want them at the panel level and if we have more than one spot for sync on a tab, we can think about having a tab sync all feature
   (4) Heather will archive – follow proposal, include more screen shots

v) How we deal with credit splits
   (1) Heather will archive- another workflow issue

vi) Contact data pulls from tables
   (1) Heather will archive – a developer issue, not really ours

vii) Faculty denoted on details or on the contacts panel next to the PI name?
   (1) Coeus has faculty next to the PI name in both versions
   (2) Do we have room for faculty on our mocks?
   (3) This is really a UI subgroup issue
   (4) Does anyone have any strong opinions about where it should be?
   (5) On person detail panels, it is there but Coeus has it on the actual contact screen but they don’t have the info we have like role and phone and email.
   (6) What do feel is important?
   (7) Vote
       (a) Arizona: details
       (b) IU: details
       (c) MSU: details
       (d) CSU: details
       (e) Cornell: details
   (8) Heather will email Jenn or Rob to find out the reason for the faculty check box on the investigator tab before archiving it
   (9) Did Coeus have any input as to why it was there? No one from Coeus here today

viii) Adding a new contact – system add the new name and info to the credit split?
(1) Default would be that they be added into the credit split area but defaults would zero and if it needed to be edited, that would be a workflow issue and prompt a trip through KEW
(2) Heather will archive

ix) What other kinds of contacts would we want to have listed?
   (1) Right now, we can only have a financial contact and an administrative contact – so to have more, would it require an enhancement
      (a) Does anyone really want to have more than the two contacts?
      (b) We recognize that there are other roles could be a
      (c) MSU – base values
      (d) No support for more contacts
      (e) So Coeus defaults are fine
   (2) Heather will archive – not worth it to pursue it

x) PI – hard and soft errors
   (1) UA argues that it should be a soft error
   (2) So that you can do drop down menus
   (3) Make sure to document that it’s a difference from Coeus
   (4) Wouldn’t that also have an affect on the NIH Multi PI?
      (a) This issue is starting to be handled with newer versions
      (b) So the issue is can we allow more than one PI in the roles in the
      (c) Come back to this one
   (5) Proposal speced it so that you had to delete the PI to change the PI
   (6) Heather will do some research

xi) Coeus Enhancement
   (1) Note here so Heather will archive it

xii) Contact Type drop down list – do we love the list?
   (1) Or should we change any of them?
   (2) We’ll keep the list
   (3) Heather will archive it and we’ll keep what Coeus has

KRA_AWD-Apply_An_Award_Template (Awards) – Q&I update, Tracey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.4.1.5 on the grid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) 1.5 on the grid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Did we want to change the panel name to Sponsor Template and all the associated details or just the header?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Wherever it’s referenced, change to sponsor template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) No one disagrees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Questions
   (1) Where should we note that we made the above change
      (a) Differences from Coeus
      (b) Field description area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) How much information should we have here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Tyler: just information on this panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) We should capture all functionality for one thing in one spec – not define things by panel because panels were set up by us arbitrarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) We should be specific about what data flows from one place to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) This document should stop at the point that gets to syncing template information on other panels – if we apply a template and fields are already entered, do we want to throw a warning that those fields will be overridden – that warning does come in per Coeus when you are on the supply template panel so that does belong on this spec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) But the errors that come up in other panels as a template is applied after one has already been applied are issues relating to those specs

KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) - Q&I update, Renee

h) Questions

i) Capturing cost share information?
   (1) It’s going to take a lot of work to get everything together
   (2) So coeus awards just lets you enter on that screen and you can choose the type but there’s no way to quantify it out
   (3) So we’re talking about an enhancement then
   (4) So we need to specify that enhancement and if you feel strongly that you want that enhancement that you need to draft something and bring it to the SME
   (5) Does anyone feel strongly enough that they want to help Renee do that enhancement?
   (6) Renee’s not even sure that her school wants to do it
      (a) Renee will archive it

ii) Add a field to indicate when CS is completed?
   (1) Pam and Renee will work on it and write a enhancement request so that we can indicate when cost sharing is completed for an award
   (2) A lot of strong feelings about this!

iii) Validate source/destination accounts?
   (1) Handled by award hierarchy functionality?
   (2) Coeus help – source and destination accounts are different
   (3) Each institution would have to decide if there was a one to one relationship between the source/destination account and project account
   (4) MSU – do not use companion cost sharing account
   (5) UA – same as MSU
   (6) If we went for a one to one – it would have to be parameterized – something that could go off and on
   (7) Source/destination accounts are used in un-recovered F&A
   (8) Basically doing this would require an enhancement
   (9) So document what Coeus does now and if anyone feels strongly, they can write an enhancement
   (10) Validation question – could the system verify that it actually exists
       (a) And if it does exist is it being used as a destination account for another award
       (i) Pam will work on that enhancement request as well
   (11) The rest of it will be tabled for now – note it as a suggestion but we don’t have a quick fix for this
   (12) Title was type and default values are from the C/S table – do we need to define them
       (a) Changes were made to include them and Type look-ups are defined – they were MIT values but most other schools pick something else
       (b) What are the values that other schools are using
       (c) Is this the best list?
       (d) Collect alternate suggestions if they are listed in the manuals for the other schools
       (e) Renee will also as while she’s at the user meeting to see what they used

i) March 31 is the User meeting so Renee won’t be pressured again until then!

KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) - Q&I update, Heather
j) Heather will take it back to the drawing board – review the maintain reports and see if that functionality should be included in here

KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Q&I update, Julie (New spec template intro?)

k) In the works

KRA-08 Enhancement - Pre-Award Authorization – related to KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel spec (Awards) – Tracey (on hold for FC review of KRA-08)

l) This dealt only with the Coeus payment screen and not the payment details.

m) We should pick up the extra stuff

n) The enhancement request we had originally discussed had to do with tracking the payments

   i) Tyler has started the enhancement request

   ii) There is a Coeus enhancement number for this

   iii) We need to pick up the data entry of the general payment entry

o) Questions

   i) Purpose of this?

      (1) Describes invoicing that needs to be done by a certain date

      (2) Other fields track amounts and submissions, invoice number, who sent it… track the invoicing and the institution’s responsibility in triggering payment from the sponsor

      (3) Archive

   ii) Functional description

      (1) Changes were made

      (2) Archive

   iii) Business requirements

      (1) Added

      (2) Archive

   iv) Assumption is that you have intuitionial invoice forms or types of invoicing that are maintained in an invoice type table or you have a specific form that the sponsor wants you to use

      (1) We need to check out this assumption

   v) Admin business rules

      (1) Frequency – a subset of all possible frequencies come up because that’s all that’s applicable

      (2) Invoicing and payment – valid basis – include it in there too

   vi) Admin – Award Rules - class reporting frequency

      (1) Shows invoice and frequency is scheduled

      (2) Can we add that invoice has monthly or quarterly frequencies – would that allow the system to generate some schedule as it does for the regular reporting?

         (a) Susan was able to add quarterly as an option for invoicing

         (b) Add invoice to a fiscal report

         (c) Tyler should explore this to see if it is a possibility to have an invoice schedule

      (3) Can this be separated so that different parts of the office can do financial reports and the other side can indicate invoicing?

         (a) Yes and it goes further – the PI can use it to track tech reports and OSP can track financial reports…. And so on

   vii) Due date required only if you do a new line

      (1) Archive it
viii) Payment schedule entry
   (1) MIT policy: it just requires a payment schedule to be created for select payment methods – so business rule will be taken out for that
   (2) Archive it
ix) Already answered – we’re just missing the other payment fields – as for integration points, there are none
   (1) Will be handled when that piece is picked
x) Numbering alternate flows
   (1) Use correct header so that it shows up on the document map
xi) Not deleting for historical purposes
   (1) Institutional practice issue
   (2) So no rules about it having to stay there
   (3) Pam at CSU – accounting function is with pre and post award
      (a) From audit perspective – if you’re doing a roll forward for an audit, it would be tough to collect the info you had to pull paper files
      (b) So people can have the option to delete but deleting is not a good idea
      (c) So it’s a training issue not worth pursuing
   (4) Archive
xii) Submit date
    (1) Usage issue – institutional defined
xiii) Submitter has to match someone in the person table error
    (1) Added to error list
    (2) Archive
xiv) Possible warning messages: warning before data is deleted?
    (1) “Are you sure you want to delete?” error message
    (2) Tyler added it as a warning in the spec document

4) New Functional Specifications for Review:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – Tyler
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron

5) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
Upcoming Spec Due Dates:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
   KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards) – Susan, Due ASAP
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
   KRA_AWD-Budget Overview Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Sub-Awards Panel (Awards) – Julie, Due 03/21/08

6) Questions and Roll Call
   a) Chris – hasn’t gotten any comments on hers yet (proposal)
   b) Comments should be emailed
   c) Agendas will be posted for two weeks ahead
   d) Monday – Wednesday
   e) Have a deadline for when we’re posting an updated version?
   f) Post everything by end of work on Tuesday so on Wednesday the versions are static
   g) Always suggest improvements
   h) The new template is not ready
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i) Kenton will post it when he’s hammered it out some more
i) That may be a couple weeks away

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler, Ron, Pam, Betty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Julie, Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, March 12, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) **KRA Glossary**
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   a) Advance account
      i) Cornell, CSU, MSU, IU, and UA all agree that the term is fine
   b) Frequency base
      i) Table it for today – look at it later
   c) Intellectual Prop report and Tech report
   d) OSP Distribution
      i) Under Admin
         1) Code tables
         2) What’ll be sent out
            a) A report, report plus letter, letter only, sponsor form
            b) Action item: think about a better name and/or definition

   Need KRA Awards **volunteer presenters**
   a) Renee may be willing to do it
   b) Tracey may be willing to do it
   c) If anyone else wants it, please tell Susan

3) **Outstanding Issues:**
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Next Q&I update 3/19, Heather
   a) KRA_AWD-Apply An Award Template (Awards) – Q&I update, Tracey to update 3/11/08
   b) If you have suggested changes, email Tracey
   c) We didn’t want an auto save after you hit sync so we can use the reload option
      i) So Tracey updated through the document with the reload option
      ii) Would it be possible that when someone hits sync or apply template, they get a new window that shows everything that will change next to the original value
         1) That would be an enhancement
         2) Is it worth it to pursue? Should we ask the DM’s to see how big of a deal it is?
            a) No response
            3) Susan will email Terry to see if it will be a big deal
   d) Template issue
i) In coeus, it’s award template, maybe we could use sponsor template to specify it’s use here
ii) That way we don’t encroach upon any other use of the word
   (1) Sponsor template – good for MSU
   (2) Sponsor template – good for Cornell
   (3) Sponsor template – good for UA
   (4) Sponsor template – good for CSU
   (5) So we’re taking it – Susan will bring it up as an FYI in the next meeting to see if the integration team needs to look at it
e) Button question can be archived because we decided that we would have one on each panel, so it can be archived
f) Validation error question
g) Kenton is coming to Tucson next week and will help us make sure we’re on the same page everywhere
   **KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel** (Awards) - Q&I update, Renee
   h) Do we want an enhancement request that allows us to have a check mark or something to say that it has been met?
i) Source and destination account need to be described and distinguished better
   i) Source
      (1) The institutionally assigned account ID where cost share funds were committed
         (a) Source account is the where the cash resources that will be used to cover the expenses that post in the destination account
         (b) This will be added and we accept it
   ii) Destination
      (1) Institutionally assigned account ID where cost share funds are recorded
      (2) Should we specify that each destination account can only have one related project?
      (3) Susan will send the comments to Renee with her own comments
      (4) Action item for next week – check with your own institution and see how source and destination accounts are used so we can up with a best practice
      (5) Termination: is it cost-share or cost-sharing?
         (a) Glossary says Cost-share
         (b) Vote
            (i) UA - share
            (ii) Cornell - share
            (iii) CSU - share
            (iv) MSU - share
            (v) IU – share
   iii) Cost-share
      (1) The portion of total project costs that are paid from sources other than the sponsor
         (a) Accepted
   **KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel** (Awards) - Q&I update, Heather
   j) Update next week
   **KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel** (Awards) – Q&I update, Julie
   k) Has been changed much since last weekend
   l) Table of contents will be updated by next meeting
   m) This is version 1.3
   n) Functional description
      i) Removed info about comments
      ii) Notes are pretty free form – no drop downs or features like that
   o) Business requirements/assumptions
      i) Requirement – what do you need the system to do?
      ii) Assumptions: baseline rules to get you to that point
(1) Hopefully Kenton will give us better definitions of these by then.
(2) With him, it’ll be going over everything that’s been drafted and then it’ll be fixed up

iii) Tapped into proposal spec to try to have consistency

iv) The notes panel originally had delete function in the mocks but now does not have delete functionality and Coeus doesn’t seem to have the delete functionality

(1) Rob – role for modify template so perhaps if you were assigned that role you would be able to change it

(2) When we’re doing requirements, assumptions and permissions, we’ve tabled it but in the KRA test instance of Coeus, the application and system admin at your school can change your roles and rights and people need to know how to look at those roles and what they are
   a) Maintain:
   b) Unit Heirarchy
   c) Click level
   d) Select User Maintainence
   e) Shows roles Coeus has available
      i) For each role, it kinda shows what they doe
      ii) Each role is made up of rights
      iii) We need to start specifying what users have what rights so be more specific in the specs – ie. User with “modify award” role can do xxx

(f) Modify template
   i) Still can’t delete but can edit
   ii) Once we add it’s not permanent until we hit save – so you can add and then hit cancel
   iii) Unless you navigate to a different tab (implied save)

(g) How would someone access the notes made in proposal
   i) Medusa – same cross reference comes up and it displays the award
   ii) Is that written into KRA already (Medusa)? Yes – we want a functional equivalent but don’t have to call it the same thing
   iii) Not sure how the system integration will work with proposal – this is probably the first time it’s been discussed
   iv) So start addressing it now to find a way to handle the medusa functionality – will need to be added to this spec or somewhere else

(v) Do we need errors or validations
   1. To make sure you want to save this?
   2. No – there’s no error message that prevents dumb… so just have to train people right

(3) Does anyone have any problems with the way the mock layout is?
(4) Can you only add or can you modify a comment? Can you only see the last comment entered?
(5) Julie will email Lora about the disappearing delete button
(6) So this panel is for notes that apply the award in general as opposed to the more specific comments
(7) Modify or correct a note – have to look into it
(8) Other questions have been updated based on the last meeting so can be archived
(9) Differences from Coeus is just a sweet blurb.

