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The following process should be considered as Rutgers and Huron prepare to move forward with implementation.

**Discuss Huron Recommendations and Incorporate Feedback**

**Share Recommendations with Key Stakeholders**

**Plan Implementation**
- Determine Highest Priorities
- Define Project Structure
- Develop Communication Plan

**Conduct Wave 1 Implementation**
- See Steps Outlined Below

### Step Description

1. Obtain consensus to proceed with the implementation of a prioritized list of recommendations.

2. Develop a project model that will ensure effective coordination among key initiatives.

3. Develop individual project plans for those areas considered highest priority; plans should describe more specific tasks, responsibilities, timelines and deliverables, metrics to measure progress, and identify necessary resources. The PMO will establish a metrics dashboard to assess current state.

4. Develop a master work plan to understand the cumulative resource requirements, timelines and interdependencies.

5. Appoint project teams and begin execution of prioritized work plans. Create teams representative of the research community and designate leadership for each work group.

---

Note – This document is solely for Rutgers University’s information, benefit and internal use and is not intended to be, nor should be, used or relied upon by any other person or entity.
Once recommendations are prioritized, initiatives will be formed for each research administration functions. These initiatives will kick-off in Waves 1, 2 or 3. Each Wave is estimated to be four months in duration. Service to faculty, compliance, efficiency and performance metrics will be a focus of all Waves.

**Implementation Waves**

**Wave 1**
- Quick-Wins
- Visible to Faculty
- Build Momentum
- Key Enablers

**Wave 2**
- Continuation of Wave 1 initiatives
- Lengthy implementation timeline
- Reduce administrative burden
- Not as visible to faculty

**Wave 3**
- Continuation of Wave 1 and 2 initiatives
- Consolidation of committees and technology
Each area identified in Wave 1 will have a dedicated working group to discuss changes and implement new processes. The Project Management Office will oversee and provide support across all initiatives.

- **Initiative Working Groups**: Teams would implement recommended changes in the areas identified for Wave 1. Working Group participants should include central staff and local research administrators, where appropriate, as these individuals have intimate knowledge of the process, can help flush out the details of new processes and act as champions to the rest of the research community.

- **Governing Structure**: A project coordinator for each project initiative will manage working group efforts to ensure consistency of solutions and a strategic rollout plan. This will be a dual effort between Huron and the Rutgers Project Management Office.

- **Publicize and Celebrate Successes**: As quick wins are achieved, working groups would share successes with the research community and other parties while also gauging the impact through performance metrics.
The following recommendations should be considered for implementation in the first four months (Wave 1). Recommendations that will take longer than four months to implement will extend into Wave 2. Performance metrics and the ORSP-DGCA Advisory meetings will be an ongoing theme that impacts all waves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workgroup</th>
<th>High-Level Recommendations</th>
<th>Workgroup Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Submission</td>
<td>1. Update endorsement form to match streamlined RAPSS proposal submission form</td>
<td>ORSP, Local Research Administrators (LRA), DGCA (modular budgets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Enforce the 5 day deadline for proposal submission, and allow a second ORSP deadline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2-3 days) for the science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Accept modular budgets when accepted by the sponsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Management</td>
<td>1. Provide balances for RBHS novated awards</td>
<td>DGCA, LRA, OCC, ORSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Streamline review for interim reports and invoices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Implement updates to IPAS for NCEs, CFs, advance accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Develop and communicate a policy for applying fringe rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Closeout</td>
<td>1. Develop a closeout template to be shared and reconciled with local research administrators that flags questionable expenses</td>
<td>DGCA, OTC, LRA, ORSP (invention statements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Close indices in Banner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Define process for reviewing invention statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Set-up</td>
<td>1. Standardize data entry and process flow for award set-up</td>
<td>ORSP, OCC, DGCA, Regulatory Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Revise process for IRB and IACUC congruency review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Agreement Types</td>
<td>1. Develop a matrix to define award types (e.g., gift, grant, subcontract, service agreement) and identify the office that handles each award type</td>
<td>ORSP, OCC, DGCA, Procurement, RU Foundation, OTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following recommendations should be considered for implementation in the first four months (Wave 1). Recommendations that will take longer than four months to implement will extend into Wave 2. Performance metrics and the ORSP-DGCA Advisory meetings will be an ongoing theme that impacts all waves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workgroup</th>
<th>High-Level Recommendations</th>
<th>Workgroup Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Management</td>
<td>1. Develop an automated excel tool to facilitate the LOC draw and quarterly reports</td>
<td>DGCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Subrecipient Monitoring / Subaward Execution | 1. Develop a tracking tool for subaward execution  
2. Initiate outgoing subawards execution within ORSP  
3. Require the subrecipient PI signature on final invoices only for those institutions that are high risk | Subaward Team, DGCA, ORSP, OCC, Procurement                               |
| IACUC                                  | 1. Standardize processes and procedures across the IACUC committees  
2. Move to a single protocol form for all committees                                  | Regulatory Affairs                                                       |
| IRB                                    | 1. Replace “de novo” review with a continuation review  
2. Eliminate dual review for expedited studies and decouple from full board reviews     | Regulatory Affairs                                                       |
| Conflict of Interest                   | 1. Update COI review at the proposal and award stages  
2. Standardize COI review by the Research Deans and COI Committee                      | Regulatory Affairs                                                       |
| IT Task Force                          | 1. Establish a Research IT Task Force  
2. Develop an IT roadmap                                                               | ORSP, OCC, DGCA, Regulatory Affairs, Central IT                         |
| Reconciliation Projects                | 1. Reconcile backlog of A/R  
2. Reconcile LOC holding account in Banner                                                | DGCA                                                                     |
Questions