Resource Allocation Program RAP
A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies

RAP Review Form
Shared Technology Awards Proposals

Cycle:

Applicant Name: ...
Proposal Title: …
Grant Mechanism: Shared Technology 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. Impact to a Broad Community: Who will benefit from the procurement of the technology, equipment or computational resource? Who will be able to use the technology, equipment, hardware, or dataset? Will the resource be available within a campus core?
3. Novelty of Equipment or Resource at UCSF: What is the availability of the equipment, hardware, or dataset? Is the equipment or computational resource not otherwise available on the campus?

4. Significance. Does the proposed technology, equipment, computational hardware, or dataset meet an important need?
5. Management Plan. Do the PI and team have adequate expertise to manage and maintain the resource? Will the resource be part of a current core? Is there a plan to manage/schedule the resource/equipment use? How will the users be charged for its use?
6. Cost-Sharing: What other support is available for the equipment, computational hardware, or dataset? Is there evidence of cost sharing among investigators, department, and the funding agency?
7. 7. 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.