4) New Functional Specifications for Review:
KRA-08 Enhancement - Pre-Award Authorization – related to KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel spec (Awards) – Tracey
a) Pre-award panel spec is on hold until we hear about this
KRA_AWD-Complete the Payment Panel (Awards) – Tyler
b) Everyone needs to send comments to Tyler by Friday morning and he’ll update and post it on Monday

5) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings

Upcoming Spec Due Dates:
Priorities will shift toward more complex specs!
KRA_AWD-Complete the Budget Versions Panel (Awards) – Renee, Due ASAP
a) Need volunteer for: KRA_AWD-Create and Maintain an Award Hierarchy (Awards)
b) Susan will take it
KRA_AWD-Complete the Proposal Information Panel (Awards) – Chris, Review 3/19
c) KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Foreign Travel Panel (Awards) – Pam, Review 3/19
d) KRA_AWD-Complete the Terms Panel (Awards) – Ron, Review 03/19/08
e) KRA_AWD-Complete the Approved Equipment Panel (Awards) – Heather, Due 03/14/08
f) E
g) Table of Contents
   i) Go into View
   ii) Toolbars
   iii) Outline
   iv) Update Table of Contents – you can update numbers only or update the table and it’ll add any other sections
   v) Once it’s updated, you can hit control and the chapter and it’ll jump you around
   vi) Or if your cursor’s in the table of contents, you can right click and select update fields
h) More specs will be ready for next week
   i) Grid has been updated so check to see what’s coming up

6) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coeus</th>
<th>Rob, Jenn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Diane, Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Tyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Renee, Wendy, Laura, Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan, Heather, Julie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, February 20, 2008
Time: 1:00–3:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EST)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary

Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as

    time permits.

    a) The new functional specs are there and available to allow us to read ahead if we have
time

2) Outstanding Issues:

    KRA-Edit Custom Attributes.doc (Lookup) – Q&I update, Tyler (SME-F?)
    a) Purpose of Has Lookup checkbox question has been archived
    b) We’re really only waiting for one at this point
       i) Should we be able to delete Custom Attributes that have not been used?
          (1) We should just make a note that this is a developer problem
          (2) Can we mark it SME final and let the developers deal with?
          (3) Just leave it in active and let them deal with it.
          (4) SME FINAL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

    KRA-Lookup_Spec_Custom_Attributes.doc (Lookup) – Q&I update, Tyler (SME-F?)
    c) Two active issues
       i) Proposal developers suggested that there be one line item for each
       ii) If you look at the screen shot from a section from proposal
          (1) See mocks in proposal, permissions tab
             (a) They have people with one role assignment but if they did have multiple roles,
                it would role, role, role…
             (b) Tyler will look for a screen shot and add it here
             (c) The assigned module lists, the other three are concatenated
             (d) We could have multiple return results for each but that might make it more
                confusing
                (i) Concatenated list? Yes
                (ii) And so shall it be speced
       iii) Issue one – removing an attribute – so same as previous spec
          (1) Leave it up to the developers
          (2) Susan prefers that attributes can be deleted if they are assigned and unused
          (3) Concurrence around the board

    KRA_AWD-Complete the Pre-Award Panel (Awards) – Q&I update, Tracey (SME-F?)
    d) Jenn was supposed to check if we needed a field to display institutional authorizations
       i) Jenn isn’t here today so Tracey will get with her via email
ii) Depending on her answer we may have further group discussion
iii) Or can we express a preference as to usage on this group so that Tracey can archive
this issue regardless of how Jenn answers?
   (1) At IU, would use institutional authorization more than sponsor authorization
      (a) But could live with it either way
      (b) Use the fields as they are in a more encompassing way?
         (i) Maybe not
         (ii) So maybe would be requesting the enhancement
   (2) UA wouldn’t request an enhancement
   (3) So Tracey would document the different usage in Coeus and then archive
   (4) Susan will put it on the agenda for next meeting but once an answer is received it
can be archived

KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)
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KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)

KRA AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards) – Q&I update, Heather (comments
collected by E-mail from SME participants), review in conjunction with Award Tab, Panel &
Field Analysis spreadsheet, Contacts worksheet.

e) Reviewing MSU’s questions

f) NIH Multiple PI
   i) All PI’s are the same
   ii) There is one head/contact/lead PI
   iii) What terminology does NIH use? Julie Sanders
   iv) How does the proposal group handle this? Renee Dolan (check with Lisa in proposal group)
(5) Add business rule – if there is a change here, institutional approval is required (can we say that the status would then change to routing/pending and require approval)
   (a) Homework – how to handle the changes to credit split
(6) Maybe put a hidden field on the database that changes came in from the proposal so it’s clean but if it’s taken from the proposal it becomes dirty and gets triggered with the workflow
   (a) Coeus has
      (i) Active, Inactive, Pending, Terminated, Closed, hold, restricted – No postings allowed, No cost extension
      (ii) What’s the difference between hold and pending
      (iii) If we include this, we need a really good error message
   (b) But we need something in the business rules that states making changes to the credit splits changes the status of the award and requires approvals

k) Should sponsor contact be a required field?
   i) UA argues that sponsor contact shouldn’t be a required field
   ii) There are cases when we wouldn’t have a sponsor contact
      (1) So we could either make it not required
      (2) Or do we want it in the validation that
         (a) UA – not required, no warning
         (b) IU – not required, no warning
         (c) MSU – not required, no warning
         (d) Cornell – not required, no warning
         (e) CSU – not required, no warning

l) Errors upon deletion
   i) Do you want to delete this row
   ii) And apply to all contact types
      (1) Coeus has two different
         (a) Name and units associated with it
         (b) Or Units/sponsor contact
      (2) So is it worth it to have a distinct error message for Key Personnel?

m) Showing effort in person months?
   i) Coeus has an enhancement (C4.3) to track % effort by summer months and academic
      (1) Want it so that we have all options at all times – person months
      (2) Coeus is supposed to do this already (Coeus lite) from the percent months entered
      (3) Renee will send Heather screen shots to include

n) Project Personnel – Multiple?
   i) So want two additional options – and only available if it’s NIH (or also sub-NIH – one of the units in the org. hierarchy?)
      (1) Key person has an editable field to add what the person’s job/role is in Coeus
   ii) Either suggest that out of the box KRA have an additional code table entry for project personnel role to say contact PI, which would change the business rules regarding that their can only be one PI selected for NIH
   iii) Or designate contact PI as PI and use the other category to denote the additional investigators
      (a) (Lead PI for these NIH’s are listed in the leadership plan)
   iv) How is proposal managing this?
   v) They’re going to have to deal with it first
   vi) Julie will look into this with proposal
Where does the percent effort go?

- Can we shove it on the main page? Or must it end up in the details section
- MSU likes it on the main page for use on eSnap
- UA no strong preference
- Cornell likes it on details – too much info to put it the main page
  - (1) Chris will send Heather a screen shot of what those fields look like
- CSU likes it on the details
- IU for room, put it in details

Preference to have months and percent effort in the same spot
- We’ll have to wait for either confirmation or rejection from Lora and the mock screen people

Questions

- Co-I’s/Key Personnel – required or not
  - (1) Go with what Proposal did
  - (2) Heather will see what they did
  - (3) Cornell – do what proposal is doing
  - (4) CSU - same
  - (5) IU - same
  - (6) MSU – same
  - (7) UA – same
  - (a) Have informational update next week
- Change in PI
  - (1) Heather will archive it
- Who maintains rolodex and person tables, tables be combined? (KIM)
  - (1) Note that rolodex and person tables will be maintained as defined by institutions and that when KRA develops KIM, we’ll have to revise if not already handles
  - (a) Heather will archive
- Sync – keeps contact details but deletes contact? We can’t replicate this so delete first half
  - (1) Can we rename Sync button
  - (2) Template Default – UA
  - (3) Cornell – Template Default
  - (4) CSU – no preference except Sync
  - (5) IU – Not sync, Template Default will be ok
  - (6) MSU – no preference
  - (7) Does Proposal use Sync? Tracey will check to see if they use Sync
- Accessing Rolodex unclear
  - (1) Heather will delete
- Use of sub-award vs. subcontract (in contact type)
  - (1) Cornell - award
  - (2) IU – award
  - (3) MSU – award
  - (4) CSU – award
  - (5) UA – award
  - (a) So it’s sub-award instead of contract
- Details
  - (1) We wants to have a details button
- Specs be updated after mocks updated
  - (1) Duly noted
ix) Question about details – we’ve addressed with our suggested mocks so be archived (by Heather)

x) Was addressed at the add contacts level
   (1) Archived by Heather

xi) Lora’s comment – about roles drop-down being removed
   (1) Archive by Heather

xii) Shared spec
   (1) No longer shared so archived by Heather

xiii) Enhancement doc to sort the date on the four panels on the contact tab
   (1) What does this even mean?
   (2) Deleted by Heather

xiv) All panels displayed regardless of whether or not there is data?
   (1) Show/hide question
   (2) UA - display
   (3) Cornell – No problem if it displays
   (4) CSU - displays
   (5) IU – display
   (6) MSU – display
   (7) Heather will archive

xv) Add a percent effort column
   (1) Addressed already – MSU really wants it on the main page but if it comes down to it, it can e in details

xvi) Is it too specific to denote leads with radio buttons
   (1) Archive by Heather

xvii) Entry point for PI
   (1) PI field shows up on other panels where is the point of entry?
   (2) Makes most sense to do it just on contacts
   (3) Tyler says proposal development had the same issue so we need to limit to one place
   (4) Can’t really just change PI – needs to be routed anyway
   (5) UA – contacts page
   (6) Cornell – no preference
   (7) CSU – no answer at this point, not strong preference but if the awards page is the first place you see, maybe it should be on awards
   (a) Tyler likes it on the contacts page
   (8) IU – no strong preference, makes sense on contacts
   (9) MSU – awards screen, but no strong preference

xviii) Another drop down menu in the add contacts? (18)
   (1) Addressed
   (2) Archived by Heather

xix) Instead of numbers, add radio buttons for leads
   (1) Accepted

xx) How are OSP contacts assigned
   (1) Split
   (2) Archive by Heather

xxi) Sortability in the way contacts are presented
   (1) Suggested and hopefully made a good argument
   (2) Susan noted it
(3) Achieve with a note referencing to the spreadsheet indicating the way Coeus sorts
xxii) Radio button by unit – lead OSP and Contact
(1) Archive by Heather
xxiii) Institutional customization on the credit split column?
(1) Destroy ability to upgrade?
(2) This is from the business rule that says that there are customizable rose (business
rule 9)
(3) Is the answer that there must be a system parameter allowing customization but
that it would inhibit your ability to take upgrades without modifications
(a) What’s the purpose of this?
(4) Archive by Heather
xxiv) (24) Sync button on just sponsor panel
(1) Only info affected by the sync
(2) Placement of Sync (or Default Template button)
(3) On Panel or Tab
(4) Tracey will look at it and see how many tabs are affected by Sync
(5) Heather will ask proposal how they handle sync buttons
(6) In proposal development when you sync institutional rates – it’s in the right hand
column?
(a) Tyler will email Heather to say where they Sync buttons occur in Proposal
xxv) On proposal side, adding multiple PI’s as Primary PI and Co-I, Co-I’s are routed
as Key personnel
3) New Functional Specifications for Review:
  KRA_AWD-Apply an Award Template (Awards) – Tracey
  a) KRA_AWD-Complete the Cost Share Panel (Awards) – Renee
  b) KRA_AWD-Complete the Reports Panel (Awards) – Heather
  c) KRA_AWD-Complete the Notes Panel (Awards) – Julie
  d)
4) Goals/Information for upcoming meetings
  No meeting next week (W, 2/27/08) due to KRA Face-to-Face in Detroit, Feb 2008
  a) Awards SME Attendees: Susan Mundt (UA), Chris Ashdown (Cornell), Tyler Wilson (CSU),
     Tracey Levy (IU), Renee Dolan (MSU), Kristin Burt (MSU new member)
  b)
5) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Heather Arnett, Susan Mundt, Julie Sanders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam Harrington, Tyler Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MSU      | Peter Asquith, Laura Baise, Wendy Derby,
           Renee Dolan, Craig O’Neill              |
| Cornell  | Chris Ashdown, Diane West                  |
| Coeus    | Absent                                     |
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, January 30, 2008
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   1. Now new glossary

