

# Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies



## RAP Review Form

**Cycle:**

Applicant Name: ...

Proposal Title: ...

Grant Mechanism: **Re-Entry**

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
<b>Minor Weakness:</b> An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact <b>Moderate Weakness:</b> A weakness that lessens impact <b>Major Weakness:</b> 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?
6. Environment/Departmental support. Is appropriate support available from department? Does the applicant(s) have access to the necessary tools?

7. Future potential. Is the research likely to lead to extramural funding?
8. Any question or concern about the budget?
9. Has a non-classical pathway clearly been pursued (i.e., relocation, primary dedication to teaching, clinical practice rather than research)? Is the "Re-entry" classification justified?

**Confidential Comments**

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