### SCRA Public Policy Mini-Grants: Proposal Rating Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Reviewer:</th>
<th>Date of review:</th>
<th>Proposal #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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)**

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?)

2. **Does the proposal connect to community psychology?**
   (Is the policy issue directly or indirectly connect to community psychology? Is the connection clear?)

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?)

4. **Does the proposal demonstrate the potential to establish or build upon relationships with other organizations and their resources?**
   (Does the proposal discuss and include other persons or organizations that are important to the policy issue? Is the project collaborative?)

5. **Does the proposal demonstrate potential to have a successful impact?**
   (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?)

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?)

7. **Does the proposal increase capacity of SCRA to influence public policy?**
   (Do the authors outline a process to benefit SCRA or its members? How will SCRA members increase their policy or advocacy skills or knowledge?)

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? Is the budget over/under $5,000?)

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?)

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?)

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