2) Outstanding Issues:
KRA_AWD- Complete the Award Actions Summary Panel Wrapping/Navigating added?
   2. Some changes made – you can see them in the track changes view
   3. Since we don’t have firm resolution on the parent/child award/sub-award… Susan reworded it so that we don’t have to even deal with that issue
   4. There was also a tab that was mislabeled so in the functional description, titles were corrected
   5. Assumptions had corrections in mislabeled tabs as well
      a. There was the assumption that subcontracts would have it’s own tab but that’s on hold for now so adjustments were made to reflect that
   6. Business rule was adjusted to get rid of child/parent terminology
   7. Flow of Events
      a. Summary used to be under award actions tab but would probably be better placed in time and money, as reflected in MSU’s work, which Rob Yetter pointed out was done that way for ease of use in Coeus
      b. Took out the click on close in the main success scenario – that event occurs after what we currently have as our post condition so should be eliminated
      c. Next and previous are pretty much the same, just going a different direction
   8. Money and End date screen shot
      a. We don’t have mock screens yet so we may have to come back and make corrections if changes occur
   9. No error messages
      a. It just pulls data and displays it
   10. Permissions and rights
   11. Questions issues
      a. Screen placement can be reviewed when we look at MSU’s spreadsheet
      b. Wrapping and Navigation
         i. Wrap
            1. You can’t go from the last award back to the first
            2. If not enhancement request – would schools like this
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3. No real opinion
4. CSU- don’t care
5. IU – no problem
6. Cornell – no problem
7. So if it’s not an enhancement, great, we’ll take it, but if it is an enhancement, we don’t want to pursue it
c. Navigating from first level to first level if there is more than one level… not that important so archive this
KRA_Prop-Complete the Custom Data page (Shared) Updated yet w/data flow input?
KRA-Lookup Spec Custom Attributes (Lookup)
KRA-Edit Custom Attributes (Lookup)
12. Will these by ready (by Tyler) for next week?
a. No changes made but we can review what’s there

3) Functional Specifications for Review:
Review Awards Tab, Panel and Fields Analysis document in Confluence and be prepared to discuss MSU’s proposed Time & Money tab (research Coeus distributed, distributable, change, history… functionality).
13. Ann is leaving our SME
14. Toggle buttons for viewing:
   a. Using the different buttons change your views
   b. Change button gives you the edit mode
   c. Total is totals
   d. Distributed is what you’ve sent out to subs
   e. Distributable is still available to send out
   f. These were put here to make viewing easier and also is an adjustment from uploading from another program straight into java
   g. The toggles are pretty comparable to our tabs
   h. Improve functionality of the screen
15. Can we add another column:
   a. So obligated, anticipated, and have distributed
   b. Then if you want to know distributable, just do the math in your head
   c. The distributed and distributable are just views
   d. Does everyone like the hierarchical view of the award and understand what it is?
   e. So Distributed is the amount that has gone to the parent
   f. Distributable is the amount left in the parent
   g. Do we really need the distributed column. Isn’t it more of just a double check? It is somewhat of a thread showing from whence the money was distributed but if there were more children, it would get complicated. Couldn’t we accomplish the same thing but just having a total at the bottom?
   h. It would make sense to have totals in this column that make reconciliation easier. How can we set up the view so that you know what’s in the parent, what’s in the children, grandchildren, and what the total is. It would also be helpful to see the total award amount
   i. So seeing a grid with totals at the bottom would be easier
   j. And we don’t really have a need for a change button because we can either have a distinction between edit and view or we could leave it to permissions so that if you have edit rights you can change it
i. So we will leave it to the permissions roles
   ii. Get rid of the buttons on the bottom
k. Maybe have an obligated tab and an anticipated tab?
l. Would it be useful to have percentages and know how much has been budgeted and received
m. It would be useful but is it confusing to have it all on the same page?

16. History
   a. In Coeus, selecting a line and showing detail transactions, you get the same toggle buttons as the main award so this needs to be designed to match how we are going to change the main money and end dates page
   b. We need to see some samples of what this might look like. Anyone that has an idea of what this should look like please put it together on Excel or some other format for next week. Susan will make a sample one too.

17. Preaward – shows effective date

18. F&A
   a. This isn’t really about rates – it’s just the difference between the indirect and directs costs
   b. This button may change to anticipated funding
   c. It’s still up in the air so they are taking suggestions

19. Budget
   a. Budget Version
      i. How does Proposal look – don’t they have high level tabs for these? Yes
      ii. Proposal has multiple budgets that combine to get to one budget but we start with one budget and work open into multiple versions
      iii. So our tab would have the summary at the top
   b. Budget Summary
      i. In Coeus, if you open budget summary and select copy, it can bring in a budget from proposal
      ii. This is the Princeton version, MIT has less detail – no cost elements – just direct and indirect
      iii. Calculate recalculates for you
   c. Submit – ties back to the money and end date screen
   d. Can you delete a budget?
      i. Yes
      ii. But only because the status is not approved
      iii. Approvers would have pretty much the same screen but view only with the reject and approve buttons available

20. Cost Share
   a. Own tab – too much info to bury
   b. Just filling out the cost sharing type which you can see from the details menu
   c. Do we have to have a percentage or the dollar amount?
      i. You can do either. The percentage doesn’t automatically calculate the amount – it’s just informational and you have to the calculations yourself
      ii. The whole screen seems to be purely informational to keep track of what your institution’s cost sharing is
      iii. No mechanism for indicating whether or not you met your cost sharing goals

21. Rates
   a. Details drop down
b. Indirect and Special Rates
   i. Pretty informational
   ii. Fancy notepads!
   iii. Opportunities to take the windows under the details and make them into more robust tracking devices to show under-recovery and cost sharing... it might be enhancements but if we see it in proposal and we can use it in its same form, we might be able to add them to ours without much hassle.

c. Valid IDC Rates comes from an institutional table

22. Award Summary
   a. Nothing new but just suggesting that it would be a better place here
   b. That way you can click on the summary right from the budget panel
   c. It’s a better place for it because it’s not really an award action
   d. Move the summary to money and end dates?
      i. Cornell – yes
      ii. IU – yes
      iii. CSU – yes
      iv. MSU – yes
      v. UA - yes

KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards)

23. hold for now, UA needs to make changes, this was based on the old mock screens

KRA_Shared - Sponsor Inquiry (Lookup)

24. Flows are fine

25. Criteria
   a. Proposal will check theirs
   b. There are screen shots showing where we want to look for sponsor
      i. Person table
      ii. Rolodex – sponsor or contacts (people)
      iii. Sponsor Table – give you money
      iv. Organization – may be a sponsor but if we’re subcontracting down, they would be in this table, vendor’s would be here (we think – but no separate vendor table)
   c. Sponsor ID would pull from the sponsor table, prime sponsor would, vendor would not, subcontractor would not
   d. So lookup criteria in Coeus as listed
   e. This is different than what it is in the Mocks currently
      i. We need to add an active/inactive indicator so we can weed them out from our search
      ii. These are the only things we can use to search for a sponsor
      iii. Where is the sponsor name? – It’s there just in a horrible spot so let’s suggest we want it to be reordered
      iv. Create User – is the person who created the record
   f. We don’t have the option because a decision was made that we can only access the maintenance tables from the drop down menu but KFS has the option to “create new”
      i. So Susan is trying to figure out who made that decision so we can see if we can have it in the awards module
   g. Coeus will come with a package of certain things that out of the box are the search criteria
h. So in the Coeus search list, are there ones that are in the Coeus that we want to make sure we have in ours?
   i. Our list is probably ok just in a bad order
   ii. Sponsor code because the “power users” will just memorize the sponsor codes and such

i. So we agree on
   i. Sponsor Code
   ii. Acronym
   iii. Country Code
   iv. Postal code
   v. Rolodex ID
   vi. Sponsor Name
   vii. Sponsor Type Code
   viii. State
   ix. Create User
   x. Active/Inactive Indicator

j. Now what order?
   i. Sponsor Code
   ii. Acronym
   iii. Sponsor Name
   iv. Sponsor Type Code
   v. State
   vi. Country Code
   vii. Postal code
   viii. Rolodex ID
   ix. Create User
   x. Active/Inactive Indicator

26. Results
   a. List as presented in Coeus
   b. Is different in KRA
      i. Sponsor code
      ii. Acronym
      iii. Sponsor Name
      iv. Sponsor Type Code
      v. Active/Inactive Indicator
      vi. Country Code
      vii. Postal Code
      viii. Rolodex ID
      ix. State
      x. Create User
   c. These should be in the same order as the search criteria but eliminate Country Code, Postal Code, Rolodex ID, State, and Create User
   d. So our list of results is: sponsor code, acronym, sponsor name, sponsor type code, and active/inactive indicator
      i. Susan will reorder them in the spec so they’re in the right order based on the search criteria

27. Error
   a. No values match
   b. Enter primary key
28. Questions  
   a. Requires input by other modules and Susan will ask unknowns to Lora and some have been answered

4) **Goals/Information for those attending for next meeting**
   a) Proposal needs help writing specs so even though Susan is giving us deadlines for the specs we have assigned, we will be getting assignments from proposal and hopefully they will be ones with joint benefits
   b) Coeus Sandbox – roster info was submitted but users need to be set up so hopefully we’ll have it soon with the Princeton budget as a part of it.
   c) We now have due dates
      i) Estimated that we have about 19 meetings before release 1 (7/1/08)
      ii) This is assuming we will take off a couple of weeks – one in February when lead SMEs and others will be in Detroit. In April, there’s an FC meeting and in May there’s Kuali days 6
      iii) We have 32 specs not counting most of the shared and/or lookup specs so it may be as high as 40 with the additions we need for time and money
      iv) So we need to complete about two a week
      v) So they have been ranked in anticipated ease
      vi) Even when a meeting is cancelled, specs are due, just gives us greater lead time for group reviews
      vii) Everyone is encouraged to volunteer for one by themselves or in groups of two so we can all learn more and get them done faster!

5) **Questions and Roll Call**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Julie Sanders, Heather Arnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Peter Asquith, Laura Baese, Renee Dolan, Craig O’Neill, Ann Spaulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown, Tammy Custer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Betty Eckert, Pam Harrington, Tyler Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Jenn Flach, Rob Yetter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) KRA Glossary
   Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
   1. We need to review definitions posted by other groups - will do next meeting

2) Institute Proposal Update following FC discussion
   a) Institutional proposal came up in functional counsel today
      i) Lori's going to find out why it was created and if we need to duplicate or if we can
         make changes to proposal development and have the functional equivalent with
         (1) We want to get rid of institute proposal
         (2) Regardless of whether KRA has institute proposal we will be able to get the data
             to feed into awards - meaning we won't have to reenter data if it exists already

3) Outstanding Issues:
   KRA Prop-Complete the Custom Data page (Shared) Update on issues
   a) Complete the Custom Data
      i) Date should only flow one direction from proposal to award
      ii) So no sync or refresh button because the data should flow only once and then from
          then on, we'll have new data sets
      iii) Need to note that as a difference from coeus, that the data will flow at all
   b) Display the custom data tab or just make an indication that it's empty
      i) What's the likely hood of it not having custom data?
      ii) Does it even matter?
   c) Error "please enter required field"
      i) This is a data validation error
   d) If a change to custom data is made, do we have to add in that info on all awards?
      i) Not sure quite yet
      ii) But we need to change the business rule that says that if an attribute is required to
          save a doc, only a user with edit rights can update it...
   e) Change under integration points
      i) Custom data tab is displayed when the institution defines custom attributes for that
         module
      ii) we won't have reentry of data because of the limited data in institute proposal
          currently
      iii) Add it back in include as a diff
   MSU update on organization of Time & Money tab?
   a) Ann and Renee are here
i) Summary tab
   (1) Made changes to main success flow
       (a) As far as next and previous
   (2) Tried to write it in a way that it would be clear with the hierarchy
   (3) Placement of the panel
       (a) Suggestions there - let it ride
   (4) Issue - have links from summary to go into the other panels?
       (a) no movement
   (5) Issues about previous and next options
       (a) Need to provide for wrapping
       (b) Navigating
           (i) Print documents, next previous - covered by these? Come back to these
   b) Time and Money tab preliminary layout
      i) Went through to lump things together as they made sense
         (1) Subtab - Money and End dates
             (a) Panel - Money and End Dates
             (b) Panel - pre award
             (c) Panel - F&A ($ of direct costs & $ of indirect costs for the award, not rates)
             (d) Panel - history
         (2) Subtab - budget
             (a) Panel - Budget Version
             (b) Panel - Budget Summary
         (3) Subtab - Cost share
         (4) Sub tab – Rates
             (a) Panel - Indirect Cost Rate
             (b) Panel - Special Rate
         (5) Subtab - Award Summary (if this is moved off of the award actions tab)
      ii) Distributed and distributable - what do we do with those?
          (1) Should we just have distributed?
          (2) Set up a spreadsheet laying out the tabs
              (a) Anything that gets cut - make a note of why and mark it in another color so that it's still there but that we know why it's not in

2) **KRA_AWD-Complete the Award Actions Summary Panel** Alternate Flows created for Next/Previous buttons?
   a)

