**CONFIDENTIAL**

**SP Quality Assurance (QA) Document Review, Feedback, and Coaching Form**

**Instructions:** Form to be completed in ~5-10 minutes by SP’s designated QA reviewer and emailed to SP Project Leader/Lead Writer, copying the Associate VP for Sponsored Programs, QA Administrator, and respective SP Director. The purpose of the QA feedback form is to recognize successful project management, promote continuous quality improvement, and help the SP Project Leader/Lead Writer learn from prior edits and experiences and enhance his/her document development, finalization, and submission skills—going forward.

**Date of QA**: **Initials of QA Reviewer**: **Level of QA (1-4)**:

**Total Amount of Time Required for QA**:

**Abbreviated Document Name**:

**PI/PD Name and School**: **‘**

**Funding Source**:

**External Submission Deadline**:

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Name of SP Project Leader/Lead Writer**:

**SP Level of Assistance (i.e., 1, 2, 3, or 4)**:

**Rubric**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Quantitative Feedback**: Outstanding = 5/5; Very Good = 4/5; Satisfactory = 3/5; Needs Improvement = 2/5; Unacceptable = 0-1/5; Not Applicable = N/A | |
| **Timeliness/Completeness of Cover-to-Cover Document**: Rate the timeliness of the QA submission (i.e., on routine submissions, did the SP Project Leader/Lead Writer submit a well-prepared, cover-to-cover document for QA review well ahead of the external deadline to allow for all QA corrections to be returned and made by the Project Lead, without hardship?). |  |
| **SP Service/Expertise Extended**: Rate if or how well the SP Project Leader/Lead Writer met with, coached, and/or influenced the PI/PD to develop a more competitive document (understanding the PIs/PDs have final say). |  |
| **SP Teamwork**: Rate how well the SP Project Leader/Team worked, in advance and proactively, with other SP Team members to eliminate errors/weaknesses/inconsistencies early in development—thus producing a more competitive document at QA. |  |
| **Budget Integrity**: **Part I**: Rate how well the budget sections (form pages, spreadsheets, and narrative justification, etc.) met the guidance and supported the methodology/research plan and project narrative. **Part II**: Rate whether the budget numbers computed correctly and if they were consistently cross-referenced in the application. | Part I: |
| Part II: |
| **Guideline Compliance**: Rate how well the document responded to all applicable guidelines/instructions and especially the review criteria (i.e., within the Program Announcement, SF424R&R, PHS398, funding agency guidance/template). If/where applicable, were funding priorities/preferences well integrated and maximized? **Briefly list any guideline issues, discrepancies, and/or omissions found:** |  |
| **Overall Document Quality**: **Part I**: Aside from routine/surface QA edits, rate the overall condition, readability, flow, and competiveness of the document (i.e., does it meet ATSU and SP QA standards for submission?).  **Part II**: Is the document prepared in a competitive fashion befitting the level of competition? | Part I: |
| Part II: |
| **Total Points (of 40 maximum)** | **X of 40 (%)** |
| **Qualitative Feedback**: Note areas of exceptional strength or lessons learned that will impact SP best practices. Provide general comments about QA observations, and/or list any repeated, serious, or fatal flaws found during QA that must be addressed and resolved going forward by the SP Project Lead. **If any category is deemed at or below Needs Improvement (i.e., a 2/5), provide specific details and/or suggestions for improvement:** | |

Is a full, second round of QA required (beyond SP Project Lead correction of routine QA edits)? Yes orNo