



## ORSP PAF / Proposal Review Checklist

Following is ORSP's standard Proposal Approval Form (PAF) and Proposal Review Checklist. Provided a finalized proposal is received within ORSP's internal deadline, ORSP will review, verify and work with project teams to resolve issues as necessary with respect to the following items. Please note that many of these checks do not apply when sponsor guidelines are not applicable (e.g., contract negotiations).

### **Proposal Approval Form (PAF)**

- If Limited Submission, UMOR or Medical School Office of Research approval uploaded to PAF.
- Project Long Title corresponds to title on proposal.
- Relationship to previous Project/Grant, if disclosed.
- Class code is correct.
- Sponsor(s) properly identified, including Sponsor role, ID and contact information.
- Deadline is correct or is not entered when no deadline exists.
- Faculty named on PAF are listed in proposal (and vice versa).
- U-M PI eligible to serve in the role or, if not eligible, approved by Dean's Office.
- Compliance factors (e.g. animal research, human subjects) are correctly identified and correspond to proposal.
- Related agreements, both funded and unfunded, do not prohibit proposal submission.
- When disclosed to ORSP, use of third party intellectual property does not prohibit proposal submission.
- When disclosed to ORSP, use of U-M proprietary technology does not prohibit proposal submission.
- When disclosed to ORSP, encumbrances of U-M intellectual property to third parties disclosed to sponsor.
- Start/end dates correspond to proposal.
- Budget corresponds to funding requested in proposal.
- Indirect cost rate corresponds to indirect cost rate used in proposal.
- Indirect cost rate does not exceed rate appropriate to class code.
- U-M Cost Sharing, Non-U-M Cost Sharing and Other U-M Commitments correspond to proposal.
- U-M Cost Sharing, Non-U-M Cost Sharing and Other U-M Commitments documented and approved.
- If applicable, subcontractors have provided letters of commitment and, for PHS submissions and sponsors that adopt PHS practices, FCOI forms.
- Sponsor RFP, FOA, or equivalent (or applicable link, when allowed) provided.
- PI conflict of interest question answered.
- Signatures/approvals present and correct (*i.e.*, for Administrative Home, Personnel with Effort, Cost Sharing, Ineligible PI).

### **Proposal**

- When project team submits proposal via sponsor's online system, proposal information provided by project team matches information provided in the PAF.
- When ORSP submits proposal via sponsor's online system, proposal information in sponsor's system matches information provided in the PAF.
- When ORSP submits proposal via sponsor's online system, sponsor's online system available to ORSP.
- Administrative data complete and correct (e.g., EIN, DUNS, FWA, authorized official data, etc.).



- Required components of proposal included.
- Sponsor's file naming and format conventions followed.
- Page length limits observed.
- Budget compliant with sponsor guidelines/requirements, for example:
  - Sponsor's restrictions and requirements met, e.g. sponsor prohibits equipment purchases or restricts funds to student stipends.
  - Cost sharing requirements met.
  - Indirect cost rate does not exceed rate allowed by sponsor.
  - Budget items consistent with Uniform Guidance (2 CFR 200) and the Cost Accounting Standards, when applicable.
  - Uniform Guidance monitored costs appropriately justified.
- Compliance factors (e.g. animal research, human subjects) properly disclosed.
- Sponsor-required representations, certifications and other forms acceptable or modified as necessary.
- Review non-negotiable terms and agreements to obtain necessary institutional approvals for submission  
(e.g., Gates Foundation, Keck Foundation).
- Institutional approvals necessary for non-negotiable terms and conditions obtained.
- Signatures/approvals present and correct.
- Agreement negotiated prior to submission, when required (e.g., Teaming Agreements).