4) **What Changes needed to Awards Mocks Version 2 (now available)?**
   a) Changes were made
      i) Names changed
      ii) content added
      iii) Susan noticed changes
          (1) Where we're supposed to move credit split to bottom of panel on contacts
      iv) Have anyone else noticed any other things that we need to request
      v) Susan needs to post UI change requests by the end of Friday
          (1) Did anyone else catch anything?
              (a) Silence means no?
          (2) Please look at it

5) **Functional Specifications for Review:**  
   **KRA-Lookup_Spec_Custom_Attributes.doc** (Lookup)

---
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a) KRA Custom Attributes
   i) main success scenario
      (1) user selects link
   ii) This is how to find the custom attribute table through the maintenance document using a look up screen
   iii) Select maintenance and look up
      (1) What can you search and what are the resulting column headers
      (2) Tyler built the screen shot
         (a) The titles don't match from the screen shots to the field names under criteria
         (b) Prefer custom attribute name and custom attribute label over column name and column label
      (3) Has lookup - gives you access to a look up option when setting it up
         (a) Wasn't in our list so add it back in
         (b) Can we use "Lookup option?" and have it as a yes no checkbox option. no
         (c) This is a filter in the lookup options - to reduce the query results
         (d) Lookup indicator?
         (e) Lookup activated indicator?
         (f) Extra info: drop down list (yes/no/either) to indicate whether search will return results that include a lookup attribute
            (i) filters results by whether or not they use lookup definitions
         (g) Lookup Indicator is official name
      (4) Lookup window
         (a) Drop down list
      (5) Table this for now
      (6) The lookup and the data is all about how you want it filled in and since there's so many options it's hard to document here

KRA-Edit Custom Attributes.doc (Lookup)
b) Functional Description
   i) Can we delete custom attributes?
   ii) Can we deactivate?
   iii) Do we have limits on number of custom attributes?
      (1) No
   iv) Coeus appears to let us delete them but once they've been used, they likely just become deactivated
   v) Add to Questions - What workflow/routing approvals will be needed for new/edited attributes
      (1) - what about inactivation vs. deletion
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i) data attributes will be integrated into each applicable module

f) Flow of Events
   i) is not an add button, is a create new button that initiates everything but we start out in
      the lookup screen
   ii) Main success scenario: they system displays the custom attribute maintenance screen
      (1) without assigning to a module
      (2) Post condition: a new custom attribute is saved

g) Alternate flow #1
   (1) click edit, make changes, save... is it with or without implementation?
      (a) Without implementation
   ii) do we need to include any ad hoc routing?
      (1) no is included with rice infrastructure

KRA_AWD-Complete the Contacts Tab (Awards)

6) Goals/Information for those attending for next meeting?
   a) Meeting Tuesday January 29th for ad hoc and route flow modules
      i) Meeting with IRB, proposal and us
      ii) Whoever can attend, please do so, we will review together
      iii) preliminary analysis
      iv) Susan will send an email to everyone in our group with details where that doc can be
          found so
      v) 3-5 est
   b) CSU has a developer boot camp next week
      i) Should we cancel next week?
      ii) MSU is here
      iii) IU is here
      iv) Tyler is going to be at boot camp
      v) So we will have our meeting next week
      vi) So Renee and Ann will have something else posted by Monday of next week... just
          add it to the spreadsheet already on confluence - add it to that tab
   c) We will meet next week
   d) https://test.kuali.org/kra-reg/
      i) quickstart is login
      ii) play around there
   e) meet Tuesday the 29th as well
      i) 3pm east

7) Questions and Roll Call

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Heather Arnett, Susan Mundt, Julie Sanders, Julia Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Peter Asquith, Laura Baese, Renee Dolan, Craig O’Neill, Ann Spaulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Tammy Custer, Chris Ashdown, Diane West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Pam, Betty, Tyler Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updates are in progress on the [KRA_AWD- Tabs, Panels & Fields Analysis](#) document on Confluence following our group discussion.
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1) KRA Glossary
Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.
Approve the terms Payment Basis and Payment Method? Better suggestions?

1. Payment Basis: Payment type required by the sponsor, CR, FP
   a. Costing/Price Type
      i. Does it have anything to do with invoicing?
      ii. It does – because if it is FP, that determines what type of invoicing will happen
         1. Internet search
            a. Funding Type
            b. Billing Type
            c. Payment Type
            d. Project Type
               i. Vote:
                  1. Arizona: Payment Type
                  2. IU: Payment Type
                  3. MSU: Payment Type
                  4. Cornell: Payment Type
                  5. Colorado: Payment Type
                  6. COEUS: Absent
      iii. The form of payment required by the sponsor??
      iv. The payment structure of the sponsored award
         1. Vote:
         2. Cornell: iv
         3. IU: iv
         4. MSU: iv
         5. Colorado: iv
         6. Arizona: iii

2. Payment Method: Payment method or system required by the sponsor, Fed LOC, Automatic Scheduled Payment, Cost Invoice
   a. We need to change the definition a bit
   b. Instead of method
      i. Vehicle
      ii. Mechanism
   c. Mechanism for obtaining payment as required by sponsor
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i. Go with it!!

2) Outstanding Issues:
   KRA_Prop-Complete the Custom Data page (Shared) Update on issues
   1. Outstanding issues
      a. Should have alternate flows with cancel and other buttons
      b. Tyler will add
      c. Susan will forward Kenton’s email to Tyler to deal with it
   MSU update on organization of Time & Money tab (from 12/12/07 meeting)?
   3. They will show us next week

3) Functional Specifications for Review:
   KRA_AWD-Complete the Award Actions Summary Panel
   Alternate Flows created for Next/Previous buttons?
   1. Alternate flows for next and previous buttons
   2. Functional Description
      a. Are we using Parent/Child or sub-award?
         i. Check back in minutes (Ann)
            1. Ask proposal – discuss next week
         ii. Someone check KFS (MSU)
            1. KFS uses sub-award for subcontracts
         iii. Glossary
            1. Search for parent/child
               a. One instance, is KRA Awards
            2. Search for sub-award
               a. One instance, is KRA Awards
      b. The use of the term sub-award may cause problems – does it imply sub-contract?
   3. Assumptions
      a. Some areas were combined for the sake of brevity
      b. Changed pre-populated to populated
   4. Flow of Events
      a. Change in main flow
         i. Now all it does is open and close
         ii. Should we take out the reference to parent out of pre- and post-condition
         iii. Yes
         iv. It pulls up info for the current open award document
      b. Alternate flows
         i. Need to include information about this being available in so far as the account is part of a hierarchy (summary)
            1. (To see the history of award sequences, see history)
         ii. 1. The system opens the Summary panel for the open award doc
            2. User clicks on “next” or “previous” depending on where the open award falls in the award hierarchy
            3. The system opens the Summary screen for the corresponding award
               1. Remove the other steps until we get to close and the system closing it
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v. Is it better to be succinct or have more alternate flows?
   1. Ask Kenton

5. **KRA-Lookup Spec Custom Attributes.doc** (Lookup)
6. **KRA-Edit Custom Attributes.doc** (Lookup)
7. **KRA-Lookup Spec Custom Attributes.doc** (Lookup)

4) **Updating Awards SME Roster**
Voting members for each institution, make sure Susan has a current member list with contact information. Susan sent email to voting members 1/9/08.
8. Susan will send an email after this meeting
9. Everyone needs to respond to her
10. OnCourse will be updated for current Roster info

5) **Goals/Information for those attending for next meeting?**
Each school must volunteer for **at least one new spec assignment** at today’s meeting.
1. MSU: Renee
   a. Time & Money Budget Cost sharing
   b. Time & Money F&A
2. IU
   a. The two that were changed from other header
3. Cornell
   a. Proposal info panel
   b. Closeout panel
4. AZ
   a. Reports & Terms Approved Equipment (Heather)
   b. Reports & Terms Reports (Heather)
5. Colorado
   a. Shared and Look-up specs (Tyler – already working on these so he’ll ask around at his institute to see if anyone else can pitch in)
6. We need to work off our excel spreadsheet at this time until we have better mocks
7. This is posted under the Agenda as “KRA AWD-Tab, Panels & Fields Analysis” (ie. Mock Mocks)
   a. This is not a set in stone thing, but use it to write mocks until the mocks catch up with us
   b. If the tab is not colored, we don’t have sufficient info to attack it yet
8. Specs should include all functionality from Coeus but we want them to be written so that it will happen the way we want it
   a. Certain functionality requests will be enhancements
   b. Some may be just a better way of doing the same functionality in Coeus
   c. If you have any questions or concerns, just put them at the bottom
9. Andy – the project manager, is the acting DM for awards
10. So as you write specs, make sure you’re checking the questions and issues tab to see what we’ve already dealt with
11. Spec Grid assignments already made were based on the specs already assigned and wherever the majority of the functionality from Coeus resided in our new layout, that assignment got transferred over
   a. There are still a lot of specs not assigned out
12. All the old spec docs are still available under edit, attachments – they’re all still there!
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FC wants to see sample of how we want to “bury” what are high level tabs in other modules.

1. Table for now until we hear back from Lora

Other stuff for next week

13. Contacts Tab will be up for review next week too
14. Agenda will be posted by Monday
15. When new versions of specs are posted, make a note in the status column with the date and version number so we can tell if it’s been updated

6) Questions and Roll Call

Updates are in progress on the KRA_AWD- Tabs, Panels & Fields Analysis document on Confluence following our group discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UA</th>
<th>Heather Arnett, Susan Mundt, Julie Sanders, Julia Wood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Peter Asquith, Laura Baese, Renee Dolan, Ann Spaulding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Chris Ashdown, Diane West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) KRA Glossary
Be prepared with comments/questions for unapproved/revised definitions to be discussed as time permits.

1. Obligated Total
   a. The amounts obligated to date, sponsor funding provided to date under the award. This does not include cost share. The Obligated Total must be equal or less than the anticipated total
   b. Change: first sentence: amounts obligated by sponsor to date under award
   c. Ok to change

2. Payment Basis:
   a. Needs changes
   b. Is: The payment type required by the sponsor
   c. We think it documents the type of invoicing – fixed price, cost reimbursement, monthly, scheduled, etc?
   d. Since payment method and basis are so easily confused, we should include an example
   e. Options are
      i. Cost reimbursement
      ii. Fixed Price
      iii. No Payment
   f. Code Table maintenance?
   g. Greg posted code table listings as one of the final things before he left but we can’t remember where
   h. Cornell uses Pricing Type
   i. Leave definition as it is and just add, for example, Cost Reimbursable or Fixed Price, etc.
   j. Lookup page on Confluence has info on payment basis and other code tables
      i. https://test.kuali.org/confluence/display/KRACOEUS/KRA-Coeus+Lookup-Maint-Inquiry+Functional+Specifications
   k. So just add the open ended sentence at the end and approved
   l. Payment type – would it be better as pricing type?
      i. Is this really a costing type?
   m. Skip, discuss next week

3. Payment method
   a. Skip too – discuss next week

4. Template
We deferred

2) **Functional Specifications for Review:**

- **KRA_Prop-Complete the Custom Data page** (Shared) finish review
  1. We had three outstanding issues
  2. No response on question two and three
     a. Email was sent by Susan
  3. Question 1
     a. Left for discussion for this meeting to discuss at this meeting
     b. If custom data entered in one module and flows to another module when link established between documents, then data update between the two docs will not occur again unless link terminated and re-established? Example: Custom data entered in a proposal doc, then linked to an award doc. Award doc custom data is edited (the data is not different in each doc.) If proposal edited, then it would have to be re-linked to the award doc to feed that data link again. Do we want custom data to update only when first linked, or each time the link is refreshed? Do we need a sync or refresh link button?
        i. We don’t want it to update backwards – have the award changes feed back to the proposal – no!
        ii. What if a proposal is revised?
            1. is that a case when we would want the proposal to be revised and have it feed down?
            2. UA does it so that if there is a revision, they have to resubmit proposals because we want the department to be aware
            3. Do we know what proposal module has to deal with this?
               a. No
     4. In what circumstance do we do revised awards?
     5. Once awarded, it shouldn’t re-feed?
        a. Are there any circumstances that we would want it to re-feed?
        b. Seems like the only time it would be really useful is if you had human error in proposal that you fixed and want it to feed back to awards – if that’s all it’s for, it would make more sense to just update to correct data entry error in two places than to re-sync
           i. Too much potential for refeeding
     6. But are there any circumstances where we would a manual refresh?
     7. We need to talk to proposal module
        a. Do they assign a new proposal document for changes such as PI, time,
           i. If so, then that will take care of our problem
           ii. We will revisit after talking to proposal module
        c. The other two questions will be addressed with the developers and we’ll discuss later as well

- **KRA-AWD-Complete the Award Actions Summary** Begin review
  1. This was modified and posted by Ann
  2. Updated

