UPSITE UP System Information Technology Foundation

Criteria For R&D Proposal Evaluation

Each Program/Project/Study will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. Relevance

- 1. Potential contributions to
 - 1. National/Regional Development
 - 2. Advancement of knowledge in its area of concern
 - 3. Policy and Standard formulation
- 2. Potential areas of application (for basic research)

2. Significance

- 1. Impact and benefit to society
- 2. Potentially/Directly provide social wealth
- 3. Potentially/Directly lead to technology transfer
- 4. Provide solution to an important fundamental problem in the area of concern (for basic research)

3. Literature Review

- 1. Provide a synthesis of the topic; not a mere summary or listing of published papers
- 2. Proper citation provided
- 3. Related to the hypothesis of the study

4. The Hypothesis (If applicable)

1. Based on a well-founded reviews of known results

5. The Methodology

- 1. Provide either
 - 1. novel technique/s
 - 2. innovations or improvements of known methodology or techniques
- 2. Soundness and rigor (if applicable) of methodology or techniques
- 3. Limitation, assumptions, and definitions of the study should be precisely stated

6. Work Plan

- 1. Deliverable should be clearly provided and identified
- 2. Milestone must be precisely identified (per quarter/annual)



UPSITE UP System Information Technology Foundation

7. Budget

1. Reasonable budget with respect to the extent of activities and deliverables

8. Academic Credentials of Proponent/s

- 1. Published on a refereed journal
- 2. Done research/project funded by CHED
- 3. Done research/project funded by DOST
- 4. Done research/project funded by other funding agencies, including own Institution
- 5. CV shows that proponent could do the project (for first time to do research)
 - 1. PhD
 - 2. MS/MA
 - 3. BS/AB



UPSITF UP System Information Technology Foundation

Evaluation Form:

Program	:	
Project	:	
Study	:	
Proponent/s	:	
Institution	:	
Problem (+ Literature Review, and Hypothesis)		
Significance (+ Relevance)	•	
Methodology (+ Work plan)	:	
Expected Output		
Researcher(s) Capability (Academic Credentials)	:	
Proposed Budget	:	
Recommendations (for funding; revision; or reject)	:	

Evaluator: