Compensation Compliance under Uniform Guidance – Where Are We Now?

Lisa Mosley, Executive Director, Yale University

David Ngo, Associate Provost, The New School
Overview

• Purpose: Consistency in interpretation and practice
• Premise:
  – Faculty realities – perspective and understanding
  – Regulatory distinctions between cost principles and administrative requirements
  – Business models for budgeting and compliance
• System of Internal Controls – holistic approach
• Internal Control Framework
• Update on an implementation
• UG revision impact to 200.430

Fundamental Disconnect

• Faculty are not hourly employees
• UG 200.430 focuses on work activities and compensation
• Salary cost estimates are made at time of proposal (IBS)
• Salary expenses are reported in financial reports (IBS – and budgets are finite)
• ‘Person months’, in the context of time, are reported on Other Support/Current and Pending (Time)
• RPPR asks if ‘level of effort’, in the context of time (time devoted), will be reduced by 25% or more in the next budget period

Salary Time Work activities
Faculty Perspective: Inexplicably Intermingled Activities

Key Aspects of 200.430

- Flexibility of institutional policies and internal controls to efficiently and effectively meet the cost principles.
- Institutional Definition of IBS
- IBS reflects total compensation and work-related activities under contract
  - **Allowable Activities**: Charges may include reasonable amounts for activities contributing directly to the work, such as delivering special lectures about the project, writing reports and articles, developing and maintaining protocols, managing research materials or project-specific data, participating in seminars, consulting with colleagues and graduate students, and attending meetings or conferences (h)(i).
- Documentation standards apply to compensation charged to federal projects
- Charges for worked performed cannot exceed the proportionate share of IBS for the period reviewed
- Budget Estimates/Interim Charges until confirmed reasonable for the work performed by the after-the-fact review – the final amount charged must be accurate.
Internal controls for compensation should function as a holistic system in support of allowable compensation on federal awards.

- Salary allocations via Payroll
- Salary cap restrictions (IBS)
- Cost Transfer and Approvals
- Payroll Review and Reconciliation
- Funding source expiration date
- Ensures certification of all federally-funded awards
- Annual Certification based on award budget year anniversary
Internal Controls

- Annual certification reports prepared and are available in a timely manner
- Stakeholders appreciate detailed payroll information available for review on a quarterly basis
- Adjustments, corrections, and revisions identified and implemented on a quarterly basis (rather than an ad hoc basis)
- Strengthened Internal Controls

Cohort Internal Control Framework

System Controls
- ERP/SYSTEM DRIVEN
  1. IBS Policy, Pay Codes
  2. 100% IBS is identifiable
  3. Allocation of 100% IBS sources
  4. Pay within Project Period
  5. Cost Transfers identify earning period

Payroll Process Controls
- ESTIMATE PAYROLL
  6. Initial allocation of payroll
  7. Allocation review and approval
- REVIEW PAYROLL
  8. Reconciliations
  9. Payroll Reports
  10. After-the-fact review (charged estimates determined accurate)
- ADJUST PAYROLL
  12. Reallocate estimates or charges
  13. Cost Transfers of payroll already reviewed for accuracy
  14. Cost Transfer over 90 days of payroll determined accurate
  15. Extra Compensation review and approval

Institutional Controls
- ENFORCEMENT CONTROLS
  16. Cost Transfer restrictions if controls failed
  17. Spending restrictions for non-compliance
- ADMINISTRATIVE (NON-FINANCIAL) CONTROLS
  18. Agency Salary Cap restrictions
  19. Committed Cost Sharing
  20. Minimum deviation of time
  21. Reduction of 25% PI/PD time
- COMPLIANCE MONITORING
  22. Confirm controls work as intended or perform additional controls for higher risk processes
- EDUCATION AND TRAINING
  23. Responsibilities of individuals performing controls are understood
System Controls

1. Institutional Base Salary (IBS) and Supplemental Pay Codes
   – Institutional Definition
   – Exclusions
   – Administrative appointments
   – Practice Plan