---
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3. Refering to the summary panel in its current location instead of where it was in Coeus
4. is a simple spec – is more of a reporting, no data entry
5. Do we want a summary at a higher level than at proposal?
6. User will be using it frequently so they should be able to be pretty familiar with it
7. Functional Description
   a. Ann will update it to fix the tab names
      i. It’s up in the air as to whether or not subcontracts will be it’s own high level tab or not
      ii. If any panel/tabs change, this will have to be adjusted
   b. No objection to the current description except as tabs change
8. Requirements/Assumptions
   a. No summary input required
   b. Displays check boxes if something has the listed feature, it is checked
   c. No need to include the info about the check boxes
   d. Assumptions
      i. List of pre-populated items
         1. Award should be award tab, not award panel
      ii. Sponsor pending transfer
         1. Last meeting added this to the award tab
      iii. Instead of investigator, we should say project personnel and instead of units, unit contacts
      iv. Need to add dates
         1. Obligated effective and obligated expiration – which are now obligation start date and obligation end date
         2. These are pre-populated from the time and money tab
   e. No Business rules
      i. Add that the next/previous buttons are only available if we have children accounts
9. System Integration points
   a. All info flows from other tabs:
      i. Award, Time and Money, Payments, Reports and Terms, Special Review, Contacts, Subcontracts, and Other Actions
      ii. Just do a reference back to the assumptions page instead of listing the specific tabs – that we only have one update to do if we have to do updates
10. Flows
    a. Pre-Conditions
       i. User selects Award Actions tab and the Summary panel in order to review information related to an award
    b. Main Success scenario
       i. Steps 1 and 2 are listed in the preconditions so we can take those out
       ii. Make main success scenario
          1. Just no child award(s)
          2. So basically user views award summary data
       iii. Do alternate flows to include the next/previous buttons
    c. Post conditions will change to reflect the new main success scenario
    d. Screen shot it just the summary screen from Coeus’ money and end date
11. Actions
    a. Simple
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12. Workflow and Routing
13. Definitions
   a. None
14. Questions/Issues
   a. Where is the best placement for this summary information?
      i. We put it under award actions
      ii. Should it be more prominently placed
      iii. Vote: Where do you want summary and history placed?
         1. Cornell: Not overload awards page but needs some prominence? So as long as we know where it is, it’s ok but is Award Actions the best name for this tab? So no problem with where it is
         2. UA: Ok with where it is
         3. CSU: It’s fine where it is
         4. IU: Agree that it’s fine where it is
         5. MSU: Ok with where summary is but want to have more discussions about history when we get there
         6. Coeus: Ok
         7. Consensus that the summary is ok on award actions tab
   b. Can we have hyperlinks from summary to the tabs where the information is actually stored?
      i. Question for developers
   c. The reason why Summary is on Money and End dates now – is because you can have an award with around 100 accounts and if you have the summary in money and end dates, you can look at a line there where it is and then just click on a line and select summary to see the specific information there for that award.
      i. Make this an outstanding issue
      ii. We don’t know what this will look like as a mock in Kuali yet and we haven’t even begun to address the money and end date in Kuali
   d. Can we have the option of having when we search for an award, the system will pull up then the summary info, save clicking?
   e. Susan will ask the developers about these
15. Differences in Coeus
   a. Just changed names

3) Goals/Information for those attending for next meeting?
   Volunteer for new spec assignments based on new Tab/panel layout
16. We have a new tab in the mock mock worksheet set up to house questions and issues
17. Under Functional spec
   a. Look-up Maintenance Query
      i. Tyler wrote documents for review: KRA Lookup Spec Custom Attributes and KRA Edit Custom Attributes
18. Julia did a re-work of Complete the Contacts Tab
   a. Hasn’t been uploaded yet
   b. Will be posted soon
19. Volunteers
   a. Email Susan to make a claim on other specs
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4) Questions and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Julia Wood, Heather Arnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Peter Asquith, Ann Spalding, Renee Dolan, Laura Baese, Craig O’Neill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Diane West, Tammy Custer, Chris Ashdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>Tyler Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rob Yetter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updates are in progress on the KRA_AWD- Tabs, Panels & Fields Analysis document on Confluence following our group discussion.
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1. Functional Specification Review – Arizona
   - KRA_AWD-Complete the Award Detail Panel
     a. Has everyone started working on their own specs? Tammy at Cornell did
        screen shots, MSU almost has their first draft done. Is anyone having
        trouble? No from Cornell & MSU. Julia had a problem in that the system
        told her that there was a conflict of interest and it would be put on hold.
        No one else had those problems.
     b. We revised the functional description
        i. We removed a general description, decided it would be better in a
           separate document
        ii. Did everyone have a chance to review it or are we looking at the
            changes as we’re meeting?
        iii. This portion is a lot shorter
        iv. Categorized the detail by function.
        v. Question about first sentence – any suggestions for changes or
           does it look ok? Silence is approval
     c. Business Requirements/Assumptions
        i. Got rid of obvious assumptions according to Lora’s advice last
           week
        ii. We shorted the fields, played around with dates under business
            rules
        iii. Under business rules on this page, question 6 – are there any other
            business rules that any COEUS consortium schools can add to our
            list? The list will be sent to Lora after today for input
     d. System integration:
        i. Not a lot of change but a few small changes to this.
        ii. Question: What parts are optional implementation? Can you
            implement awards and not proposals with KRA? COEUS was the
awards section first and there was no proposal part to it. Afterwards, they linked in the proposal function. Assumption is that with KRA, you can implement whatever pieces you need/want. So the first sentence (All new awards will be linked to a proposal located in the…) may be false. So it would be more appropriate to make it an IF statement: If you have both pieces, all new awards…. So if you only have the awards section, you manually enter the proposal information.

1. Per Lora, we should not assume that everyone that has the award module will have the proposal module.

iii. We should ask to see what is really available for us

1. Flow of Events
2. Begins with… user selects maintain awards… automatically brings to award search screen… close box and then either select edit, new award or hit the create new icon…
3. System opens proposal search window… user identifies search criteria and clicks find…
4. Results returned by system… user picks a proposal…
   a. if you select a rejected proposal, it brings up an error message as listed on the error message page (pg 19)
   b. page 19 shows all current errors, if anyone encounters more errors, page will be updated
5. user selects pending proposal… system brings up award detail panel
6. Award no assigned by system and sequence defaults to 1 and populates certain data… user selects status of award from drop down menu
   a. Note about drop down menu – if you click in the field it automatically pulls down the drop down menu
7. User fills out the fields
   a. Fields are not restricted and allow alpha/numeric and special characters
      i. Other institutions do use hyphens in sponsor numbers
      ii. UA does not use hyphens
   b. CFDA number allows you to put in a period and then chops off the end number but does not give a warning
8. Use tabs to advance in fields, not enter
9. User enters award number as provided by sponsor, user enters account number, checks NSF code if populated by the system or selects it if blank… system takes value
10. User enters mod number, dates
   a. Have decisions been made in other parts of KRA as to what format the dates will take?
   b. Not sure at this point
   c. COEUS does not seem to have a requirement that start date be after end date or any other requirements – it accepts pretty much anything as long as it is in the right format
   d. Execution date is not required
11. Look up sponsor with the search
   a. General consensus is that we would rather have it searchable by sponsor name, not by sponsor code and have the sponsor name displayed
   b. Question section: #9: instead of searching by sponsor code, can the search be done by sponsor name?
   c. In the sponsor search, you have the option of sorting each field – so you can sort by sponsor code and select from there or you can sort the sponsor name alphabetically, etc.
   d. After searching for sponsor, it pulls up the sponsor code and lists the sponsor name next to it.
12. Anyone have a problem with what we’ve done so far or have any input about this?
13. Does anyone know how the procurement priority code works?
14. Moving forward: user enters pre-award amount and effective date
   a. Error message: needed input on other header
   b. So whoever is doing other header needs to include those mandatory fields in their specs, it shouldn’t be in this one
15. Once all required fields in all tabs have been inputted, the system will let you save it
16. Comments: keep moving
e. Alternative flow
   i. If you do not select a proposal from the beginning, you hit cancel and this is an alternate flow
   ii. If you don’t have a proposal before the award, do you need to do a search?
      1. MSU has ones where they never have a proposal so they just do a proposal log with the bare minimum information
2. Can we assume that everyone has an institutional proposal system if they don’t take the Kuali proposal system?

iii. If we assume that a school does not have the proposal module, then how do we approach it?

f. Screen shots
   i. Main toolbar screenshot:
      1. Would it be appropriate to leave it in or take it out
      2. Let’s ask Lora
      3. Screen shots are good because it helps the developers know how we got to where we did, what we were thinking
   ii. Award search screenshot
      1. Also prior to our flow of events
   iii. Toolbar screenshot
      1. Icons that are available and what they do
   iv. Proposal search window
      1. Search for proposal
   v. Proposal search, status dropdown screenshot
      1. Listing what each status means
   vi. Award detail page
      1. The panel that this spec is detailing
      2. Went through all the fields on that panel
      3. Question: What’s the difference between the begin date and the start date?

g. Error messages
   i. Tried to provoke the system to give us error messages
   ii. Some will most likely be duplicated in other spec docs

h. Workflow and routing has been delayed for the time being
   i. Just made a note of the award status possibilities and what they mean

i. Permissions and Rights was skipped

j. Who wants to be the KRA Glossary person?
   i. As of the first draft of this, there was only one entry into the glossary
   ii. So glossary person attaches the word and definition if they have it but if there is no definition, the glossary person can search for it and add a new definition
   iii. In the proposal module, they all have access to the glossary to add definitions, including their names so we know who did it
   iv. Lead SME should then go in and clarify or make final decisions on the glossary
   v. Do we have to wait until things are finalized before we update the glossary?
      1. Each school has a lead SME
      2. Depending on how each school works, either individuals or the lead school SME should post
3. all the members of this SME should be able to comment on it
4. The only person making changes should be the lead SME on Awards itself
   a. Lead SME on Award should have final review of everything
5. So on the glossary, the 5th column should note if the SME group has reviewed it yet or if it is approved
6. We’re not sure if the glossary is going to be KRA as a whole or each group will have their own
7. Susan’s impression is that it is for KRA as a whole – so all modules use the same terms
8. As we come up with new terms for the glossary, we should be posting them to the KRA glossary. On the glossary page, all definitions that have the 4th and 5th columns blank, those entries were not available in the KRA glossary
   a. If we like those definitions, we should post them to the KRA glossary
   b. Susan will email Pam for more information on the glossary
9. As we go through, if we find names we don’t like, we should suggest changes

vi. Glossary definitions
1. Award no.
   a. Is it unique or not?
   b. It is generated by the system
   c. Do we want to address the “how” in regards to the source of the number in this section or leave that to the other sections of the document
2. for specs that the proposal group have gone over, those definitions are posted but they haven’t gone all the way through them
3. Would it be worthwhile for UA to go through and compare the definitions in the proposal group to the definitions we have here to save time and avoid duplication? Yes
4. Proposal group sets it up so they go through glossary terms at the start of the weekly meetings

vii. Since limited attendance, we’ll break early
k. Any questions or issues?
l. Tammy is emailing Susan and Pam to ask Pam to get in touch about the glossary

2. Goals for those attending for next meeting?
   ☐ Begin writing Functional Specification for your COEUS panel/topic
   Current panel assignments under Maintain Awards are:
   i. Arizona – Award Detail
   ii. Cornell – Contacts
iii. MSU – Money and End Dates
iv. IU - Other Header
v. Coeus Consortium – Please volunteer for a tab (Reports, Terms, Investigator, Subcontracts and Other tabs are still available)

- Cornell will try to have the Contracts spec done for review by next week
  i. We’re going to do these in order

3. Questions/Misc.

4. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Susan Mundt, Katie Poore, Heather Raehl, Julia Wood, Paul Sandoval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Michelle Artmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Ann Spalding Laura Baese, Renee Dolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Tammy Custer, , Laurie Michelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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KRA Awards SME Group Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, July 25, 2007
Time: 12:00–2:00 pm (MST) / 3:00-5:00 pm (EDT)
Phone Number: (812) 856-3600 Participant PIN: 001776#
Breeze Session: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ “Enter as guest”

1. **Functional Specification Review – Arizona**
   - KRA_AWD-Complete the Award Detail Panel
     - a. We used the template document from Lora including the naming convention as shown in Lora’s template
     - b. The award module description is shown first then award detail panel; it describes the other tabs in the section
     - c. We also have COEUS open in the session if we need to switch back and forth to look at as we go
     - d. Those who have reviewed the spec docs as provided by UA:
       - i. Tracy from IU looked at it briefly
       - ii. Craig from MSU thought it was good
     - e. As a group, we’ll have to develop our own style in the way of language/writing
     - f. Comment: at the top there is a summary of all the different components; assume we’re not going to run all the different panels at the same time
     - g. Craig’s suggesting: he is used to seeing an identifier number – too easily bring up a document number – cross referencing spec docs so hyperlink by panel name
     - h. Do we want some sort of cross-referencing number scheme to help us cross reference these?
       - i. Example: FAR; DFARs – a numbering index so as you have sub components, you have a point of reference to return to.
     - j. We want specs to be consistent with other modules so as we go through
     - k. Function description (pg 4) – all these descriptions are panels
       - i. Is this appropriate to have these descriptions here? It was just an overview to get us started
       - ii. Back to title page
iii. Describing specific functionality, so you are describing the specific panel

iv. We have screen shots in the actual documents but don’t show up well on the breeze session. So in COEUS, we go to award list, display award (award detail).

v. We are taking bite size information from Coues and trying to describe it.

vi. Tab award detail – this is what this spec is describing.

vii. The overall description may go on another document, may go on the page where functional specifications are listed. The problem with having it on the award detail specification is that it might be duplicated on other specs

viii. We need to focus on exactly what happens for the benefit for the programmers.

