

Application Review and Scoring Handbook Comments 2026

#	Name	Section	Comment
1		I. Purpose	I don't think reviewers need to be paid.
2	Laura	VIII. The Grant Application Review and Scoring Process	Clarifying questions - need guardrails to distinguish "clarification" from "supplemental" responses, especially if scores are limited to application materials submitted. Clarifying questions shouldn't be opportunity to substantively change response.
3	Laura	III. ARC Member Application and Selection	III(3) - Clarify that this includes board members, officers, and/or staff of applicants and fiscally sponsored applicants.
4	Stephen	VII. ARC Group Formation (PARCS)	Difficult to know how many ARC members are needed until after application deadline. Agree 5 ARC members per panel is ideal.
5	Stephen	VIII. The Grant Application Review and Scoring Process	Appeals from eligibility determinations should be heard by EAAC Subcommittee rather than full PRAC. More streamlined and easier to schedule.
6	Stephen	VIII. The Grant Application Review and Scoring Process	Name of applicant and fiscal sponsor should not be redacted for conflict review purposes. Only applicant contact person and info need be redacted.
7	Stephen	VIII. The Grant Application Review and Scoring Process	Clarifying questions could prove cumbersome to implement fairly. Applicants should not be allowed a do-over on their applications. Answers would need a strict word count limit.
8	Stephen	VIII. The Grant Application Review and Scoring Process	Agree public observation of ARC meetings should be Zoom only to prevent observers from influencing the ARC members.
9	Stephen	IX. Score Tabulation and Ranking	With only 5 reviewers for each application might be better to take the median score rather than the average to lessen the impact of outlier scores.

10	Stephen	IX. Score Tabulation and Ranking	Need clarification after applications are ranked who decides the cutoff for funding and the amount awarded to each approved grant (e.g. EAAC Subcommittee?). Awards need to be matched to funds available.
11	Maryana	V. Required Training	Recommend compensating reviewers at a minimum rate of \$16.90 per hour for the estimated 38 hours of work, totaling approximately \$642. Given the importance and responsibility of this role, we recommend compensation in the range of \$700 to \$1,000.

Updated 5/8/2026