

	<b>RESEARCH PROPOSAL EVALUATION/SCORING SHEET</b>	Document No.	<b>WVSU-RDC-SOI-01-F02</b>	
		Issue No.	<b>1</b>	
		Revision No.	<b>0</b>	
	<b>WEST VISAYAS STATE UNIVERSITY</b>	Date of Effectivity:	<b>April 27, 2018</b>	
		Issued by:	<b>URDC</b>	
		Page No.	<b>Page 1 of 1</b>	

**Lifesaver Boat: An Innovation for Survival in a Flood Prone Community**

Program/Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Proponent: Ms. Milagros P. Matillano

College/Unit: Pototan

**A. TECHNICAL ASPECTS (80 POINTS)**

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Score</u>
<b>1. Significance of the proposal (20 points)</b>	_____
In consonance with the University's Research Thrusts and Priorities	
Extent of likely net benefits to be derived	
Potential contribution to science, rural households, industry, commodity/sector, region, or national economy, etc.	
Utility of R & D results	
<b>2. Technical Merit of the Proposal (60points)</b>	
• <b>Objectives</b> (Adequacy, Clarity, Attainability) (10 points)	_____
• <b>Adequacy of literature review</b> (10 pts)	_____
Comprehensiveness/exhaustiveness	
Currentness of the state of the art used	
Exhaustiveness of prior search on related technologies	
• <b>Analytical Framework and Methodology</b> (20 points)	_____
Adequacy of analytical framework	
Appropriateness of research design and statistical tools to be used	
Completeness/relevance of variables	
Adequacy of data collection method	
Consistency of planned activities with the research objectives, expected outputs, available manpower and financial resources	
• <b>Contribution to new knowledge</b> (20 points)	_____
Extent to which the expected outputs could help eliminate, mitigate or prevent the problem and its attendant negative consequences from occurring	
Significance of expected outputs, whether national or of international importance	
Superiority of expected outputs to existing knowledge/technologies	
Complementarity of the expected outputs with the interest of various Stakeholders	
<b>B. FINANCIAL ASPECT (20 POINTS)</b>	
• <b>Budget reasonableness</b> (10 points)	_____
• <b>Availability of counterpart funds from other sources ( 10 points)</b>	_____
<b>TOTAL RATING</b>	_____

Remarks: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**C. RECOMMENDATION**

**For Technical Review Committee Use Only**

Assessed and Rated by:

- For In-House Review after revision
- Rejected due to major revisions
- For Ethics Review

\_\_\_\_\_  
Technical Reviewer/Date  
Printed name and Signature

**D. RECOMMENDATION**

**For In-House Evaluator Use Only**

- For Implementation
- Not for Implementation

Assessed and Rated by:

**DR. LOURDES ARAÑADOR /JUNE 29, 2018**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator/Date  
Printed name and Signature