

**SCRA Public Policy Mini-Grants:  
Proposal Rating Form**  
Grant #/Name:

Name of Reviewer:	Date of review:	
Please rate the proposal on the following items using a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = definitely, 3 = to some extent 5 = not at all)		Proposal #:
<p>1. Does the proposal address a current public policy issue of importance to the community of interest? (Does the policy area matter to the community of interest? Is the proposal likely to improve a condition(s) important to the community of interest?)</p>		
<p>2. Does the proposal connect to community psychology? (Is the policy issue directly or indirectly connect to community psychology? Is the connection clear?)</p>		
<p>3. Does the proposal address a policy area where community psychology has a contribution to make? (Does the proposal make clear the benefits of involvement of a community psychologist in this policy area?)</p>		
<p><b>4. Does the proposal demonstrate the potential to establish or build upon relationships with other organizations and their resources?</b> (Does the proposal discuss and include other persons or organizations that are important to the policy issue? Is the project collaborative?)</p>		
<p><b>5. Does the proposal demonstrate potential to have a successful impact?</b> (Do the persons or organizations involved have policy experience? Has prior work been successful? Is the political climate supportive of the policy issue? Does the proposal include innovative work or methods?)</p>		
<p>6. Does the proposal increase capacity of communities/groups to influence public policy? (Are other communities/groups involved? Are there plans for active collaboration with other communities/groups?)</p>		
<p><b>7. Does the proposal increase capacity of SCRA to influence public policy?</b> (Do the authors outline a process to benefit SCRA or its members? How will SCRA members increase their policy or advocacy skills or knowledge?)</p>		
<p>8. Does the proposal articulate an appropriate budget that effectively supports the proposed activities and ensures accountability of expenditures? (Did the authors include a budget table with line-item expenditures? Do the budget items reflect the work proposed in the grant? Do the items seem reasonable? Is the budget over/under \$5,000?)</p>		
<p>9. Does the proposal demonstrate the likelihood of effective dissemination of results or outcomes within our field, such as including, but not limited to, publication in AJCP or TCP, Biennial and/or APA Conference presentations? (Does dissemination include community psychology-relevant outlets? Does dissemination include the community of interest?)</p>		
<p>10. Does the proposal demonstrate the likelihood of effective dissemination of results or outcomes to relevant policy/advocacy venues (organizations, national offices, policy-relevant journals etc.)? (Do the authors' proposed policy and advocacy relevant dissemination plans align with the proposed work? Does dissemination include more than a presentation at a conference?)</p>		
<p>11. Does the proposal include a timeline with major activities and anticipated dates of accomplishment? (Do the items reflect the work proposed? Are the items to occur in a reasonable amount of time? Is the proposed project to be completed in two years or less?)</p>		

12. Is the proposal clearly and effectively written? Did the proposal include all of the relevant grant sections?	
13. RANK YOUR OVERALL JUDGEMENT OF THE PROPOSAL ON A SCALE OF ONE (highest) TO TEN (lowest)	
What is the <u>major strength</u> of the proposal?	
What is the <u>major weakness</u> of the proposal?	
Other comments, questions, or concerns?	