**PNASH Center Core Review Criteria for Proposals**

* + 1. 3.5 - 4.0 Highest rating. Clearly responsive to the category and proposal call.

2.5 - 3.4 Medium rating. Adequate response to the proposal call.

1.5 - 2.4 Low rating. Barely responsive to the proposal call.

0.0 - 1.4 No evidence or response to the proposal call.

**Project Title:**

**Evaluator Overall Comments (3-5 sentences):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Category** |
|  | **Regional Needs**   * Does the proposal demonstrate its responsiveness to health and safety needs and priorities expressed by data, industry, and communities? * Does the proposed research address communities or topics that PNASH or other organizations do not currently address? |
|  | **Translation and Communication**   * Does the proposal include a plan to communicate research progress or findings with study participants, direct partners, and key stakeholders (i.e. returning of results)? * Does the proposal include a communication approach for broader target audiences or stakeholder groups of interest? |
|  | **Research to Practice**   * Does the proposal describe how this research will be integrated into user practice? * Will the translation activity provide a resource or tool that stakeholders can use? * Is there evidence of efficacy, user interest, capacity, and access (consider using existing systems within a community)? |
|  | **Equity** (Consider [NIOSH’s BNI Framework](https://www.cdc.gov/niosh/programs/bni.html))   * Does it describe the structural/systemic/historical factors that create and perpetuate occupational and environmental health disparities? (Burden) * Does the proposal describe partnerships with stakeholders that are mutually beneficial to partners, employers, and farmworkers? (Need) * Does the research proposal demonstrate a plan to obtain feedback or direction on the proposed research activities? * Does the research proposal have appropriate representation from industry and/or community groups? * How can this project support future work of PNASH partners? * Will the research lead to tools, training, or practical solutions that are appropriate for the needs of the community, accessible (technological/language), culturally tailored? (Impact) * Does the project have a plan to sustain the resources or tools long-term (i.e. after the project is complete in 2027)? |
|  | **Advisories**   * Are there any advisories? * Who does the advisory committee involve and is it representative of the key players? * Is the scale of advisory engagement practical for the project? * Could the project share advisories with other PNASH projects that share common stakeholders and interests? |
|  | **Innovation**   * What are the innovative aspects of the engagement approach and tools/resources? |
|  | **Personnel**   * Is there adequate staffing and expertise to support these activities? * How can the PNASH Outreach Core assist with this work? * Does the reviewer have any suggestions for a clear division of labor between project staff and PNASH Outreach Core staff? |