ix. Think there is going to be a spec for a panel that may have to be moved around to adjust. This is partly because we don’t have availability to the mock screens right now. As the mock screens do come in, we will make adjustments and move where things should go

x. If we were to use a numbering system: In COEUS, we have tabs “Award Detail” and Award No. in that tab. So award detail would be 1.00 and award no would be 1.01. As a sort of indexing. We’re tabling for the moment and will come back to it later

xi. Functional description: reference as needed but describe specifically that functionality that is being described through the rest of the text. Additional information doesn’t hurt but it may be repeated across the different specs or we could have a general specification document for the info that is across the board on all the specifications

xii. Susan likes the idea of a general specification document

xiii. The bottom paragraph and subsequent list is really what is the applicable part of the spec. The part above was just a means to get things started. The bottom paragraph and subsequent list is the part that will definitely stay in the document unless we decide as a group to do otherwise (plus the two lines on the next page.)

xiv. DFAFS – what does that stand for? Old name of the payment management system but now is where we put the NIH document number.

xv. The list on page 4 looks to be a description of panels. It may be a good way for spec writers to get familiar with COEUS and be able to suggest improvements

xvi. In Kuali, will need to update field title (DFAFS) to something more current/ relevant. What should it be? LOC payment? NIH Document No?
1. Brown has a really good Awards section documentation. It was heavily used in making this spec document. The link to it is in the references section of this specification document on page 23. Everyone should look at it. It is a really good guide.

m. Business Requirements and Assumptions
   i. Used template draft to figure out what these things are.
   ii. Difficult part of this is figuring out what is a requirement, assumption or business rules. It is okay to default to business rule instead of trying to figure out where each thing fits.
   iii. 1. “The award form is used only in conjunction with C&G activities”
        1. is this a reference to COEUS? First impression (Lora) is that we’re really talking about Award Documents when we’re in Kuali other than a form
        2. C&G – this is a reference to award processing
        3. C&G activities: definition: negotiation to set up to closeout
        4. we should change the term C&G to award processing
   iv. 3. “Each award will be identified by its own award and sequence no”
        1. That is good that each thing is identified by it’s own number
        2. Julia thinks that the sequence no. is automatically updated by the system
        3. Your business rules at your institution define what happens with the sequence number. So at Brown, every time they get a new modification, it adds a sequence – so you can add either an allotment of funding as a new sequence or change/adjust/award under a specific sequence
        4. How do we define the field?
        5. At Brown, they create a new sequence to match each award document. Changes to award are tracked using sequence
        6. We need to add a question to this spec and do a little more analysis on sequence number. So discussion might be how do we trigger sequence number, what should be done to generate sequence number?
        7. More analysis needed,
        8. This will come into play when under business rules we show the functionality of this
        9. It seems like versioning and history tracking
   v. 4. “Certain…”
        1. is fine for now but will probably change as we go – don’t feel like you have to identify all that for this spec

n. Assumptions:
i. 3. “The award detail panel.”
   1. Custom attributes are where
   2. Procurement priority code – wasn’t sure how brown used it so wasn’t sure if was customizable
   3. Custom attributes should be handled under the “Other” Tab
   4. So for our spec doc, what is the procurement code and do we want it to be there in Kuali
   5. MIT uses the field for some government contracts to identify them
   6. We need to decide if we want to keep it
   7. Delete number three in this section
   8. Question: do you think users of the COEUS system now that use that field will want to use it in the new system

ii. 4. “Each institution.”
   1. This is true, but leaving it in might throw in red flags for developers. This statement is so universally known that it might be unnecessary to state because it might confuse the developers
   2. But we are correct in our assumption
   3. So add a question for future about out of the box required field
   4. Are we stating anything too obvious?
   5. We are going to start with Kuali and think about what from COEUS we want to add to it

o. Business Rules – not complete, didn’t have enough time to complete
i. Can we create a new award?
   1. Go into COEUS and open a new one – hit save to see whenever we get error messages
   2. Save
   3. Errors: must pick status
      a. If we pick anything in status besides active, what does it do?
      b. As we work through business rules, some interesting things to note in business rules – if you note that something different happens on this panel if you change the data – some of the other consortiums may have documents on this
   4. Try to find what you can
   5. For institutions that already use COEUS, email any business rules to UA
   6. If we don’t find something, the developers will come back to us
ii. We do have required fields in Kuali, if we tried to navigate through different tabs without having first filled out all required fields, it will give us an error

iii. Errors can be two types for Kuali
   1. upon save
   2. upon submit or validation

iv. Required fields in Kuali are marked with asterisks. But COEUS doesn’t show unless you mess it up

p. Batch Scheduling
   i. Nothing, as will be the case for many specs we’re writing

q. System Integration points
   i. Different screens or modules may have dependency on each other – note it here
   ii. Put what you feel is necessary here
   iii. So other tabs or panels are filled by data present in our award detail panel, a cross referencing of the two, fed by one or populated by something else
   iv. What happens if your award document is the first document that you have – you can set up a new award without a proposal but if you get it backwards, you fill in the award detail and then later at the point that the proposal comes in, link the proposal to the award but most of the fields that would be pulled from proposal will be populated as you fill in the award detail info first
   v. So we will have a document that shows as you pull up an award from a proposal, what fields will auto populate
   vi. Change language that all awards should be linked to a proposal? But if you have a proposal after the award, certain fields will be populated.

r. No Governmental Regs

s. Flow of events
   i. Is to get the individual who is reading the spec a visual in the mind as to what is happening here
   ii. Above main success wording – scenario starts when “user clicks on the award tab” or “starts when filling in boxes on screen,”
   iii. Then go back and forth between actor and system
   iv. Shows how the system and the user interact
   v. 1. You should really start with entering in the first field
       1. User is in Award Detail panel and user/actor inputs information first box in the panel –
   vi. No need to go back to prior events, just focus on award detail panel, not how we got there.
   vii. So first thing is that we pick status of an award
       1. 1. user selects status of award from drop down number
       2. 2. system retains value selected
3. There is some flexibility
   a. You can have the first act by the system
      i. 1. system has assigned award no and sequence no
      ii. 2. users selects award status from drop down list
   4. Don’t worry about doing it right or wrong
   5. Just indicate what user is doing and what the system is doing.

viii. Question about format of main success scenario
   1. format is used across the board
   2. Programmers will use business rules from above to know what happens automatically and what happens by the system based on actor action.
   3. Will we ever tell the programmers to refer to COEUS and see how it works?
      a. We as a group will create specifications
   4. A request was entertained at the functional counsel to have the programmers just take COEUS and re-write and that was voted down for what we’re doing now.
   5. SME group involvement is important for testing, helping us all get familiar with it, and for PR as we show the product to other schools

ix. AZ will go and re-write this
x. Alternate flows
   1. More used in Kuali mock
   2. i.e. when we have another button on the page – one says close – user clicks on closed and gets out of the document entirely

xi. Pre-Conditions

i. Pages and Actions
   1. Screen shot –
      1. Just started from the first page
      2. Some of these pages are not necessary – it all depends on where we defined as the start of the start point
      3. So we may have an alternate flow of events if we choose a different start point
      4. Start point: click on create new award
         a. then we have the option of alternative flow
      5. So we will keep Award search screen shot
   ii. The COEUS Awards toolbar is also needed
      1. List of Actions
      2. All our options
   iii. This is also going to go into a user guide so you have to think about the non-experienced user
   iv. Screen shots are a big help for end users as well
u. Proposal Search
   i. After selecting “create new” with award, gives the option of looking here for a proposal to attach to it
v. Would “how to search a proposal” be a different spec?
   i. Probably, leave it out
w. Award detail page – is where we currently have it documented as our start page
x. Error messages
   i. We added one thing at a time and just documented errors that popped up
   ii. Items in blue were notes to JW (herself) or to the group to review later
y. Workflow and Routing – was skipped for now
   i. Need to know if restricted postings are allowed
z. Permissions
   i. In another spec
aa. Additional Info
   i. Added terms to a glossary
   ii. If anyone had comments, please let AZ know
   iii. All the specs should have a list of glossary terms at the end of their specs, and will be uploaded for everyone to see later.
   iv. If you don’t know the name or definition of something, include it anyway and we can update it later
bb. Did any other school start writing documents?
   i. Contacts have been started (Cornell)
   ii. She’ll check to see if they have enough to review on later
cc. Is collaboration going ok?
   i. Cornell – says its good for collaboration, to have different people looking at it and getting information back
   ii. This is hard because there’s no mock shots
   iii. It depends on schools - your own locations within schools, how you work together, etc. So as you work
   iv. Should we assign specific names to different items?
   v. Yes so you have one central contact person
dd. We still have tabs that we need volunteers for
   i. Pam is writing a special review for proposal side so Cornell may have already pretty much written what we need for the award section special review

2. Goals for those attending for next meeting?
   - Begin writing Functional Specification for your COEUS panel/topic
   - Current panel assignments under Maintain Awards are:
     i. Arizona – Award Detail
     ii. Cornell – Contacts
     iii. MSU – Money and End Dates
     iv. IU - Other Header
v. Coeus Consortium – Please volunteer for a tab
   - Reports
   - Terms
   - Special Review – Cornell (looking into it)
   - Investigator
   - Comments - AZ
   - Other

vi. Lead writer’s name and email will be listed with each assignment in KRA

vii. Next week – continue with awards to get more work on it and have it mostly done

viii. Everyone else start writing your own documents as assigned

ix. We can have several in process at the same time

x. May have to table things and go back to it

xi. Can use email to have small side discussions as well

xii. This one spec doc should be enough to keep us busy for the next meeting

xiii. As we become more experienced, we will figure out what we need to be doing and how to do it better

xiv. Meet next wed at usual time

3. Questions/Misc.

4. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Indiana (IU)</th>
<th>Michigan State (MSU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Susan Mundt, Katie Poore, Heather Raehl,</td>
<td>Brian Miller, Tracey Levy, Lora O’Connor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Sandoval, Julia Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig O’Neill, Ann Spalding, Lara Bates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tammy Custer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marisa Schasel (Brown U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>John Annibal, Susan Mundt, Paul Sandoval, Lori Schultz, Julia Wood, Ben Murphy (guest, taking minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy, Lora O’Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Peter Asquith, Laura Baese, Lisa Oliva, Craig O’Neill, Ann Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Dan Dwyer, Pam Plotkin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeus</td>
<td>Rob Yetter (MIT) Jenn Flock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KRA Awards Subcommittee Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, July 11, 2007
Time: 10:00-12:00pm (MST) / 1:00-3:00pm (EDT)
Conference Number: 812-856-3600, code 001468#
Breeze Demonstration Access: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ (“Enter as guest”)

1. Review of Functional Specification – Lora O’Connor
   A. Who Has Written Functional Specs? All Newbies
   B. Purpose of the Spec Doc
      a. Provide developers with a blueprint of how the application should work
      b. Variable format
         i. Information provided to a large group of people describing how it should look, feel, and work
         ii. Streamlines process, define what users want
         iii. Written and approved by functional group, functional user expectations
      c. Spec can be used to convey thoughts, marketing tool
      d. Breakdown complex project into bite size pieces
   C. Who Writes
      a. Functional people ideally to communicate to tech people
      b. SME groups share spec writing among group members
      c. Can be done by one person
      d. Single, hard to find someone to commit that amount of time, group members stay at same level if multi members write it
   D. Effective Spec
      a. Describes the design you want
      b. Something the developer can code from, easy to understand
      c. Detailed, but not too detailed – so it can be used for reference and discussion
      d. Contain pictures or other tools to help describe your point
   E. How do We Take Coeus to Kuali
a. What in Coeus do we want to keep
b. Mock screens – None to start with – Write specs off of Coeus screens, create Mocks from there, then incorporate into specs.
c. Pre HTML mocs are helpful, but get into Coeus first

F. Cost of Specs
a. Time - Participants
b. Energy

G. Things to Remember
a. Don’t be afraid of the Specs
b. They will not be perfect the first time
c. Gauge usefulness of the specs throughout process
d. Consistent specs across SME groups
e. Learning on the job process – ask for help when writing/reviewing, ask Lora, Lori, Rob, Marisa, others.

