Potential Conflicts of Interest: ARCC places a high priority on ensuring that the proposal review process is conducted without any actual or apparent conflict of interest. It is not always easy to identify a conflict of interest and it is important that potential conflicts be identified as early as possible. Reviewer should contact ARCC if they have any questions about a potential conflict before reviewing a proposal.

Reviewers are asked to keep all information about applicant identity and application content confidential.

Review Guidelines
Grant awards will be awarded on the basis of a competitive review process.

The projects selected will be consistent with ARCC’s mission to improve community health and build stronger community-academic partnerships. The 2016 Seed Grants are focused on Partnership Development. Reviewers are encouraged to review the RFP to see what is requested for this grant award: http://www.feinberg.northwestern.edu/sites/cch/funding/seed-grants/arcc/.

Criteria:
- Quality and feasibility of community and academic partner engagement
- Quality and feasibility of proposed activities
- Potential for future research collaboration and funding
- Potential for positive community impact
- Reasonable and realistic budget

Scoring: We are using the National Institutes of Health’s (NIH) 9-point scale for the overall impact/priority score and individual scores. Score of 1 = exceptionally strong application with essentially no weaknesses. Score of 9 = application with serious and substantive weaknesses with very few strengths. 5 is an average score. Ratings in whole numbers only (no decimals).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very strong with only some minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Strong but with at least one moderate weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Some strengths but with at least one major weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>A few strengths and a few major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

We have many requests and a small amount of funding to disburse. Please be critical in your reviews to help us narrow which applications are the strongest. A summary of all written feedback will be shared with applicants (reviewer identities will be anonymous) so please be generous with your constructive criticism and ideas.

Name of Project:      Grant Application Number:
Reviewer Name:

1. Quality and feasibility of community and academic partner engagement: The proposal shows evidence of the quality and feasibility of community and academic partner involvement and previous (or planned) related experience. The proposal shows evidence of collaborative spirit or intent of the proposed partnership. The team has the capacity/capability to complete the project and to continue or expand the project in the future.
Community partner(s) have appropriate knowledge/skills/experience with the community and interest in the identified research area.

Academic partner(s) have appropriate research credentials and interest in collaborative community research and interest in the identified health issue.

The partner’s history and prior collaborative work experience supports project success or they have described mutual interest in developing a relationship.

Personnel involved in the project appear to be appropriate based on project objectives (e.g. have necessary skills/expertise to implement planned activities) and have an adequate percent of time allocated.


Score:__/9 Comments:

2. Quality and feasibility of proposed activities:
- Clear structured plan for partnership building. You understand logistically and practically how they will achieve their goals and be prepared to conduct research together by grant completion.
- Clear explanations of partner roles, expectations, and contributions to proposed project.
- Discussion of possible additional partners (academic and/or community (including community members beyond community organization) that may need to be engaged as part of the partnership to design and conduct future research activities, if relevant.
- Clear description of collaborative capacity building of both community and academic partners, if applicable.
- Potential hurdles and how they will be addressed are presented and appropriate.
- Timeline is realistic given work plan/budget resources.

Score:__/9 Comments:

3. Potential for future research collaboration and funding
- Clear plan to lead to feasible research questions/projects/proposals.
- Clear description of specific goals for seeking additional fiscal support and sustaining partnership.

Score:__/9 Comments:

4. Potential for positive community impact
- Clear description of how the community may benefit from proposed outcomes.
- Partnership and potential outcomes are mutually beneficial to all parties.

Score:__/9 Comments:

5. Reasonable and realistic budget
- Budget is appropriate and reasonable given tasks.

Score:__/9 Comments:

Total Score (from 5 Core Criteria): __/45 points

Overall Impact/Priority Score: __9 points

This score should reflect your assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the field(s) involved and in consideration of the core review criteria.

Proposal Weaknesses/Areas of Concern:

Request for revisions/changes from applicant:

Any additional comments: Please add any additional comments about the proposal you believe to be important to the review process.

Resources to suggest to the applicant (e.g. links, organizations, programs, tools):

Use additional space if necessary.

Reviewer Signature Date

Review Form 2015