**What is your proposal submission deadline?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Berkeley</th>
<th>UCSF</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Five working days before the sponsor’s due date. | Because it is the Central Office’s responsibility to prepare, review and submit applications: Per the Service Partnership Agreement:  
- Final budget and administrative components with draft research to route for chair approval 8 full business days prior  
- Submit final budget and administrative components with draft research to SO for review and approval 5 days prior to the deadline.  
- PI to provide final science to RSC at least 3 full business day prior to deadline  
- Submit final proposal to sponsor on PI’s behalf – recommend at least 48h prior to deadline  

**NOTE:** deadline can vary if the sponsor’s location affects the due date and time (e.g. sponsor in the U.K. is 8 hours ahead of the U.S.) | Five full business days in advance of the sponsor’s due date. |
**UC Berkeley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What does a review entail?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is the central office responsible for checking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What elements are checked and when are the elements checked? Checked more than once? If yes, when?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review depends on the “priority” level of the proposal. New campus guidance divides proposals into first, second, and third priority levels based on when the proposal is submitted to SPO:

- **First Priority:** Proposals with a final administrative section and a final or draft technical section received by SPO at least five business days before the sponsor’s deadline with the final/corrected technical and administrative sections received by SPO at least 16 business hours before the sponsor’s deadline.

- **Second Priority:** Proposals with a final administrative section and a final or draft technical section received by SPO at least five business days before the sponsor’s deadline with the final/corrected technical and administrative sections received by SPO received 8-16 business hours before the sponsor’s deadline.

- **Third Priority:** Proposals that miss the five business day deadline and/or are received in final form by SPO less than 8 business hours before the sponsor’s deadline.

First and Second Priority proposals will receive normal review and submission assistance from SPO. Normal review includes:

- Making sure all institutional issues are addressed (see below)
- Review of budget for F&A/FB rates/allowable costs

**UCSF**

Because it is the Central Office’s responsibility to prepare, review and submit applications:

**RSC Responsibility**

- Review FOA for specific agency/program guidelines and terms & conditions and provide guidance to PI
- RSC works with PI/dept staff to develop proposal and guide PI/dept staff to ensure appropriate guideline/requirements are met during proposal development
- RSC peer review prior to submission to SO (manager or certified RSC based on level of certification)

**Signing Officer Responsibilities**

- Review FOA for specific agency/program guidelines and terms & conditions
- Review administrative components (required by Sponsor and University requirements)
- Review budget and budget justification
- Check when PI and Dept. Chair reviews have been completed and upon routing to SO*. Manager conducts final review and submits.
  *SO can be Managers or Certified RSC.

**Stanford**

Review depends on when the proposal is received.

A proposal received ≥5 **full business days** in advance of the sponsor’s due date must include all proposal components and be released in the relevant sponsor portal as applicable. The administrative components of the proposal must be complete and final; however the policy allows for the technical components to be in draft form and finalized up to 3 full business days in advance of the sponsor’s due date. If the finalized technical components miss the 3 day deadline, the proposal is placed back into the queue and the clock restarts.

Proposals received ≥ 5 **full business days** in advance of the sponsor’s due date are given priority review, including:

- Review ahead of proposals submitted with < 5 days
- Detailed review of budget and justification
- Ensuring all components are compliant with sponsor and University policies
- Detailed review to ensure that all sponsor guidelines/requirements have been addressed and met
- Feedback and comments provided to the PI/department

Components reviewed at the 5-day deadline are not reviewed again when the technical components are uploaded.

Proposals received with <5 **full business days** in advance of the sponsor’s due date are reviewed on a “first in, first out” basis and are not allowed to cut in line of other proposals or other existing commitments.
• Ensuring all sponsor’s proposal requirements are met
• Ensuring administrative and technical sections match
• Ensuring e-submission errors have been corrected

Third Priority proposals must be approved by the VCRO and will be reviewed for institutional issues only. These proposals will be submitted “as is” but only after any institutional issues have been corrected. Institutional issues include:

• Documentation of any pledged cost sharing
• Use of appropriate F&A and fringe benefit rates
• Signed commitment forms for all named subrecipients
• Completed State and/or Federal Conflict of Interest disclosure forms (if applicable)
• Acceptance of terms or commitments at the proposal stage that would obligate the university financially or programmatically at the award stage.

CGOs should not have to re-review the administrative section of a proposal after the final technical section is submitted—although in practice this does occur.

These proposals receive an expedited review which, at minimum, includes review for:

• Compliance with University policies; and
• Issues that would physically prevent submission (i.e. system errors)

Proposals received with ≤2 full business days in advance of the sponsor’s due date will not be submitted.

We do not have a waiver/exception process.
### Under what circumstances is a proposal returned? Does it start the clock again?

**Draft/Final Technical Section:** There should be no blank spaces or placeholders in the technical section submitted. The CGO should have access to all of the technical information needed to review the administrative sections of the proposal. This may vary by proposal. CGO’s use their own judgment in making this determination.

**Administrative Section:** All administrative sections required by the sponsor (e.g., does not include the Subrecipient Commitment or COI forms) must be present with no placeholders, blank spaces, or “TBDs.”