H. Described Specifications Section
a. Table of Contents, Pages and Actions (Actual Pictures)

I. Volunteers Solicited for the First Specs – UA

J. Went Over Guidelines for Spec Writing in Confluence

K. Discussed Spec Review Process Flow
a. Described back and forth between coders and functional group
b. Reviewed KRA template w/sample data
   i. Create Date is important – keep track of it
   ii. Revision History, update each time a revision is done
      1. For major changes, switch number eg 1.3 – 2.0
   iii. Functional Description – non-technical, overview of function
   iv. Business Requirements/Assumptions and Business Rules
      1. Business Rule – I do this, system does x
   v. Government Regulations
   vi. Flow of Events, I do this, the system does this
      1. Main Success Scenario, alternative flow
   vii. Pages and Actions – Screen Shots Action and Response
descriptions below screen COEUS screen shots
   viii. Error Messages – When do you want them to appear? On Save or Audit
   ix. Workflow and Routing- Will be done later in process
   x. Permissions Rights
   xi. Terms and Definitions-Will be added to KRA Glossary as they are identified
      1. Volunteer for Glossary solicited and tabled
      2. If term in KRA Glossary, due we duplicate in spec doc?
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3. If same term with contradicting, first definer owns it and groups need to hash out revised definition
   xii. Field Label Definitions – Table
   xiii. Questions/Issues

L. Volunteers for Specs Step Forward
   a. Arizona Will Do First Spec in Two Weeks – Award Detail
   b. Indiana Also – Other Header

M. Reminder About Kuali Days in November – Start getting ready

N. Roll Call
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Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>John Annibal, Susan Mundt, Heather Raehl, Paul Sandoval, Lori Schultz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Phil McKown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Peter Asquith, Craig O’Neill, Ann Spalding, Laura Baese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Tammy Custer, Laurie Michelman, Pam Plotkin,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KRA Awards Subcommittee Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, June 27, 2007
Time: 10:00-12:00pm (MST) / 1:00-3:00pm (EDT)
Conference Number: 812-856-3600, code 001468#
Breeze Demonstration Access: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ (“Enter as guest”)

1. Demonstration of Oncourse and Confluence – Phil McKown
   a. Both tools have features that might be useful. We can choose as a group what we want to use, if we want to use both or just pick one or the other
   b. To use Oncourse, open a standard browser, you can use internet explorer or firefox or whatever browser you choose. Oncourse is through IU. The underlying communication source is Sakai.
   c. Go to the login, you will be prompted to enter your user name and password. If you don’t have a user name and password, ask Phil to give you access. Once you login, there are tabs across the top of the screen; we use the Awards tab.
   d. You must be a member to access the Awards tab and to be a member, you must be added by Phil.
   e. After you select the Awards tab, there is a life of tools on the left hand side. Under the Awards tab, on the left hand side is a hyperlink to Roster which shows a listing of all people that are currently members of the group. The two best tools that we use are Resources and Email Archive.
   f. Each group has its own email address. When you send an email to that address it: sends an email to everyone on the distribution list and a copy stays in Oncourse in the archives. The email archive is just an easy way to maintain an email history. You can see the email, whether or not it has an attachment. If you open it up, it will open in your email client.
   g. Resources is just a fancy name for files. It is a repository for files and can have Word, Excel, PowerPoint, etc. files or links to websites. The resources are organized in folders and subfolders. The top level is Awards Resources. You can add a new folder or add files to existing folders. If the folder has files/folders in it, it will have a “+” in it. Clicking on the “+” will expand the folder and allow you to see everything in that
folder. You can tell what type of file each one is by the icon before the file name (Word, Excel, etc.) You can open these files from here.

h. Wiki is one of the tool options on the left but we should avoid using it.

i. The format of Oncourse is fairly rigid. Each tab has the same tools and features. All KRA tabs have at least three of the same file folders: “Coeus Documentation,” “Enhancement Descriptions,” and “Functional Specifications.”

j. **Confluence**: if you need access, contact Phil.

k. Kuali took some features for Confluence from Oncourse but the login will be different. The login name default is the first initial of your first name and your last name, maximum of eight characters. The password is the same but you have the option of changing it once you login.

l. Once you login to Confluence, there is a list of options on the left hand side. Each link is a “space” and is similar to the tabs used in Oncourse. On the left hand side is a list of recent changes. This side can pretty much be ignored. When KFS started, a lot of spaces were set up for them and that’s what you see on the left hand side of the screen.

m. Select the **Kuali Research Administration** for our group. After selecting it, you will see a list of pages that we went through to get where we are, at the top of the screen. They are all hyperlinked so you can return to where you were easily.

n. Each page is organized by whoever is running it. You can view the changes made with Confluence so it is easy to go back and repair something if needed.

o. In the Kuali Research Administration, it lists members of the function team, members of technical team. This page has a lot of information.

p. Under the **Functional** heading, there is the link to **Awards**.

q. If you have the ability to edit, you will have a tab at the top of the page next to “View” and “Attachments.” The edit tab allows you to change context. It pulls up the page in Rich Text and in Wiki.

r. The Awards link is the home page for our group. It has a link to the Awards email address. It also has a table with the specifications.

s. Don’t confuse our page with the Proposal/Budget development page. It has a similar layout besides having more specifications but it is not our page. Once we start filling out the specs table, the data in the boxes will be hyperlinked to open the actual Word spec docs.

t. In the Awards home page, we can add attachments with the attachment tab at the top of the page.

u. One big advantage Confluence has over Oncourse is that it has version control meaning that as we modify existing documents, instead of saving over them, Confluence will save the new document as the latest version of the document.

v. Confluence is more powerful than Oncourse – it has a steeper learning curve though. As a team, we have to decide which to use.
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w. Back to home page for KRA and open for questions
x. Do you get the feel for relevant strengths and weaknesses?
y. Susan experienced the learning curve when it comes to attaching things. So a demo of posting to Confluence – KRA-Coeus Awards subcommittee – there is a meeting page and it currently has 3 meeting agendas. So to attach an agenda with a word document, you have to be able to edit in order to put a reference. Go to attachment tab – normally it lists all available. So then pull up the browse window and find the file that you want to attach. It gives the specs of the file: size. You can also remove it (prompt to really do it?)
z. So to add it to the table: edit tab, go to wiki. You can send the word doc to Lora O’Connor and ask her to put the word doc in confluence.
aa. Once it’s in there, it’s very easy to bring up the agenda. You just click on the link and download it. This part of Oncourse works better. It would be fair to say that the changes are probably more weekly than daily and if you work with Laura or Phil, they can get whatever we want posted up there and referenced where we want it. Don’t let the fact that uploading and edit is a challenge steer you away from confluence.
bb. The Proposal and Budget development group is pretty much ignoring Oncourse except the email distribution
cc. Proposal that we table it and think it over about which to use.
dd. Lori (UA)’s observation is from KFS SME group and sees that in the beginning Confluence is harder but over time the spec docs that changes over time, it’s much easier to track changes and keep things updated on Confluence than Oncourse. It’s easier for version control and it’s where the developers are going for the most recent information.
e. From a technical side, Confluence is going to be used and the tech people will avoid Oncourse.
ff. Any others have experience with either Confluence or Oncourse

gh. Any one strongly favoring Oncourse or Confluence? Silence
ii. With proviso that Laura and Phil are available, would push for Confluence; there was a push up front to use Oncourse because it is a sister development to Kuali (sakai as a background)
jj. Susan: take the example of previous SME groups, use Oncourse to track emails and documents and use Confluence to track our documentations. We will learn together.
k. Once you’re comfortable, you’ll wonder what you ever did without it, which is the experience of everyone else. So unless we have any huge objections, we are using Confluence.
l. No objections.
2. Review of Communication Plan - Phil McKown
   a. Will post this document to both Oncourse and Confluence. This is a word document, last version was in April.
   b. This is being done at foundation level. All Kuali projects will have this available. Main thing is to try to define roles and responsibilities in Kuali projects.
   c. Project level tables: board, board chair, and their roles and responsibilities
   d. Functional Council (KxFC)
   e. All items that a project may or may not have
   f. No lead business analyst in KFS but has it in KRA
   g. Module level – that’s the team level like Awards or Conflict of Interest.
   h. We are the functional committee.
   i. All is open to change and compromise – we can adopt or ignore any of this. KRA is keeping the same general module but it’s up to us
   j. It lists what each of these roles do.
   k. Based on what we decide, we may eliminate roles and do them in another form – group with another role.
   l. Graph of what a typical team might look like. Not all boxes will be filled.
   m. General hierarchy
   n. Communications – a table that says for every type of communication whether meeting or report, there is a reason for it, this is how we do it, who should know about it….
   o. So communication plan is out to us for consideration – it may help refine us as a team or we may feel like we’re already there and we don’t need any of this. Maybe we don’t need a business analyst and we all need to roll up our sleeves and write specs.
   p. The foundation offers this as something that should be helpful. It has been modified based on experience of KFS.
   q. Will be posted on Oncourse and Confluence
   r. Susan: we did glance at it at the original meeting. There won’t be a specific business analyst, we will all write functional specs and review as a group, following the lead of other groups.
   s. Business analyst does not have to be a SME.
   t. Use this document to see where we fit into the big picture
   u. On the tech side, the team and lead developer and similar positions are not up to us anyway, is a decision made by project manager

3. Preliminary Assignments of Specification Document Tag/sTopics
   a. Tentatively assign some screens and tab for people to become very familiar to so you have something to relate to in what Laura is talking about in COEUS
b. Everyone has their logins?
c. There will probably be problems, Susan can’t add awards so try to access for us as a group to be able to do what we need to do
d. Preliminary assignment chart was done by Susan and Lora
e. Hopefully the meeting next time on the 11th will allows us to relate to what Lora is doing
f. Confluence, Awards page, Assignments tab – pages in COEUS – volunteer for a page to look at and become familiar with
   i. Arizona – Award Detail
   ii. Cornell – Contacts
   iii. MSU – Money and End Dates
   iv. The rest of assignments will be made by email offline

4. Goals for those attending next meeting
   a. Everyone see what you can and can’t do in COEUS and Susan will make sure we have appropriate access
   b. Next meeting will not be next week as it is a holiday. The 11th, Laura is going to go over the sample functional spec docs.
   c. On the 11th, Lora will do her presentation

5. Questions / Issues / Misc.

6. Roll Call
   a. See top of page 1
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Present
Arizona  John Annibal, Susan Mundt, Katie Poore, Heather Raehl, Lori Schultz, Julia Wood
IU    Tracey Levy, Lora O’Connor
Cornell  Laurie Michelman, Pam Plotkin
Coeus  Marisa Schasel (Brown U), Rob Yetter (MIT)

KRA Awards Subcommittee Phone Conference
Date: Wednesday, June 20, 2007
Time: 10:00-12:00pm (MST) / 1:00-3:00pm (EDT)
Conference Number: 812-856-3600, code 001468#
Breeze Demonstration Access: http://breeze.ltc.arizona.edu/awards/ (“Enter as guest”)

We’re here today to review the functional aspect of COEUS. The awards module is oldest. Before COEUS was a consortium, there was not a lot of support and each institute took it and ran with it so there is a lot of variation.

The basic starting point is under the maintenance. Click on a module entry point and you will be presented with a search screen. So for searching, use an asterisk to bring up everything.

Rob is starting with a proposal that he’s dummied up.

Go through Edit – new award or correct award

Choosing correct award will bring it up in edit mode

COEUS has different tabs on top, all throughout COUES is the reoccurring theme with tabs on top

COEUS Lite has nothing similar to this

The first tab is general information.

The award number is a system generated ID

Sequence number – COEUS uses the sequence number to sequence things so with NIH if it is a five year award, COEUS can mark each year as a sequence.

Status comes from a code table
A lot of the drop down menus come from code tables

From the toolbar, select Admin: code tables to see all code tables

Code Table maintenance – you can add, different things for different institutions

Sponsor number is user defined, add something in there
Account number is user defined based on your institution: currently 7 digits
NSF code is another table found under code table
Modification number is a free form field, could use it if someone goes into the award and makes an edit
Effective date – project start date – important – drives the other information found in the award
Begin date and execution date – not tied to the proposal, user defined so use is based on the institution and it doesn’t tie in to anything later down the road but the effective date does

Sponsor code comes from sponsor table – look up

Activity type is code table driven
Award type is code table driven
Account type is code table driven
DFAFS – this has been renamed “Document number” – it is used for NIH awards
Procurement Priority Code – this may relate to the way NASA ranks awards according to priority
Authorized amount – amount requested
Title: actually put in the title of the award

Effective date is the important field

Proposal Development: is where you build the proposal for submission. Once submitted, it creates institutional proposal – our record that something really was sent to the sponsor. From that, an award is created. So some data is brought over from the proposal but not all

Other header – where you can find template, which is used for reporting requirements. COEUS comes with different templates based on sponsors

By selecting a template, it populates fields – it populates terms and conditions for different types of agreements. Ie. if you’re going to submit a continuation for a
competing continuation, you need to submit it 10 months prior to the end date. It populates a contact list of who the reports need to go to at the sponsor level. Also it specifies what reports need to be submitted – intellectual property, tech management, populates terms of agreement, shows any kind of comments. So templates are all defined in COEUS, it usually is done as central office role, not something that the PIs do. They get rather complicated but it is a nice feature for award reporting. Can modify template, add comments, change terms within report, so by creating template, ensure awards by certain sponsor will be consistent in terms and such.

The area functionality hasn’t been developed over the past few years, it has taken a back seat but MIT will probably work back around to it.

Special review: IRB protocol – can go into the IRB module and pull up the IRB protocol, in which you can go to the funding source, double click on the award and see the funding source.

Investigator tab: add investigators, do a person search, unit if they are associated with a unit, whether admin or faculty, percent effort, not really good for accurate effort reporting, only keeps most recent report of effort. Rolodex allows you to add someone from outside your institution – so you can add anyone that is not an employee of your institution, so if you’re contracting out, you can list them in rolodex

Credit split under principal investigator, allows you to split credit between investigators or units – you might want to split space usage, intellectual, financial, awards, - all defined in code table

NSF code table, you can modify through the application, schools can add in

Credit split, do recognition – you can do so it adds up to 100% or not. You can give credit to someone not an employee – like someone from the rolodex. The credit split doesn’t tie back in to COEUS. If you broke out space usage for credit, you could use it to run reports – to compare value of award to space usage.

External to the unit may mean something to data user but not to COEUS. COEUS does not disallow external individuals from being anything

Administrators – track who’s responsible for the award within the department. So you could see what admin was responsible for the award
Subcontract – add organizations in, do a search for an organization – no check in the subcontracts page, at least in the top part because it doesn’t tie out to anything.

