

# Proposal Review and Submission: Ensuring Quality and Compliance in Grant Applications

Dr. Anna Neya Kazanskaia  
NEYA Global | NEYA Global Publishing  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-5669-1676>  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-gr-wr-ms-07>

## Abstract

The final stages of reviewing and submitting grant proposals are decisive for funding outcomes, yet they are often overlooked in the broader discourse on grant writing. This article examines the review and submission process as an essential stage of quality assurance, emphasizing structured internal review, peer input, final revisions, and strict adherence to submission requirements. Internal reviews supported by checklists based on funder guidelines enhance clarity, consistency, and compliance, while external peer reviews introduce diverse expertise and strengthen persuasiveness. The article highlights the importance of final revisions, comprehensive proofreading, and alignment of supporting documents to ensure proposals meet professional standards. Submission procedures—whether electronic or physical—require meticulous attention to detail, particularly regarding file formats, signatures, and deadlines. Case examples illustrate how incorporating peer feedback has strengthened proposals and improved funding success. By situating proposal review and submission within broader debates on accountability and organizational professionalism, the article bridges academic perspectives and practical strategies. For academics, it underscores the role of process rigor in non-profit funding practices; for practitioners, it offers a roadmap to avoid common errors and maximize the probability of success.

## Keywords

grant writing; proposal review; submission process; peer review; accountability; non-profit management

## **1. Introduction**

Grant writing does not conclude with drafting. The stages of internal review, external feedback, final revisions, and submission are critical determinants of whether proposals meet funder expectations and stand out in competitive funding environments. This article explores these final stages, situating them within broader discourses on organizational accountability and professional practice in the non-profit sector.

## **2. Context and Background**

The literature on proposal development underscores the significance of iterative feedback and compliance with donor guidelines (Burnett, 2007; Worth, 2019). Internal review processes align proposals with funder requirements, while peer input introduces external perspectives that enhance persuasiveness. Submission, meanwhile, represents a procedural threshold where errors in format, timing, or attachments can disqualify otherwise strong applications (Ebrahim, 2003).

From an organizational perspective, review and submission embody accountability practices. They demonstrate not only attention to detail but also the organizational culture of quality control, professionalism, and preparedness.

## **3. Core Dimensions of Proposal Review and Submission**

### **3.1 Internal Review**

Assigning sections to team members ensures comprehensive coverage. Checklists based on funder guidelines help verify eligibility, required content, and formatting compliance.

### **3.2 External Peer Review**

Engaging colleagues or experts with grant-writing experience introduces critical perspectives. Structured feedback focused on strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions improves coherence and persuasiveness.

### **3.3 Final Revisions**

Final reviews involve verifying completeness, checking for consistency, ensuring all attachments are included, and proofreading for accuracy. Leadership approval may be necessary before submission.

### **3.4 Submission Procedures**

Funders may require electronic uploads or hard-copy packages. Online systems demand attention to file formats, upload confirmations, and technical issues. Hard-copy submissions require proper organization, signatures, and reliable delivery methods. Post-submission, confirmation of receipt is essential.

### **3.5 Avoiding Common Mistakes**

Frequent errors include missing deadlines, exceeding word limits, neglecting formatting guidelines, or omitting attachments. Building in buffer time mitigates such risks.

## **4. Case Example: Peer Review in Practice**

A mid-sized health-focused non-profit sought feedback on a draft proposal from a partner organization with prior grant success. The peer review identified inconsistencies in terminology, unclear evaluation metrics, and redundancies in the narrative. Incorporating this feedback significantly improved clarity and alignment with the funder's requirements, ultimately contributing to a successful award. This case illustrates the value of external perspectives in strengthening proposal competitiveness.

## **5. Discussion**

Proposal review and submission highlight the intersection of procedural compliance and organizational professionalism. While internal reviews ensure technical compliance, peer reviews enhance persuasiveness by introducing external expertise. The iterative process also reflects organizational learning, as feedback integration strengthens both the specific proposal and future grant-writing capacity.

Challenges include balancing diverse feedback while maintaining coherence, managing tight deadlines, and navigating complex submission systems. For smaller organizations, the procedural demands of submission may create disproportionate burdens, reinforcing

inequities in funding access (Chambers, 2014). Addressing these challenges requires institutionalized review systems, mentoring programs, and capacity-building support.

## 6. Conclusion

The review and submission phase of grant writing is a strategic process that determines the professionalism and competitiveness of proposals. Internal reviews, peer feedback, final revisions, and careful adherence to submission guidelines ensure proposals meet the highest standards of quality and compliance.

For academics, this stage offers insight into organizational accountability and process rigor. For practitioners, it provides practical strategies to avoid common pitfalls and increase the probability of funding success. Future exploration should examine digital submission platforms, capacity disparities, and the role of collaborative review networks in strengthening proposal outcomes.

## References

- Burnett, K. (2007). *Relationship fundraising: A donor-based approach to the business of raising money*. Jossey-Bass.
- Chambers, R. (2014). *Rural development: Putting the last first*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835815>
- Ebrahim, A. (2003). Accountability in practice: Mechanisms for NGOs. *World Development*, 31(5), 813-829. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X\(03\)00014-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(03)00014-7)
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Grant Writing Mastery*. NEYA Global Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.64357/grant-writing-mastery-2025>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Donor Cultivation for Major Gifts*. NEYA Global Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.64357/donor-cultivation-major-gifts-2025>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). *Philanthropy in Transition: Trends and Innovations*. NEYA Global Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.64357/philanthropy-transition-2025>

- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Fundraising Innovations. NEYA Global Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.64357/fundraising-innovations-2025>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Post-Submission Follow-Up: Strengthening Relationships and Learning in the Grant Writing Process. NEYA Global Journal. <https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-gr-wr-ms-08>
- Kazanskaia, A. N. (2025). Overcoming Barriers to Grant Writing in Developing and Low-Income Regions. NEYA Global Journal. <https://doi.org/10.64357/neya-gjnps-gr-wr-ms-11>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). Developmental evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation and use. Guilford Press.
- UNDP. (2020). Financing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations Development Programme.
- Worth, M. J. (2019). Fundraising: Principles and practice (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.