### UC Berkeley

- Errors in compliance, budget, sponsor requirements, and personnel designations that do not conform to University policy/sponsor requirements. Returned to RSC and PI for corrections. Applications are submitted after corrections are completed.
- Does not restart the clock.

### UCSF

- Incomplete: A proposal submitted to OSR must include all required components and be released in the applicable sponsor portal (i.e. Fastlane). To be considered complete it must be received by OSR through a Proposal and Development Routing Form (PDRF) and:
  - If received with ≥5 full business days before the sponsor’s due date
    - All administrative components must be final
    - Technical components may be in draft form but must be finalized 3 full business days before the sponsor’s due date.
  - If received with <5 full business days before the sponsor’s due date, all components must be final

**Administrative components include:**
- Sponsor required non-technical components
- An internal budget and budget justification
- All relevant approved waivers (i.e. IDC, PI)
- All required Subaward documentation (i.e. Commitment Form, budget, CV’s, etc.)

Proposals that do not meet the requirements above are returned and the clock resets.

### Stanford

- Late: If the proposal is received with ≤ 2 full business days in advance of the sponsor’s due date, the proposal is returned and will not be submitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Berkeley</th>
<th>UCSF</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **How do you maintain consistency from review to review? From reviewer to reviewer?** | **Because it is the Central Office’s responsibility to prepare, review and submit applications the following practices are in place to ensure consistency in reviews and reviewers:** | The PDRF collects proposal information including: PI, sponsor, submission method, approvals, waivers, project specific details, and relevant documents. OSR utilizes a two-level approach to review the proposal. First, Contract & Grant Associates (CGAs) intake the proposal and complete a preliminary review based on our internal Proposal Processing Checklist.
Following the CGA review, the proposal is reassigned to a Contract & Grant Officer (CGO) for review and submission. CGOs review based on analysis of the specific solicitation and applicable sponsor guidelines (i.e. SF424 R&R or GPG). While the basic elements of review are consistent, different CGOs may approach a review differently based on variables such as the timeliness of the proposal or past experiences with a particular sponsor, department or PI.
We share information and discuss issues/concerns during team meetings, internal training, and interactions with partner groups. Knowledge/experience is also transferred between mentors and mentees as well as through daily communication amongst the team. |
| Risk Assessment Form is completed by a CGO for each proposal and can be used by other CGOs when reviewing the proposal file. Proposal guidance is provided to CGOs in Box and during CGO staff meetings. Knowledge transfer occurs between mentors and assigned mentees. | • Standard internal compliance checks are completed in eProposal and must be completed in order to initiate the proposal preparation process. (PI Status, COI, Human and Animal usage, cost sharing, general PI and proposal information, etc.)
• Reviews include guidelines of sponsor FOAs
• Peer review of applications
• Bi-weekly announcements - communicate OSR updates/reminders/clarification of processes, NIH updates, updates/changes from other departments (e.g., Controller’s Office, Academic Affairs, Compliance & Ethics) that affect proposal prep and review or award acceptance
• Monthly Training: budgeting workbook, Salesforce CACTAS; and eProposal
• Trainers attend Team Meetings monthly
• 3 x year RA-101 policy driven, 8-session training,
• Intranet: electronic SOP, includes quick guides and FAQs, shared support documents.
• Certification Exams (3 levels)
• Information sharing/discuss issues, using Salseforce CACTAS Chatter, managers group emails, Managers attend bi-weekly leadership meeting. | |
What issues do you encounter specific to proposals submitted to foreign sponsors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Berkeley</th>
<th>UCSF</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Timing and time differences</td>
<td>• Terms &amp; conditions and legal requirements accepted at proposal stage (if insufficient time proposal is submitted with the understanding with PI/dept. that the University retains right to reject award if restrictive non-negotiable terms were accepted at submission)</td>
<td>• IDC rates lower than our Negotiated Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of or late receipt of all necessary information for proposal submission</td>
<td>• Foreign sponsors that do not provide any F&amp;A – requires PI to submit a vital interest waiver to the University’s recovery policy</td>
<td>• Time differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currency differences and conversion issues</td>
<td>• Foreign sponsor limits the amount of F&amp;A, which will require and exception to the University’s recovery policy</td>
<td>• Currency conversion issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language barriers</td>
<td>• Foreign sponsor (nonprofits) that don’t require institutional signature on proposals and PI’s submit without OSR assistance or review</td>
<td>• Language barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation of terms in RFP’s or other guidance documents or legislation</td>
<td>• Deviation from university policy (e.g. differing IP and Publication policies), as well as U.S. policy (e.g. Export Controls).</td>
<td>• Lack of specific guidelines/requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign exchange rate, invoicing and payment requirements.</td>
<td>• Interpretation/application of guidelines/requirements/terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign sponsors that require signed document by the deadline.</td>
<td>• Late notification of funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foreign sponsor front loads all administrative requirements (e.g. board members, audit information, institutional descriptions)</td>
<td>• Awards issued without a formal, institutionally approved proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of different terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy differences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>