

Community Conversations Fy 2018 Review Form		
A	<b>Status</b>	Select the appropriate status
B	<b>Date</b>	
C	<b>Reviewer</b>	
D	<b>Panel Number</b>	Select Panel
E	<b>Last Four Digits of the Application ID</b>	
F	<b>Legal Applicant</b>	
G	<b>Program Name</b>	
H	<b>State</b>	
I	<b>Principal Investigator (PI)</b>	
J	<b>Amount Requested for year one</b>	
K	<b>Funding priority</b>	Select Funding priority
L	<b>Primary department of affiliation for the Project Director/PI</b>	
M	<b>Total years of funding to complete the study</b>	

Scores		
W	Program Design	0
X	Organizational Capability	0
Y	Budget Adequacy and Cost Effectiveness	0
Z	Total	0

**Program Design - Enter approximately one comment (strength or weakness) per selection criteria (appx 7 total for Program Design) so that the ratings and scores can be justified in decision making and provided to applicants as feedback (see sample applicant feedback form)**

#	Criteria - The reviewers will consider whether the following information is listed:	Rating	Score
Q1	Title of the Participatory Research Study Type of Community (i.e., 1, 2, or 3) under Funding Priorities (see A.2.: Funding Priorities) Total years of funding to complete the project (i.e., 1 or 2 years) Project Director(s) (i.e., Principal Investigator(s)) and department affiliation(s) The community of focus (i.e., where the participatory research project will take place), community partner, including contact information and their affiliation	Select a rating	0
Q2	Community Background (10 percent) The reviewers will consider the quality, relevance and clarity of: The description and background of the community of focus and potential usefulness of participatory research to the community The existing relationship between the program director or legal applicant and the community or community partner The description of the networks and the relationships that this project may strengthen with local partners, national service or other institutions	Select a rating	0
Q3	Research Objectives and Literature Review (5 percent) Reviewers will assess the quality, relevance and clarify of: The research objectives and how relevant the objectives are to the priority areas defined in the Funding Priorities (see A.2.) Literature review with citations and relevant background research that provides adequate context for the research objectives; References are included as an additional document (See section D.7.b. Submission of Additional Documents)	Select a rating	0
Q4	Preliminary Research Design (10 percent) The reviewers will consider: The feasibility and clarity of a preliminary research design including data collection methods, sample, and analytical approach(es) with an understanding that this might change with input from the research team	Select a rating	0
Q5	Action Plans (10 percent) The reviewers will assess the extent to which creating action plans are feasible, relevant and clear and consider: The types of materials that will be created to disseminate findings to a broad audience including nonacademic and academic audiences and whether they are culturally appropriate for the focus community How community stakeholders, and other relevant audiences (e.g., academics, policymakers, national service staff) will be included in developing and implementing the action plan How the action plan will increase community engagement and build relationships with community partners and institutions to strengthen civic infrastructure and tackle the community identified issue	Select a rating	0
Q6	Work Plan and Justification of the Timeline (10 percent) The reviewers will consider the quality, feasibility, relevance, and clarity of the: Work plan (See section D.7.b. Submission of Additional Documents) including major steps in the study such as recruiting and training team members, obtaining approval from their Institutional ReviewBoard (IRB), conducting the research, creating and implementing an action plan Justification for the desired length of time, from 1 year and up to 2 years, required to complete the project	Select a rating	0
Q7	Community Involvement and Participatory Research Approach (15 percent) The reviewers will consider the extent of community involvement throughout the research process and adherence to participatory principles including:  The diversity of the proposed research team (e.g., university staff, residents, and/or community stakeholders) The extent the research team will be trained to carry out a research study including human subjects training and consistent opportunities to meet throughout the duration of the research project The extent to which the research team are actively engaged in the research and action process including finalizing a research strategy, data collection, analyzing/interpreting data, presenting findings, and creating and implementing action plans or a justification of why they would not be included throughout the full research-to-action process The extent there are opportunities to ensure the principles of participatory research, including colearning and collaboratively engaging in knowledge production	Select a rating	0
	<b>Strengths - PD</b>		0

