

Feedback on the nine sections X wrote for a proposal.

The proposal team met to go over the technical approach, winning themes, outline and writing assignments. We discussed the importance of stressing our cross-cultural experience and our unique approach to pretesting in multiple languages, which included the Survey Language Consultant (SLC) model. It was suggested X start with similar sections from the previous winning proposal and tailor them as needed to the current proposal. X asked for guidance on how to lay out our proposed approach to the usability testing. We agreed that best practices should be described and that they be tailored to the parameters of the work described in the RFP.

X's draft sections were delivered within the deadline. There was a lot of detail, the writing was clear, and X displayed in-depth knowledge about usability testing. However, it was determined that all of X's sections needed to be rewritten in large part because they were not tailored to the specifics of the RFP. For example, there was no mention of cross-cultural considerations, the SLCs or translation workshop in the detailed sections. The suggested approach to the usability testing included heuristic review, focus groups, surveys and testing in the laboratory. However, the RFP clearly stated that the focus groups were to be conducted in Puerto Rico only; the surveys were not described in a way that made them seem relevant; and testing in the laboratory assumes all the interviews were to be conducted in Rockville, when the RFP requested testing in several locations.

X's proposal sections were redistributed among four other team members because there wasn't enough time in the proposal schedule to provide the level of guidance X would need to address the identified issues. It took about three working days for the other authors to deliver the rewritten sections.