

	<b>THESIS 1 RUBRIC</b>	<b>Document No.: FM-EEC-05-02</b>
		<b>Effective Date: July 28, 2017</b>
		<b>Supersedes: FM-EECE-02-03-03</b>

NAME OF STUDENT/S:	DATE/ TIME/ ROOM OF EXAMINATION:
--------------------	----------------------------------

THESIS TITLE:	EVALUATOR:
---------------	------------

Criteria	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Score
<b>A. Organization of the Proposal Document</b>	Does not follow the writing guidelines required by the school.	Follows the writing guidelines required but most of the paragraphs does not clearly identify its content	Follows the writing guidelines required but some paragraphs does not clearly identify its content and with no sense of continuity	Follows the writing guidelines required and all paragraphs clearly identify its content and with a little sense of continuity	Follows the writing guidelines required with each paragraph serves its purpose and with a sense of continuity	
<b>B. Content of Review of Related Literature</b>	Collects information from only one source and is not related to the study being proposed	Collects some information from at least 2 sources and one is related to the study being proposed	Collects a significant amount of information from at least 5 sources and two are related to the study being proposed	Collects extensive information from at least 7 sources and are related to the study being proposed and makes synthesis	Collects extensive information from at least 10 sources which are related to the study being proposed and evaluated, organized and synthesized	
<b>C. Research Objectives</b>	No research objective was stated	The research objectives were not clearly stated	Some research objectives were clearly stated	Most research objectives were clearly stated	All research objectives were clearly stated and understood	
<b>D. Problem Statement</b>	No problem statement was identified	The problem statement was identified and without explanation	The problem statement was identified and with little explanation	The problem statement was identified and moderate explanation was given	The problem statement was identified and with clear explanation	
<b>E. Proposed Research Methodology</b>	No research methodology was identified	Research methodology was identified without explanation and was not appropriate to the problem	Research methodology was identified with explanation and not appropriate to the problem	Research methodology was identified with explanation and appropriate to the problem	Research methodology was identified with thorough explanation and appropriate to the problem	

Criteria	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Score
<b>F. Delivery and Ability to Answer Questions</b>	The presenter did not effectively deliver the report and did not answer all the questions	The presenter did not effectively deliver the report but answer some of the questions	The presenter somehow delivered the report and answered some of the questions	The presenter effectively delivered the report and answered most of the questions	The presenter effectively delivered the report and answered all the questions clearly and satisfactorily	
<b>Average = (A+B+C+D+E+F)/6</b>						

Please check the appropriate blank:

- ☐ I hereby recommend the approval of the proposal as presented. (No revisions required.)  
☐ I hereby recommend the approval of the proposal with minor revisions. (Revisions will be reflected in the final thesis examination.)  
☐ I hereby recommend the approval of the proposal with major revisions. (Revised proposal must be submitted in writing and re-approval by the examination committee.)  
☐ I do not recommend the approval of the proposal. (Student must submit and present a new proposal.)

Remarks:

**FIRST NAME LAST NAME**

**Signature over Printed Name  
Examination Committee**