Other tab: shows up throughout the application, you can custom design elements in COEUS. Used by COEUS for allowing schools to add values or controls or fields within an award record. So we could add a field called test, you can name it, specify data type, make it required or not, give it a lookup value, default value – can customize it per institution. So then go back into the Other tab and actually see the new field.

Other tab allows you to customize the data, which can be used for reporting purposes

Under details menu on menu bar, look at cost sharing
You can track cost sharing – under the award detail tab. The cost Sharing fields are not tied to anything – source and destination accounts have no validation checks

In same place, find IDC
Indirect costs – you can specify source and destination accounts, no validations.

In same place, find Payment Schedule
This allows you to write in when you expect to receive awards form the sponsor – useful if you’re expecting annual payments

These are all add-ons, so it’s not required that you use them (Cost Sharing, IDC, Payment Schedule)

Other items under the detail tab:
Science code – throws a lot of people off, but can be used for reporting purposes, search for key words for reporting purposes

Sponsor Funding Transfer – if sponsor changes, you can capture that

Approved Equipment – is free form fields, add whatever you like

Approved Foreign Trips

Funding Proposals

The information in the drop down detail list is not found in any of the other panels (in the tabs across the top). But it can be captured through reporting
There is an award notice that you can print with some information. You can’t access this info in the tabs, has to be accessed through details. You can print the report, you can also export to excel. This report shows the details that were entered. One way to capture the information

Money and End dates – most confusing tab in the application
Possible award hierarchy concept: 5 budget periods within a R01
So sequence 1 would be assigned to year one with modifications made within
Sequence two is another and may have modifications within it. For R01’s each sequence would be a year. It also has a child award feature so you can have Task Orders, which could be a child award of the overall award

Obligated amount – budget period amount – just put in the one year, total anticipated – total award expected. Obligation dates – are budget dates. Effective date – project beginning.

With obligated and anticipated amounts, you can use that to see how much is spent per year. Distributed is what you spent, allows you to see what you have left

Schools use awards modules in different ways, some care about just the obligated

The F&A window allows you track you IC – total indirect and direct must add up to the amount obligated for that period

If you have a deobligation modification – look in history for award, in sequence two – added on an award of $10,200 to the original $10,200. If you wanted to reduce by $200 – go into the obligated amount section, put in “-200” – then that shows in the funding history for award, brings down the obligated amount by that amount.

Budget screen (button on right hand side) comes from proposal budget for a start. One possible scenario: submit proposal to sponsor, sp comes back and offers 80% of our request. With COEUS, we can enter the award and pull in original budget with the account number for the institution. You can modify the budget to make the adjustment that the government made and then approve and submit the budget – that would be the beginning of your ability to start tracking expenses against the award.

Budget module created by Princeton and rolled into COEUS by MIT. Using a budget is probably a good way to track the award.
Sequence two but action 3. Each sequence can have different actions within that sequence.

To get actuals, take the highest sequence number and the highest action number – that should give the most accurate amount.

If you have done sequence 2, you can’t go back and edit sequence 1.

New entry: to indicate subsequent periods of funding. If it’s the third year, we need to enter the next year.

Edit, new entry – bring info from the last sequence into a new record so take from sequence 2 to build sequence 3. Anticipated funding should not change as well as final expiration date because those are for the whole project periods.

History now shows the third sequence and increases the total obligation amount. Anticipated hasn’t changed. So we have the total anticipated left to distribute.

Requesting a subaccount before the award comes - COEUS is there to capture what the sponsor has actually funded. So if a department uses a subaward to purchase things before the award comes – some flexibility to do it – set up an award with a -0001 or -0002 attached to it. It can be an award unto itself or not. You can adjust the templates so it has no terms and it would never come up in reporting.

The system would allow you to let each subaccount have its own funding source (NSF, NIH). The main restriction is that the child dollar amount cannot exceed the parent. So you could have a $1mil for parent and then break down to how it is in the different funding types with the subs.

Based on the template, it states what reports are due when.

Notebook – available throughout the award. It can be used to track progress of award or for whatever you want to use it for.

Restricted view – can be restricted to be viewed only by central office.

Maintenance – funding proposal – build a link – specify what proposal(s) are funding an award. You can have more than one proposal funding an award. You can also have one proposal funding multiple awards.
You can link a child to a parent. You can attach your institutional task order to each child.

No cost extensions – typically, since it’s not an increase in funding, it gets recorded in the Money and End Date screen and edit on the sequence, change the obligation exp end date by amount of NCE. This does not flow down to the children – you have to do it manually. It will show up as an action under a sequence but will not show any dollar amounts. You can then enter a notepad entry to say what happened. You can build it in so you can capture that in your reports.

Each institution should define for themselves what constitutes a new sequence. For reporting purposes, it’s hard to include NCEs in that.

What information is brought over from the institutional proposal: select proposal – it pulls up title, sponsor, investigators (not key persons – consider in the design). Grants.gov handles the PI/Co-PI confusion. So on award side, key personnel doesn’t get transferred over. Money won’t get brought over. Neither will templates. The thinking is that things change between submission to award. Force people doing the data entry to report what the notice actually says. So template is now blank. You can select a template and that will then populate fields. Prime sponsor field under other header – if there’s only one sponsor – not going through another institution (tiered), it should show one sponsor. If it is tiered through Duke or someone, the prime sponsor would be NSF, then the sponsor would be Duke. These are table driven. Institutions can populate their own table. If the sponsor/prime sponsor is not in the table, you should stop and add it here. This would be a central office role. You can’t generate a new sponsor form the template page.

The sponsor list will be generated from the institution’s legacy list. So adding a new sponsor should not happen frequently.

Most of the Award Detail is required. Required fields: Award detail tab: status, award type, account type, sponsor code, title, basis and method of payment, final expiration date (Other header) a type of template - if you don’t do a template, you can specify your own reporting requirements, contact header – basic information; PI; other tab – you can specify that certain things are required. Weren’t able to save until all that data was entered. In the event that you had to walk away from your desk in the middle, you would lose the date you entered.

If you have a catastrophic exit, COEUS will maintain a lock on the record but it’s not smart enough to do an incremental save – doesn’t put the info you’ve entered into a temporary buffer. Users in COEUS can release their own lock. So if you have a
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proposal open in another screen, it won’t let you open it in edit mode unless you unlock it. It didn’t try to do any kind of save before it released the lock so if something happens, you will lose that info. It may be possible to have an enhancement that the computer would do incremental saves while letting the user know. But when COEUS was made, that was seen as prohibitive space wise.

COEUS Lite does a save as you move from page to page – handles much better than the premium.

Kuali has the interface that it does save as you move from tab to tab.

In proposal development, you may be submitting the same thing over and again with little variation but the award is based on the record that came before it. You can use subsequent funding. If you do Edit, new entry, it brings over all the info from the previous sequence but disallows you to access the previous sequence. You can’t delete records. They can be inactivated. It doesn’t change the proposal it just marks it as inactive. Once a proposal has been linked to an award that info becomes superseded by the information in the actual award. The only thing you really get off the proposal and reason for the link is the award doesn’t capture if it’s a new; non-competing cont….. That is captured in the institutional proposal, not in the award.

Security as these thing get locked: COEUS is role driven. Red roles are central office roles. You can give someone of a lower level different roles. Or just view award. That lets them look at it. You can’t lock an award so only a certain group can/can’t see it.

There is no history of activity per segment so you can track what your people are working on. There is a time stamp so you can see when the last update happened in the award. It can tell you some of certain fields – like money coming in a certain time period. But it doesn’t break it down by an individual. It doesn’t tell you the individual that did a certain action. You can run a delta report that tells you what changed between sequences. That would be done per report though so still no easy way to track what one individual did.

Delta report makes a form showing the changes made. The asterisks show what actually changed. It doesn’t provide the detail though.

No routing built into the award module. Routing is done by paper or email. Routing will be coupled with another release. You wouldn’t expect PI to come here and get routing information. This part of COEUS functionality not really meant for PI’s. That would have to be built outside of COEUS.
COEUS Lite has a ‘my reports’ section. We should be able to do a similar thing in COEUS premium to allow PI’s to keep track of their awards. It could include an image of the award documents. The hard part would be to have the system identify the PI and send the notice to them. It’s not hard to put the notice in a pdf.

Goals for next week – play with COEUS and get familiar with it.
KRA Award SME Group
June 13, 2007

Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>John Annibal, Susan Mundt, Katie Poore, Heather Raehl, Paul Sandoval, Lori Schultz, Julia Wood, Marcel Villalobos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Tracey Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSU</td>
<td>Lisa Oliva, Ann Spalding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>Tammy Custer, Pam Plotkin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is a SME subcommittee?
SME: Subject Matter Expert – hopefully experts in the field and bring expertise to the group
Review approve and deliver functional requirements
Write specs and turn around and provide it to developers
Look at mock screens that the developers are creating
Use COEUS screens itself and write the specifications
Have discussions
Document enhancement requests
The process of reviewing, approving, and delivering functional requirements will require the most time, deciding the functionality, what items are not functioning as they should

Roles and Responsibilities: Kuali work plan, just gives a hierarchy of Kuali as a whole

Lead SME is the primary functional contact for the committee, the team leader of the group, Susan Mundt, will be working with development manager, as things are written, the functional manager will bring info to Susan and Susan will take it back to the group. She will act to keep us on track and bring up concerns or questions. She’ll write in topics for the next meeting as part of the agenda. May be the testing coordinator – but may not because it is time consuming

The group works as a committee, each school has one vote, if we find functionality peace that is missing, we write it up and it goes to the functional counsel.

Business Analyst – work horse of the group, write functional specification based on legacy. Basically writes the functional specifications, working with development managers and lead SME to make sure that everything is documented and that the developers know what they are supposed to be coding

Testing Coordinator – doesn’t come into play until later in the project when we actually have something to test. The QA period will probably start around April 1st – a couple months before the QA period, testing happens and members from each school helps test for bugs and reports and the developers adjust. We want all the bugs out before it gets released.
Business Analyst: historically was one person. KRA has deviated from that. They’ve broken this role out in the group. Each school has broken out the responsibility to write the functionality. So unless one school has about a ½ FTE to donate to the Kuali Project, it needs to be split out among the schools. IRB and Proposal have done it so they spread out the work which leads to individual ownership of the documents. When only one person was doing it, we weren’t getting very good feedback on the documents. With splitting it out, it’s moving forward faster and we’re getting better feedback. If someone wants to be the Business Analyst, that’s fine. But if we don’t have a single person for the group, it will be distributed among the group. The Proposal group has been given a list of functional specifications and people volunteer for the ones they want and whatever’s left is assigned out. First draft is not the final draft so it doesn’t have to be perfect. Lara O’Conner will be helping out. The developers will be helping when it is needed. COEUS spec writers help as well. There is a template for us to follow, and it gets easier as we go.

If someone does not have COEUS access, send email to address listed on Agenda, they’ll give you a login. That lets you play with COEUS lite and premium. We have to become experts in COEUS.

Another demo: during our meeting times, we will schedule a COEUS demo before we start writing the specifications. After the demo we can go and play around in COEUS. We need to know the functionality forwards and backwards. Please have your COEUS login by the next meeting. If we can’t do a demo next meeting, we’ll show the tools used in Kuali – Oncourse and Confluence, which are both used as a means to talk to each other and share documents, gives a chance for everyone to review it. Next week, those two docs will be showed. Make sure that you have access to Oncourse and Confluence. Next meeting will be a breeze session. It will show Paul’s desktop and we can see the same thing.

Access to COEUS, will get an email from IU from Phil. Create a guest account before you create your normal access. Just follow the instructions in the email. Tell Phil, Lori, Paul or Susan if you have problems

Lara O’Connor – questions person. Will do the next meeting on Oncourse and Confluence if we can’t demo COEUS.

Problems with this meeting time? Silence indicates no problems.

UI Group: user interface; issue of going from COEUS to Kuali, which has a different look and feel so we’re dealing with a user interface. UI group is a group of individuals that look at how we can take the COEUS product and put it into Kuali. The group talks about issues, suggest improvements, give suggestions. UI is made up of html brought into it by the developers.

Time line for award: we have proposal development, budget, award, conflict of interest groups. It has to be determined where they all fit in with each other. We can start on
specs, learn, establish dates within the next month. The Award group can go a little bit slower in writing the spec docs and make sure everyone understands.

Lead SME for each school. If it comes down to a vote or decision, this person votes and we need to know that the person voting is the correct person to vote. We don’t want to find out later that someone wasn’t authorized to make the vote.

MSU: Craig
Indiana: Tracy
Arizona: Susan
Cornell: Lori Michalman

Lara created some confluence pages for the KRA Award group. The agenda was posted on the confluence page.

The look and feel of that confluence SME page is pretty close to consistent with other pages. Eventually this particular SME group might have additional pages with other information. Once we have the informational session to show how to work with Oncourse and confluence, it will put everyone in a better place to work with it.

No business analyst, everyone chips in. Unless someone wants to volunteer. Everyone takes little chunks to work it out. The real benefit is that all group members are engaged in it.

Goal for next meeting: get COEUS access. From this week’s agenda, we will not be reviewing functional specifications. We’ll get to it after the first COEUS demo. Paul, Lori, and Susan will try to set up a demo will send out an agenda for the next meeting.

Once we get started on the actual functionality specifications, everyone will have a lot more to say.

Everyone needs to learn COEUS if they’re going to be successful in the group.

The time we met today will be the regularly scheduled meeting time and Arizona will be sending out the agenda for the next meeting.