1. Each application to utilize the RDF will be assigned to a minimum of 3 reviewers. Committee members may review all applications.

2. Members will evaluate applications according to the guidelines below, and all applications will receive some written comment.

3. Additional input may be requested from relevant internal or external parties as determined by the committee. Requests for additional input should be made through the Coordinator, and the application content treated as confidential by the review committee.

4. The RDF-AC committee will discuss the application assessments with the RDF Management Committee

**REVIEWER GUIDELINES**

Committee will use a process similar to NIH style review, utilizing a 9-point scale (below).

Applications are expected to adhere to RFA guidelines and address the items requested in the RFA. Applications that are responsive to the RFA will be evaluated based on the published evaluation criteria. NOTE that the Review Criteria are intended to assess resource improvements that will broadly enhance the TAMU(S) Brazos Valley research environment.

**Resubmission Summary (Maximum 1 page)**

Beginning in the spring 2019 application template, RDF-AC added a one-page requirement for applications being considered for resubmission. Instructions were to provide RDF Advisory Committee with a one-page summary of what has changed from the previous RDF submission. In addition, they are to identify how the RDF questions, recommendations and/or review comments was addressed in the resubmission.

**Is the application responsive to the RFA?** If NO, provide brief description of unresponsiveness. If YES, assess benefit according to review criteria. NOTE THAT THE RFA HAS PAGE LIMITS, and, SPECIFICALLY NOTES THAT SUPPORT LETTERS SHOULD BE INCLUDED ONLY IF THEY DETAIL CONTRIBUTIONS OF FUNDS, SPACE, or OTHER ASSETS.

**Innovation**

The potential to transform (or maintain) the ability of Texas A&M researchers to conduct “cutting-edge” research. The ability to which the resources position Texas A&M PIs to be more competitive for extramural funding – this resource should serve multiple broad groups – not just an existing collaborative group or small number of investigators.

**Environment**

The degree to which this request adds important new technology or resources or capabilities to Texas A&M; or expands/upgrades heavily-utilized resources. The importance and value of having the technology or resource locally, as opposed to outsourcing. The degree to which the resource may be broadly shared or utilized

**Interdisciplinarity**

The extent of any multi-departmental support for the request as an over-arching technology and/or shared resource. The degree to which the resource may be utilized by investigators in diverse research areas. The overall benefit to the Texas A&M research infrastructure;

**Feasibility**

The strength of the management plan. The plan for sustainability beyond the RDF support must be explained be feasible.
**Overall Assessment**
The application’s responsiveness to the RFA. The overall benefit to the Texas A&M research infrastructure/research enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications are scored on a 9-point scale (1=Exceptional – 9=Poor)

Is the application responsive to the RFA? If NO, just provide brief description of unresponsiveness. If YES, assess benefit according to review criteria below. See description of categories above.

INNOVATION Score (1-9) ____
Comments:

ENVIRONMENT Score (1-9) ____
Comments:

INTERDISCIPLINARITY Score (1-9) ____
Comments:

FEASIBILITY Score (1-9) ____
Comments:

OVERALL BENEFIT Score (1-9) ____
Comments:

Summary comments for applicant (and suggestions for improvement):