**RATING SHEET FORPRE-DEPLOYMENT DEFENSE**

Name of the Panelist: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Role: [ ] Chairman [ ] Member Proponents:

1. Kent Jun K. Gil 3. Alexandra May T. Pis-Ing
2. Macky Mar B. Layao 4. Mhel Jhon D. Leones

Title of the Capstone Project: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Directions:*** Kindly rate the following based on each criterion.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria and Weight (30 %)** |  | **Proponents** | |  |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Disposition (30%)   1. Generally neat in appearance 2. Projects an aura of confidence 3. Preparedness and teamwork   Delivery and Presentation (70%)   1. Organization of Content    * Sense of segmentation    * Presentation is not interrupted to reload a file 2. Manner of Presentation    * Presenter does not tend to talk to the screen    * Does not have some hesitancy in speaking    * Less consulting of notes and has good eye contact with panelists    * Volume of voice is adequate and can be heard by everyone    * Does not delve too long into a specific subject matter    * Use clear visuals and appropriate materials for the preparation 3. Ability to Defend Ideas and Technical Output    * Ability to respond to questions and criticisms    * Has good responses to critiques and comments    * Does not have the tendency to go into other issues when answering questions    * Attitude towards suggestions given (i.e., receptive, not hostile or indifferent) |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria and Weight (40%)** | **Rating** |
| Software and Simulation   * GUI properly presents the set objectives and functional requirements (30%) * Technical output, such as simulation, are relevant to the concept of the study (40%) * Degree of impact on the panelists (10%) * Exhibits ease of use and user-friendliness (20%) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria and Weight (30%)** | **Yes (**✓**) or No**  **(**✖**)** |
| **Introduction** |  |
| *Background of the Study* |  |
| 1. The various aspects of the research environment have been discussed, and a critical analysis of the background has been presented. |  |
| 2. Articles and previous research from credible sources and referred publications are included in the literature presented. |  |
| 3. The background of the study highlights the significant concerns that support the study, including the context of the problem situation and the locale of the study. |  |
| 4. The introduction is well-written, brief, and informative. |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Objectives of the Study* | |
| 5. The objectives of the problem specify how the issues will be addressed and describe the aim of the study. |  |
| 6. The objectives are logically arranged in chronological order. |  |
| 7. The objectives are specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-bounded. |  |
| *Significance and Scope and Limitation* | |
| 8. The beneficiaries of the study are well-identified. |  |
| 9. The study's purpose, contribution, and implications for stakeholders are articulated. |  |
| 10. The study’s inclusion and coverage, specifically the process involved, are explained. |  |
| 11. The limitations and exclusions of the study were mentioned. |  |
| *Review of the Related Literature and Works* | |
| 12. The literature provided offers data that enhance and support the research study’s ideas and its research outcome. |  |
| 13. The manuscript presents logically and coherently literature and works. |  |
| 14. It provides a clear and concise summary and synthesis of literature and works. |  |
| **Methods** | |
| *System Planning* | |
| 15. The SDLC model that will be employed has been thoroughly discussed. |  |
| 16. The method of eliciting requirements and discussing project identification is presented, including the study's scope and limits. |  |
| 17. The Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) is shown and explained using the SDLC approach. |  |
| 18. The Gantt Chart's alignment with the WBS is demonstrated and justified. |  |
| *System Analysis* | |
| 19. The system architecture is well-presented, relevant, and sufficient to support the system's development. |  |
| 20. The Use Case diagram uses correct UML symbols and notations that illustrate the scenario of the system or application's interactions with the actors. |  |
| 21. The Level 0 DFD (Context Flow Diagram) and Level 1 DFD, which illustrate the logical flow of the data, are presented, explained, and aligned. |  |
| 22. The functional and non-functional requirements are testable and linked to the study’s objectives. |  |
| 23. The discussion is kept consistent from one diagram to the next. |  |
| *System Design* | |
| 24. The discussion explains how the proponents plan to manageably bridge the gap between the problem area and the suggested system. |  |
| 25. The ERD models or JSON schema ensures that data conforms to a specific format and structure. |  |
| 26. The data dictionary contains detailed information about a database's contents. |  |
| 27. The concept of the study deeply discusses the processes involved in the system architecture, particularly the model/algorithm. |  |
| 28. The technologies used to develop the system are relevant, explained, and shown. |  |
| *System Implementation and Maintenance* | |
| 29. The implementation strategy has been discussed briefly. |  |
| 30. The maintenance plan was mentioned in the manuscript. |  |
| **Total Yes (**✓**) Responses** |  |

Verdict: [ ] Passed with no Revisions [ ] Passed with Revisions [ ] Deferred until \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature over Printed Name of the Panelist