eGC1 (electronic Grant and Contract Form #1)
Review Checklist
College of Built Environments Dean's Office

This document is a checklist for eGC1 review for each role on the approval process.

Grant Manager (submitter) Checklist:
- ❖ Check that the benefit rates, FTE rate, and allocations are correct
- ❖ Check that the proposal request form is complete and correct
- ❖ Ensure that the cost share approval is attached (if applicable)
- ❖ Confirm documents are correct for proposal (type and formatting)
- ❖ Ensure proposal deadlines are met
- ❖ Check the accuracy of salaries listed for individuals, including faculty, staff, and students
- ❖ Confirm that the documentation for subcontracts and/or external consulting services is adequate
- ❖ Confirm the sufficiency, adequacy, appropriateness, and accuracy of the budget for the proposed research/activity (see GIM 2)
- ❖ Confirm that collaborators are linked together in the sponsor system if needed (e.g. NSF collaborative proposals)

PI Checklist:
- ❖ Confirm all documents in the eGC1 and proposal system are up to date
- ❖ Confirm cost share matches the unit approved amount
- ❖ Confirm Significant Financial Interest (SFI) for PI and all other participants are complete
- ❖ Confirm the use of Human subjects (if applicable)
- ❖ Check grammar, spelling, sentence structure, jargon, scientific and technical terminology, punctuation, and abbreviations
- ❖ Verify grantsmanship, including strategy, persuasiveness, and significance
- ❖ Articulate the scientific and technical merit of the proposal
- ❖ Ensure and describe the Academic value of the research activity
- ❖ Qualifications of subrecipients proposed to participate in the project

Department Checklist:
- ❖ Verify that cost share is preappoved and matches that approved amount (if applicable)
- ❖ Confirm PI and everyone listed has the FTE available or verify that buyout from other responsibilities is possible or has been secured.
- ❖ Confirm FTE for faculty and staff is correct
- ❖ Confirm resource allocations (lab spaces, class involvement)
- ❖ Confirm the correct application of non-research related UW policies, such as academic human resource rules
- ❖ Confirm the reasonableness of the commitment of faculty and staff effort, and possible impacts to teaching and other obligations
- ❖ Confirm that the facilities and resources listed are available for use

Research Administrator Checklist:
- ❖ Confirm the eGC1 is in "ready to submit" status
- ❖ Confirm the documents in the eGC1 are the same as the proposal system
- ❖ Confirm GIM19 deadline did not pass
- ❖ Confirm IDC (indirect costs) and benefit rates are accurate

Initial Author Date: August 8, 2023

Chairs' + Review: August - September, 2023

Last Update: October 16, 2023

Councils Review: November 2023

All-College Review: December 1-15, 2023

Discussion and Rationale

This section includes a summary of the points of concern raised during the review process from the Chairs+ committee August-September 2023.

PI Checklist addition - comments

- Comment: Request to add *"Secure advance approval of cost share by unit providing it (e.g., department, center, college, etc.)" to PI Checklist.*

  Response: This is in the Roles and Timelines P&P - this is for an eGC1 check (last step)

"Confirm PI and everyone listed has the FTE available" - comments

- Comment: I would like to suggest to add at the end "or verify that buyout from other responsibilities is possible or has been secured."

  Response: Added.

Last 3 bullet points of PI Checklist - comments

- Comment: These three bullets are redundant (logic behind). Regarding the initial two, if someone is submitting a proposal to an unsolicited program and have made effort to prepare it, they probably value their merit and/or value. If they are submitting to an solicited program (which are often prescriptive), they may question some of the merit or value of the

prescriptions, but have anyhow decided to pursue the funding as it fits within their overall research agenda. Regarding the third one, I cannot think of anyone who would like to have a team member that is a "bad" one in terms of qualifications or experience. When I pursued federal project with TRB, I have to find team members with specific knowledge or experience that was not represented by traditional qualifications.

Response: Thank you for this. These are OSP items that one needs to include in proposals. It is the PIs role to make sure that they describe and explain the merit, value and qualifications. Of course, we want high-quality proposals from qualified researchers and research partners. But these are not taken for granted but need to be explained in the proposal and explained to the UW for review. So, we need to keep these as points to check off as individual items in the eGC1 for the PI.

"Confirm the use of Human subjects (if applicable)" - comments

- Comment: Change to "Complete the IRB application" instead (removes mention of Human Subjects)

  Response: *This is when the eGC1 is routing, this should be done before the eGC1 review. So we have included this in the Roles and Timelines.*