

IN-HOUSE REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

This form consolidates the individual evaluators' scores from the paper review to determine the final evaluation and recommendation for the In-House Review.

(To be filled out by the OEDR)

Application Code						
Basic Screening Requirements (Pass/Fail)	Requirement	Yes	No	Requirement	Yes	No
	Proposal follows prescribed format	☐	☐	Gantt Chart attached	☐	☐
	Researcher's expertise aligns with project	☐	☐	References included	☐	☐
	Budget is complete and justified	☐	☐	Ethical considerations addressed (if applicable)	☐	☐

PART I. RATING SECTION. (Please provide your rate using the rating scale 5-1, 5 being the highest. (Please evaluate the proposal using the 5-point rating scale below, with 5 being the highest and 1 being the lowest. Assign a score for each criterion based on the provided descriptors, multiply by the corresponding percentage weight to compute the weighted score, and indicate the final total in the designated row.)

CRITERIA	RATING SCALE					RATING
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
1. Alignment with SSU Research Thrusts, Institutional Mandates, and National Priorities	Strongly aligned with SSU Strategic Goals, Research Thrusts, SDGs, <i>Ambisyon Natin</i> 2040, and relevant regional and national priorities.	Well aligned with most priorities.	Moderately aligned but some linkages require strengthening.	Weak alignment.	Not aligned.	
2. Problem Significance, Situational Analysis, and Research Gap	Problem is exceptionally articulated using current statistics, environmental scanning, policy analysis, literature synthesis, and local context. The research gap is explicit, compelling, and demonstrates a strong need for investment.	Problem and gap are clearly presented with adequate evidence.	Problem and gap are understandable but evidence and justification are limited.	Problem is weakly justified and gap is unclear.	Problem and gap are poorly articulated or unsupported.	
3. Potential Contribution and Expected Impact (please see guide at the back)	Demonstrates substantial and clearly articulated potential contributions with identifiable beneficiaries, expected outputs, and realistic pathways to utilization.	Likely to generate meaningful contributions with identifiable beneficiaries and outputs.	Potential contribution is present but limited or insufficiently elaborated.	Contribution is weak or vaguely discussed.	No meaningful contribution identified.	
4. Scientific Merit and Review of Literature	Literature review is comprehensive, current, critically synthesized, theoretically grounded, and clearly demonstrates novelty and scientific merit.	Literature review is adequate and supports the study well.	Literature review is acceptable but lacks synthesis or depth.	Literature review is limited or weakly integrated.	Literature review fails to justify the study.	

5. Technical Soundness of Methodology	Methodology is rigorous, feasible, scientifically sound, and capable of answering all objectives. Sampling, instruments, procedures, analyses, ethics, validity, reliability/trustworthiness are clearly justified.	Methodology is generally sound with minor weaknesses.	Methodology is acceptable but requires improvements.	Methodology contains significant weaknesses affecting validity or feasibility.	Methodology is inappropriate or incapable of answering objectives.	
TOTAL						
GRAND TOTAL						

II. PANEL COMMENTS & REQUIRED REVISIONS

(Please specify if changes are needed in Section B.4 (Methods and Materials) or Section C (Expected Outputs).

III. FINAL RECOMMENDATION

(To be filled out by the Office of the Executive Director for Research [OEDR]. The final recommendation will be based on the ratings provided in Part I: Criterion 1 [20%], Criterion 2 [25%], Criterion 3 [25%], Criterion 4 [10%], and Criterion 5 [20%]. Multiply each rating by its corresponding percentage weight to compute the weighted score, and indicate the grand total in the designated row.)

Overall Weighted Score: _____

III. FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Overall Weighted Score: _____

Funding Recommendation

☐ **CATEGORY A: STRATEGIC / HIGHLY FUNDABLE RESEARCH (90–100)**
Highly recommended for institutional funding and external funding opportunities (DOST, CHED, NRCP, PCAARRD, PCHRD, DA-BAR, etc.)

☐ **CATEGORY B: FUNDABLE WITH MINOR REVISIONS (85–89)**
Recommended for university funding subject to minor revisions.

☐ **CATEGORY C: COLLEGE / CENTER-BASED RESEARCH (75–84)**
Recommended for implementation at the college, campus, or research center level.

☐ **CATEGORY D: ACTION RESEARCH / SMALL RESEARCH PROJECT (65–74)**
Recommended for redesign as Action Research, Operational Research, or Small Research Grant.

☐ **CATEGORY E: MAJOR REDESIGN FOR RESUBMISSION (Below 65)**
Proposal requires substantial redevelopment before reconsideration.

Evaluated by:

Position: _____

Date: _____

Criterion 5: Potential Contribution, Innovation, Utilization, and Expected Outputs. The proposal demonstrates substantial potential to generate one or more of the following:

Knowledge

- New theory
- New framework
- New model
- New evidence
- New datasets

Technology and Innovation

- Prototype
- Application
- Digital platform

- System
- Patent/IP
- Commercialization opportunity

Economy

- Income generation
- Employment
- Productivity enhancement
- Enterprise development

Health

- Improved health outcomes
- Improved healthcare delivery
- Health policy recommendations

Environment

- Conservation
- Sustainability
- Climate resilience
- Resource management

Governance

- Policy reforms
- Governance innovations
- Decision-support systems

Education

- Learning innovations
- Curriculum enhancement
- Instructional models

Community and Society

- Poverty alleviation
- Social innovation
- Community empowerment
- Improved quality of life

Institutional Development

- Improved systems
- Organizational effectiveness
- Accreditation support
- Quality assurance enhancement

Partnerships

- Industry-academe-government collaboration
- Research networks
- Community engagement