2. 100% IBS Limitation
   – Appointment Types

3. 100% IBS Allocation
   – Transparency
   – Security concerns
System Controls

4. Compensation within Project Period
   – Impact to review interval

5. Payroll Reallocation/Correction data attributes can properly identify the earnings period for compensation.

Payroll Allocation

6. Initiation of Salary Allocation (basis for the budget estimate)
   – Who determines

7. Salary Allocation Review and Approval
Payroll Review

8. Payroll Reconciliation
   – Who performs, how often, time to complete

9. Payroll Reports
   – How often, type of review and data presented

Payroll Review

10. After-the-fact Review
    – Basis for review (IBS/Time/Effort)
    – Review Interval
    – Scope (federal, 200.430, other)
    – Who completes
    – Type of attestation (certification, confirmation, other)
Payroll Review

11. Coordination of individual compensation review if on multiple projects
   – Process, methodology

12. Salary Reallocation of Budget Estimates and Interim Charges (before attestation of after-the-fact review)
   – Are these defined as cost transfers?

Payroll Review

13. Salary Corrections (payroll correction is made due to error - not part of control environment such as a reallocation of payroll for charges already reviewed for accuracy in the after-the-fact review)
   – Documentation requirements, timing
Payroll Review

14. Salary Corrections made to salary expenditures after they were determined to be reasonably accurate should be performed within a reasonable time period (e.g. errors should be corrected within 90 days upon discovery) and be justifiable against a higher level of scrutiny
   – Limitations to allow. Policy / Procedure requirements

Payroll Review

15. Extra/Other Compensation review (200.430: Includes Incentive compensation, Intra-institution consulting payments and Extra service pay)
   – Process, review requirements
Enforcement

16. Policy or procedure to restrict cost transfers that are detrimental to the federal sponsor if they are made later than institutional policy (e.g. 90 days upon discovery or after certification (if applicable)) or after a final financial statement has been submitted

17. Freezing of funds for noncompliance

18. Institution escalation process

Administrative

19. Accounting for Salary-Cap restrictions to compensation
   - Unallowable cost to be accounted for in organized research base
   - Procedures and impact for displaying in after-the-fact review

20. Committed Cost Sharing
   - Procedures to capture, account for and ensure allowability.
   - Display and impact to IBS in the after-the-fact review
Administrative
(Not based on charges to project)

21. Minimum Devotion of Time
   – Reference to regulations not in effect (A-21) via FAQ for Pre-award requirements
   – How to capture?
   – Meaningful?

22. Reduction of Time Devoted to award by PI/PD of 25% or more (include disengagement from research 3 months or more)
   – Prior Approval Requirement – related to programmatic performance
   – Where is time devoted to award
   – Project period or annual budget cycle?

Monitoring

23. Monitoring
   In the absence of the controls above or to confirm that they are effective, various monitoring reports or activities can be developed to identify control failures, exceptions, or errors. These can vary widely and are highly dependent upon the resources, systems, and risk tolerance of an institution. Monitoring activities may be routine (e.g. monthly) and as part of the standard control framework or periodic (e.g. yearly) to test the effectiveness of specific controls. System automated controls designed to prevent errors may be a stronger form of a control because they may have fewer possibilities of errors. These may eventually be a low enough risk to not require additional monitoring once established that they are performing properly and as intended.
Education and Training

24. Education and Training

PIs, departments, and staff are aware or adequately trained to understand their roles and responsibilities to the varying controls that apply to them. In addition, those that are confirming the accuracy of payroll should have an understanding of the basic concepts and requirements included in the UG for compensation. Education and training may be provided in the form of presentations, web content, webinars, personal interviews or other formats. Individual tracking of training is not a requirement.

Some Institutions who have transitioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Texas - Dallas</th>
<th>University of NC - Charlotte</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas – San Antonio</td>
<td>George Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas – Arlington</td>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New School</td>
<td>Michigan Technology University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Buffalo</td>
<td>NYU Langone Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of TX - Southwestern</td>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis – UG Compensation Compliance Using ATE

Institutions that have implemented UG Compensation Compliance (with ATE) + Institutions that are implementing Cohort UG Compensation Compliance (with ATE):

- N=44
- 64% are Carnegie R1
- 66% are Large (Carnegie Size/Setting)
- Ave student population = 20,699
- Max student population = 51,525
- Ave research expenditures = $387 Million
- Max research expenditures = $1.4 Billion
- Ave HERD survey ranking = 102
- 3 institutions are in top 10 HERD ranking
- 26 schools are public, 18 schools are private
- 20% of institutions are academic medical centers (with average research expenditures of $275M)

Blueprint for Strategic Action & Implementation Roadmap

(Email Cohort to receive a copy)
2018 Summary of Benefits - Presented by Schools Who Have Already Transitioned to an Alternative to Effort

- UTD
  - Reduced certifications per year from 2026 to 430
  - Reduced faculty burden, easier for faculty to complete
  - Audit results: the organization has a formal system to track time and effort of employees associated with the grant. Overall, university policies and procedures regarding time and effort reporting meet the requirements of Uniform Guidance and are functioning as intended; however, opportunities exist to ensure improved timeliness and appropriate reviewer access.
  - Completed OIG audit without findings
  - Completed DCAA desk audit of revised DS2

- MTU
  - Reduced certifications per year from 6700 to 620
  - Improved % certifications not returned on time from 55% to 0%
  - Audit results: determined controls were adequate, return rates improved considerably, interviews confirmed less administrative burden and turn around time to complete was decreased
  - Completed OIG audit without findings

- UTA
  - Increased faculty understanding of the process and what they are reviewing
  - Department staff are utilizing monthly reports – better, more robust information than previously available
  - Fewer resources required to centrally oversee the process

- UK
  - Reduced certifications per year from 11,500 to 1,800
  - Improved communication between faculty, department and central admin
  - True reduction in administrative burden for faculty,
  - Reduced faculty burden (less time spent, easier to do)
  - Improved internal controls

- CSU
  - Reduced total quarterly certifications from 2,700 to less than 1,700
  - Reduced administrative burden in monitoring/notifying

---

Reduction of Burden from Alternatives to Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UTD</th>
<th>MTU</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of certifications before ATE</td>
<td>2026/year</td>
<td>6700/year</td>
<td>2,700/quarter</td>
<td>11,500/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of certifications after ATE</td>
<td>430/year</td>
<td>620/year</td>
<td>&lt;1,700/quarter</td>
<td>1,800/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of faculty burden? Less time to complete and more understanding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty approval of ATE?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved overall internal controls?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 Summary of Benefits - Presented by Schools Who Have Already Transitioned to an Alternative to Effort

Arizona State
- Improved processing time.
- Achieved system documentation.
- Audit results: multiple sponsors have accepted ATE as new process for IG compliance.
- PI’s determined the system and process is easy to follow.
- PI's demonstrate positive feedback when communicating with Central Office.
- Faculty commented that ATE is reasonable, accurate and trackable.
- Audit results: internal audit determined the system of internal controls follow UG.

UNC Charlotte
- Improved timeliness in processing.
- System documentation achieved.
- Audit results: multiple sponsors have accepted ATE as new process for IG compliance.
- PI’s determined the system and process is easy to follow.
- PI's demonstrate positive feedback when communicating with Central Office.
- Faculty commented that ATE is reasonable, accurate and trackable.
- Audit results: internal audit determined the system of internal controls follow UG.

UT Arlington
- Informal, anecdotal feedback has been positive from both faculty and staff.
- Faculty understand the process and what they are reviewing better.
- Department administrative staff are utilizing the monthly reports - better, more robust, more user-friendly information.
- Fewer resources required centrally to oversee.
- Audit results: passed program specific audit by external auditor, NSF desk reviews, TX State agency program audit, Dept of Commerce program review, internal audit review.

NYU Langone Health
- PI’s very responsive and observant in verifying the accuracy of personnel expenses on their projects.
- Improved timeliness of payroll corrections.
- Improved accuracy of expenditure reporting to sponsors.
- Decreased burden from 33,000 certs/year to 1,900 certs/year.
- 94% reduction in # of certs in FY19.
- Thousands of hours of admin burden saved
- Improved monitoring infrastructure for better compliance.
- Salary allocations are reviewed and results are discussed on a regular basis.
- Timeliness of allocations and/or adjustments are monitored and recorded. Quarterly metrics detail all retroactive salary adjustments are distributed to dept admins.
- Achieve strong system of internal controls.
- Timely accuracy of financial reporting.
- Reduction in administrative burden
- Audit results: PWC reviewed and no findings.

Reduction of Burden from Alternatives to Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNC-Charlotte</th>
<th>Arizona State</th>
<th>University of Georgia</th>
<th>NYU Langone Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of certifications before ATE</td>
<td>893/period</td>
<td>9,500/period</td>
<td>33,000/year</td>
<td>2,900/year (Pilot program only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of certifications after ATE</td>
<td>564/period</td>
<td>4,785/period</td>
<td>1,900/year</td>
<td>1,837/year (Pilot program only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of faculty burden? Less time to complete and more understanding?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty approval of ATE?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved overall internal controls?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quick Glance Case Study – NYU Langone Goals

- Regular review of project expenses will **decrease frequency of cost transfers** and will increase timeliness of salary changes

- **Increase accuracy of RPPRs:**
  - Percentages align with payroll records
  - Expenses are already in ledger - decreasing incorrect expense projections

Quick Glance Case Study – NYU Langone Pilot

- **9 Departments:** Biochemistry and Pharmacology, Environmental Medicine, Orthopedic Surgery, Pathology, Pediatrics, Neurology, Microbiology, Population Health and Medicine

- **Expectations:** Each department in the pilot is expected to conduct a regularly (at least quarterly) review of payroll charges for each PI in their department and provide feedback on the process as well as actions on any misallocation of salary

- **Monthly payroll verification reports sent to each department to regularly review and verify that the payroll allocation** is reflective of the work performed

- Departments can provide input and guide/influence policy on grant administration; specifically related to cost transfers and effort
Quick Glance Case Study – NYU Langone Post Award Operations

**90 Days Prior to Project End Date**
- Review the Projects Ending in 90 days in PBI.
- Using this report to confirm a balance/deficit.
- Review any mandatory Cost Share expenses and allocate as needed.
- Verify personnel and effort for budget/project period.
- Initiate prospective MSS changes and process CTs as appropriate to correct or reallocate personnel/effort.
- Contact SPA to initiate NCE or renewal as needed.
- Review PO Receipt/Match Exception Accruals.
- Review and stop recurring charges (DLAR, Telecom, Mail, Core Facilities, etc).

**60 Days Prior to Project End Date**
- Review the Projects Ending in 60 days in PBI.
- Review all expenditures on project to conform with approved budget (salaries and OTPS).
- Verify mandatory Cost Share has been properly spent.
- Follow up on submitted MSS and CTs to ensure projected spend is accurate and confirm timely approvals.
- Notify Finance to re-class any OTPS expenses within the project as appropriate.
- Review PO activities, PO Receipt and Match Exception/Accrual.
- Remind subawards of invoices due before the end of the project.

**30 Days Prior to Project End Date**
- Review the Projects Ending in 30 days in PBI.
- Confirm approval for pending MSS changes and CTs.
- Reconcile mandatory Cost Share for closure and reporting.
- Start to close out PO’s and approve all P-card transactions, follow up with Accounts Payable for any unpaid invoices.
- Confirm recurring charges have stopped.
- Review PO Receipt and Match Exception Accruals for completion.
- After the project end date, return the completed checklist to RFO by the respective deadline in the Status of Milestones Report.

Quick Glance Case Study – NYU Langone Training, Reporting, Tools, Education
UG Revisions Impacting 200.430

Any Questions?
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