Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies

RAP

RAP Review Form

Cycle:

Applicant Name: …
Proposal Title: …
Grant Mechanism: Hardship Awards
Review Committee: …
Reviewer's Name: …

Overall Score (from 1 to 9, whole number only): …

Scoring System
Ratings are provided only in whole numbers, not decimals.
Note: scores 1-3 should represent no more than the top 30% of proposals.

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	**1**	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	**4**	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weaknesses
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	**7**	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

General Review (Please provide a one-page review) These comments **WILL** be shared with the applicant.

Please include comments for each of the following sections:

1. General critique and summary of the proposal.
2. Significance. Does the study address an important problem?

3. Approach. Are methods, study design and analysis appropriate?
4. Innovation. Is the study original and innovative?
5. Investigator(s).
    - Is the applicant(s) trained to do the studies?
    - Are there personal or professional context or background related to income disadvantage, that are relevant to the hardship?
    - Does the applicant have experience that make them uniquely qualified to conduct the research?
    - Are there qualities and potential of the applicant within the context of their overall contributions to UCSF, as well as their field(s) of research expertise, to be considered?
6. Environment/Departmental support. Is appropriate support available from department? Does the applicant(s) have access to the necessary tools?
7. Were the nature and context of the temporary hardship, the applicants' overall track record of funding, why the hardship has impacted funding, and the degree to which PI's ongoing research program will be hurt by lack of funds, sufficiently described?
8. Future potential. Is the research likely to lead to extramural funding?
9. Was there adequate evidence of funding attempts and description of plans to obtain future funding? Are there other funds available to the PI for this project?
10. If applicable, is the Mentoring Plan adequate for the applicant?
11. Any question or concern about the budget?

Confidential Comments
Please add any confidential comments or concerns about the application.
These comments **will NOT** be shared with the applicant.