The projects selected will be consistent with ARCC’s mission to improve community health equity and build stronger community-academic partnerships. Reviewers are encouraged to review the Reviewer guidance sent in a separate document and RFA 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

*Specific considerations for each criteria are listed below.*

**Scoring:** We use a 5 point scale. Score of 1= exceptionally strong application with essentially no weaknesses. Score of 5 = application with serious and substantive weaknesses with very few strengths. Ratings in whole numbers only (no decimals).

We have a limited amount of funding to disburse. **Please be constructively critical and clear** about your reasons for good scores in your reviews to help us narrow which applications are the strongest. Reviewer scores often bunch and it is helpful to have clear markers of excellence. A summary of all written feedback will be shared with applicants (reviewer identities will be confidential) so **please be generous with your constructive criticism and ideas.** Please write a short (1-3 sentence) feedback response for each criterion.

Research Pilots awards are intended to advance the work of existing partnerships that have prior collaborative experience to conduct preliminary research activities that prepare engaged teams for developing engaged research proposals for external research funding. **Research Pilot applications must include some form of data collection or analysis (examples included in RFA) and also include discussion about strengthening and extending partnership sustainability and capacity for research.**

*Note:* Alignment with Priority Criteria (Healthy Chicago 2.0/2025, NMH 2019 CHNA, and completion of previous ARCC Partnership Development award) will be assessed by CDPH, NMH, and ARCC staff.

**Name of Project:**

**Grant Application Number:**

**Reviewer Name:**

1. **Quality and feasibility of community and academic partner engagement:** The application shows evidence of the quality and feasibility of community and academic partner involvement and previous (or planned) related experience. The application shows evidence of collaborative spirit in the proposed partnership/project. The team has the capacity/capability to complete the research pilot project and to continue or expand the research/partnership in the future. ARCC seed grants support the full spectrum of engagement (applicants do NOT need to be pursuing community-based participatory research).

- Community partner(s) have appropriate knowledge/skills/experience/support within 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.
• Partners have existing partnership and prior collaborative experience that supports research pilot success.
• Clear structured plan for strengthening/extending the community/academic partnerships sustainability and capacity for research. This may include continued relationship building, addition of new partners (academic and/or community) and/or collaborative capacity building necessary to conduct the proposed data collection/analysis and/or future research activities.
• Clear explanations of project leadership including partner roles, expectations, decision making and contributions to proposed project. Includes infrastructure and/or for strategies for engaging community members (people with lived experience) beyond community organization leaders.
• Personnel (co-leads & others) involved in the project appear to be appropriate based on research pilot objectives (e.g. have necessary skills/expertise to implement planned activities) and have adequate time allocated. Partners necessary for competitive future research support are engaged or will be during the course of the seed grant (e.g. faculty or community partners that have expertise in the proposed health issue or research methodology).
• Reflects the Center for Community Health Principles of Engagement (Collaboration • Respect • Equity • Transparency • Impact).

Score: ___/5 (1 is highest/best score, 5 is lowest/worst score)
Comments:

2. Quality and feasibility of proposed activities:
• Research pilot applications are required to include some form of data collection/analysis. Proposed activities include a clear structured plan for collaboratively identifying, collecting, and/or analyzing new needs/assets assessment/pilot data or reviewing and interpreting existing data to inform further study or demonstrate potential impact/capacity for application for external funding. Proposed recruitment/data collection/analysis methods/tools are clear and appropriate. You understand logistically and practically how the partnership will achieve their goals by grant completion.
• Potential hurdles and how they will be addressed are presented and appropriate.
• Timeline (up to 24 months) is realistic given work plan/budget resources (includes IRB submission/approval, if relevant).
• How research pilot addresses health equity: May include focusing on those most experiencing inequities, considering context and root causes of your health issue of focus such as poverty and discrimination, and considering potential assumptions and implicit biases in data analysis. (Resource on equity perspective in research.)
• If the partnership or one of the partners have received previous ARCC funding, there is a clear description of how this application is building on or distinct from this previously supported work.

Score: ___/5 (1 is highest/best score, 5 is lowest/worst score)
Comments:

3. Potential for future research collaboration and funding
• Clear plan to lead to future feasible research projects/proposals.
• How pilot research findings will be shared with community and academic stakeholders and used to determine next steps.
• Clear description of how proposed data collection/analysis will directly contribute to the partnership’s future research collaboration and competitiveness for future research funding.
• Clear description of specific goals for seeking additional fiscal support and sustaining partnership including identification of potential research funding opportunities (inclusion of specific grant mechanisms, if possible), preparing proposals for external research funding, etc.

Score: ___/5 (1 is highest/best score, 5 is lowest/worst score)
Comments:
4. Potential for positive community impact
   - Evidence presented that the proposed partnership/project focus is a community priority and addresses a critical knowledge gap in the field.
   - Clear description of how the community(ies) may benefit from proposed outcomes.
   - Partnership and potential outcomes are mutually beneficial to all parties.

Score: __/5 (1 is highest/best score, 5 is lowest/worst score)
Comments:

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

Score: __/5 (1 is highest/best score, 5 is lowest/worst score)
Comments:

Overall Impact Score: __/5 (1 is highest/best score, 5 is lowest/worst score)
This score should reflect your assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the community(ies) or field(s) involved and in consideration of the core review criteria.

Application's main strengths:

Application's main 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