<b>Weaknesses - PD</b>		
<b>Clarifications - PD</b>		

**Organizational Capability - Enter approximately one comment (strength or weakness) per selection criteria (appx 2 total for Org Capability) so that the ratings and scores can be justified in decision making and provided to applicants as feedback (see sample applicant feedback form)**

#	Criteria - The reviewers will consider:	Rating	Score
Q8	<p>Legal Applicant’s Ability to Manage Federal Funds and Work with Community Partners (5 percent)</p> <p>Reviewers will consider the capacity of the legal applicant to deliver their proposed activities based on:</p> <p>A description of the legal applicant’s ability to manage a Federal grant and/or apply sound fiscal management principles to grants, as evidenced by previous grants experience</p> <p>A description of how the legal applicant supports research with and in communities</p>	Select a rating	0
Q9	<p>Program Director’s Ability to Deliver Proposed Activities (15 percent)</p> <p>Reviewers will consider the capacity of the Program Director to deliver their proposed activities based on:</p> <p>A description of the Program Director(s) (i.e., Principal Investigator) experience working with participatory research approaches and with and in communities, and a two-page Biographical Sketch of the Program Director is included (Section D.7.b. Submission of Additional Documents and Appendix I)</p> <p>A letter of support or Memorandum of Understanding from the community partner(s) is included (See section D.7.b. Submission of Additional Documents). This letter includes a description of the history and activities to date of working with the Program Director(s) and how the community partner and researchers will be involved in the research activities</p>	Select a rating	0
	<b>Strengths - OC</b>		0
	<b>Weaknesses - OC</b>		
	<b>Clarifications - OC</b>		

**Cost-Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy - Enter approximately one comment (strength or weakness) per selection criteria (appx 1 total for budget) so that the ratings and scores can be justified in decision making and provided to applicants as feedback (see sample applicant feedback form)**

#	Criteria - Reviewers will consider	Rating	Score
<b>Q10</b>	<p>COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND BUDGET ADEQUACY (15 percent)            Reviewers will assess the budget to determine:            The level of impact on research outcomes to the extent that projects distribute the maximum possible funds to the community level such as paying community researchers (i.e., co-researchers) a living wage to participate in the research team, travel for community researchers, a training space, and incentives to increase the sample size            Whether there is adequate information to assess how each line item is calculated That it is without mathematical errors, and costs are reasonable and allowable (Current indirect rate cost Agreement is included- Section D.7.b. Submission of Additional Documents)            That travel and associated expenses are included for at least a Program Director and a representative from the focus community to attend one meeting (up to three nights) in Washington D.C. (see section F.4 Reporting)</p>	Select a rat	0
	<b>Strengths - BUDGET</b>		0
	<b>Weaknesses - BUDGET</b>		
	<b>Clarifications - BUDGET</b>		

Rating	Description
Excellent	A high quality, detailed response that addresses all aspects of the selection criteria and exceeds some. Strengths are substantial and solid. No weaknesses are identified, or any weakness has minimal effect on the overall quality of the response. A high confidence that the proposed activities will achieve and exceed the anticipated results
Good	A quality response that addresses most or all aspects of the selection criteria. Strengths are substantial, but do not exceed what is required. No weaknesses are identified, or any weakness has a minimal effect on the overall quality of the response. Proposed activities should achieve the anticipated results.
Fair	Response addresses some to most aspects of the selection criteria but makes assumptions and leaves aspects unexplained. Strengths are not significant and some weaknesses affect the overall quality of the response, demonstrating room for improvement. It is unclear how the proposed activities will achieve all of the anticipated results.
Does Not Meet	A low quality or very weak response that does not address most of the selection criteria. Overall response is lacking or inadequate making assumptions in key elements. Weaknesses relating to vague or inaccurate detail are numerous and significantly outweigh the strengths. There is low to zero confidence that the proposed activities will achieve the anticipated results.