

Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies



RAP Review Form

Cycle:

Applicant Name: ...

Proposal Title: ...

Grant Mechanism: **Family Support 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:

- General critique and summary of the proposal.
- Significance. Does the study address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
- Approach. Are methods, study design and analysis appropriate?
- Innovation. Is the study original and innovative?

- Investigator.
 - Is the applicant trained to do the studies?
 - Does the applicant have life experience or positionality that make them uniquely qualified to conduct the research?
 - Description of the qualities and potential of the applicant within the context of their overall contributions to UCSF, as well as their field(s) of research expertise.
- Eligibility.
 - Has the applicant clearly described the caregiving-based hardship, the need for the funds and how they will be used to continue their research program?
 - Description of the caregiving responsibility and impact of this caregiving on capacity to conduct research and/or to financially support the applicant's research program.
 - Identification of a qualified research and career mentor(s) who has provided guidance in the past - if applicable.
- Environment/Departmental Support. Will the scientific environment where the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Is appropriate support available from the Department? Does the applicant have access to the necessary tools?
- Future potential. Is the research likely to lead to extramural funding?
- Budget and Budget Justification. Does the proposed budget include only allowable expenses? Has the applicant clearly described the need for the funds and how they will be used to continue their research program? Is there a clear description of how the funds will be used and how an award will increase capacity to conduct research (given the researcher's context).

Confidential Comments

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