

1st ORAL DEFENSE RATING SHEET

(FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUPS ONLY)

Project Title: **SU:AD (Silliman University Academic Databank) - A Digital Archive for Silliman University Academic Papers**

Defense of: **CHAPTER 1 – Introduction and Background of the Study**
CHAPTER 2 – Review of Related Literature and Systems
CHAPTER 3 – Methodology
CHAPTER 4 – Analysis, Design & Deployment

SCHEDULE:

Day

Date

Time

Room

INDIVIDUAL RATING:

*Please place a **circle** on the rating that best describes the ability of the student.*

CRITERIA 1: Oral/Physical Presentation (Includes manner of dressing, voice projection, respect in addressing the panelists, confidence in explaining the assigned part, unnecessary mannerisms, etc.)	4.0 –Presentation is excellent 3.0 –Presentation is very good 2.0 –Presentation is satisfactory 1.0 –Presentation is poor 0.0 –Not presentable at all				
	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Deanne Mitchill Agir	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kyle Angelee Estabillo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Renz Joshua B. Labiaga	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CRITERIA 2: Comprehension of the project as a whole	4.0 - Fully understands the whole project 3.0 - Understands most part/s of the project 2.0 - Understands only half of the project 1.0 - Understands only a small portion of the project 0 - Does not understand the project at all				
	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Deanne Mitchill Agir	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kyle Angelee Estabillo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Renz Joshua B. Labiaga	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CRITERIA 3: Providing sensible answers to questions	4.0 – All of the answers are sensible 3.0 – Most of the answers are sensible 2.0 – Half of the answers are sensible 1.0 – Only a few answers are sensible 0 – Does not provide sensible answers				
	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Deanne Mitchill Agir	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kyle Angelee Estabillo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Renz Joshua B. Labiaga	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PROJECT RATING (Chapter 1 & 2):

Please place an X on the box that describes the criteria of the project

CRITERIA	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0.0
<i>Problem Definition</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the problem definition needs revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> The problem is non-existent
<i>Literature Review and Comparison of Related Works</i> - <u>Should not be copied and pasted from the source</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated; references are enough for the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision; references are enough for the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major revision; references are enough for the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major revision; lacks sources/ references	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be overhauled
<i>Objectives</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the objectives need to be revised	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Not stated
<i>Significance</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the significance needs to be revised	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Not seen
<i>Scope and Limitation</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly stated	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the scope & limitation needs to be revised	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Not seen
<i>Complexity</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Complexity is more than enough for the project	<input type="checkbox"/> Complexity is enough for the project	<input type="checkbox"/> The project lacks a little more complexity	<input type="checkbox"/> Only a little complexity can be seen	<input type="checkbox"/> No complexity at all
<i>Grammar (of the chapter as a whole)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No need to improve	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a little improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the chapter needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be overhauled

PROJECT RATING (Chapter 3 & 4) :

Please place an X on the box that describes the criteria of the project

CRITERIA	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0.0
<i>Completeness and Correctness of the Conceptual Framework</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Complete, correct and thoroughly discussed	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of this section needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-existent
<i>Correctness of the Software Development model being used (with an explanation on why/ how the model is used in their project)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Correctly presented	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of this section needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-existent
<i>Correctness of the Project Timeline/ Timeframe -synchronization of their activities to the Gantt Chart</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Correctly presented	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of this section needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-existent
<i>Completeness and Correctness of the Analysis section in the chapter</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Complete, correctly presented and thoroughly discussed	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of this section needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-existent
<i>Completeness and Correctness of the Design section in the chapter</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Complete, correctly presented and thoroughly discussed	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of this section needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> This section needs major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-existent
<i>Grammar (of the chapter as a whole)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No need to improve	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a little improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the chapter needs improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs a lot of improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs to be overhauled

OVERALL RATING: ☐ No need for re-defense
 ☐ Accepted without Revisions
 ☐ Accepted with Minor/Major Revisions
 ☐ For re-defense (redo the whole chapter)

Rated by: _____
 Jonathan N. Te
 Panelist

TOTALS FOR THE FIRST ORAL DEFENSE

Individual Rating:
 Deanne Mitchill Agir _____/4.0
 Kyle Angelee Estabillo _____/4.0
 Renz Joshua B. Labiaga _____/4.0

Project Rating: _____/4.0