Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies

RAP

RAP Review Form
Institutional Matching Instrumentation Award Proposals
Cycle:

Applicant Name: …
Proposal Title: …
Grant Mechanism: Institutional Matching Instrumentation Award
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. Demonstration of scientific need
    a. Significance. Does the proposed equipment meet important scientific goals and/or technical needs?
    b. Impact to Broad Community: Who will benefit from the procurement of the equipment? Are users spread across different departments or programs, how many investigators or programs will benefit?
3. Justification of Equipment as Novel Technology not otherwise available on Campus

    a. Novelty of Equipment at UCSF: What is the current availability of this equipment at UCSF? If the equipment exists on campus is there sufficient justification for duplication?
    b. Availability of Equipment: Which Core will the equipment be placed in? Does the application include Certification of Campus Core Status, and is the PI of the application the Director or Manager of that Core? Will equipment be available to the entire UCSF community and how will access be facilitated (e.g. by training users, providing expert operator)? Who has priority for access?
4. Management plan for sharing the Equipment in a Campus Core resource
    a. Management Plan. Do the PI and team have adequate expertise to manage and maintain the equipment? Is there a plan for advertising and scheduling the equipment?
    b. Sustainability: Does the financial plan describe how costs related to the instrument will be covered for the next five years? Does it include a plan for covering maintenance beyond manufacturer's warranty and costs of necessary staff and supplies? How will the users be charged for its use?
5. Sharing of the cost for the equipment among investigators and department
    a. Cost-Sharing: What other support is available for the equipment? Is there evidence of cost sharing among investigators, department, and funding agencies?
6. Any question or concern about the budget? Allowable costs include equipment, plus maintenance and personnel costs during the validation period. In most cases the funding period will be one year, however for innovative technology that requires development as well as validation this period may be extended. Budgets of more than one year must be well justified and are only allowable for instruments that require more than one year for development or validation.

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