Alliance for Research in Chicagoland Communities (ARCC)
2019 Seed Grants PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REVIEW FORM

Potential Conflicts of Interest: ARCC places a high priority on ensuring that the application 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 equity and build stronger community-academic partnerships. Reviewers are encouraged to review the 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 are using the National Institutes of Heath'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 <u>whole numbers only</u> (no decimals).

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

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 limited amount of funding to disburse. **Please be <u>critical</u>** 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 confidential) so **please be generous with your constructive criticism and ideas**. *Please write a short (1-3 sentence) feedback response for each criterion.*

There are two types of ARCC seed grants in this round (Partnership Development and Research Development). <u>Partnership Development awards</u> are intended to support newly developing partnerships in, for example, relationship building, creation of partnership structure, exploration of shared areas of interest, and

research capacity development. <u>Research Pilot awards</u> 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. *This form is for reviewing <u>Partnership Development applications</u>*.

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 or intent of the proposed partnership. The team has the capacity/capability to complete the partnership project and to continue or expand the partnership/project in the future. ARCC seed grants support the full spectrum of engagement (applicants do <u>NOT</u> need to be pursuing community-based participatory research).

   - *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.
   - Partner's history & prior experience with collaborative research supports project success or they've described mutual interest in and plans for developing relationship/collaborative research experience.
   - Personnel involved in partnership appear to be appropriate based on the aims (e.g. have necessary skills/expertise to implement planned activities) and have adequate capacity time allocated.
   - Reflects the Center for Community Health Principles of Engagement (http://bit.ly/1Kud22W).

Score: __/9 *(1 is highest/best score, 9 is lowest/worst score)*
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 collaborate on 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) that may need to be engaged as part of the partnership to design and conduct future research activities, if relevant. This includes examples of mechanisms for engaging community members/residents and other stakeholders beyond community organizations/agencies on the application.
   - 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 (up to 12 months) is realistic given work plan/budget resources.
   - 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: __/9   *(1 is highest/best score, 9 is lowest/worst score)*
Comments:

3. **Potential for future research collaboration and funding**
   - Clear plan to lead to feasible research projects/proposals. Activities/time/milestones are included that focus on collaboratively identifying possible research questions and research project designs.
   - Clear description of specific goals for seeking additional fiscal support and sustaining partnership including activities/time that focus on identifying potential research funding sources, etc.

Score: __/9   *(1 is highest/best score, 9 is lowest/worst score)*
Comments:

4. **Potential for positive community impact**
   - Partnership/project addresses an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field. Evidence presented that proposed partnership/project focus is a community priority.
   - Clear description of how community(ies) may benefit from proposed outcomes.
   - Partnership and potential outcomes are mutually beneficial to all parties.

Score: __/9   *(1 is highest/best score, 9 is lowest/worst score)*
Comments:

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

Score: __/9   *(1 is highest/best score, 9 is lowest/worst score)*

Comments:

Overall Impact Score: ___9 points *(1 is highest/best score, 9 is lowest/worst score)*
This score should reflect your assessment of the likelihood for the partnership/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*

To be completed by ARCC Staff and/or NMH and CDPH staff:
Priority Criteria *(not required, but if relevant, applicants could include how their application meets one of the identified priority areas):* Clear and compelling description and rationale for how application meets any of the three identified priority areas.

- ☐ Alignment with Healthy Chicago 2.0 priorities
  - Address high hardship & low childhood opportunity areas priorities
  - Reference specific objective in plan
  - Address specific strategy in plan
  - Build on data from HC 2.0 metrics and/or Chicago Health Atlas

YES   NO
Comments:

- ☐ Alignment with Northwestern Memorial Hospital Priority Health Needs
  - Access to Healthcare Services
  - Chronic Disease (including Obesity & Heart Disease)
  - Injury & Violence
  - Mental Health

YES   NO
Comments:

- ☐ Applicants who *haven't* received ARCC grant before or are new to engaged research

YES   NO
Comments: