



**Alliance for Research in Chicagoland Communities (ARCC)  
2019 Seed Grants RESEARCH PILOT 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 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).

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	1	<b>Exceptional</b>	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	<b>Poor</b>	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 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 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 Pilots). Partnership Development awards are intended to support newly developing partnerships. 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). In addition, these applications should also include a focus on strengthening and extending partnership sustainability and capacity for research. This form is for reviewing Research Pilot applications.*

**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/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 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.
  - Partners have existing partnership and prior collaborative experience that supports research pilot success.
  - Personnel 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 (<http://bit.ly/1Kud22W>).

**Score:** \_\_/9 (1 is highest/best score, 9 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 data collection/analysis methods/tools are clear and appropriate. You understand logistically and practically how they will achieve their goals by grant completion and be prepared to apply for and conduct research together.
- Clear structured plan for strengthening/extending their partnership 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 partner roles, expectations, and contributions to proposed project.
- 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).
- 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 future feasible research projects/proposals. Activities/time/milestones are included that focus on collaboratively designing components of an engaged research project (including developing research questions, methodologies, recruitment & retention approaches, data collection/analysis instruments and protocols, interventions, dissemination and implementation plans).
- 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: \_\_/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 the proposed partnership/project focus is a community priority.
- Clear description of how the 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 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:

- Application submitted by community-academic partnerships who have previously received and completed an ARCC Partnership Development award. Clearly outlines how this proposal builds on the work of the previous award.

YES NO  
Comments: