



2nd ORAL DEFENSE RATING SHEET

(FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GROUPS ONLY)

Project Title: **SU Digital Repository: A Digital Archive for Silliman University Academic Papers**

Defense of: **FIRST INCREMENT of the Application**

SCHEDULE:

Day

Date

Time

Room

INDIVIDUAL RATING:

*Please place a **circle** on the rating that 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 –Not presentable at all				
Deanne Mitchill Agir	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Kyle Angelee Estabillo	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Renz Joshua B. Labiaga	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0

CRITERIA 2: Comprehension of the scope (theory, framework and methods) of the First Increment	4.0 - Fully understands the scope of the increment 3.0 - Understands most part/s of the scope that is being implemented 2.0 - Understands only half of the scope that is being implemented 1.0 - Understands only a small portion of the scope that is being implemented 0 - Does not understand the scope at all				
Deanne Mitchill Agir	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Kyle Angelee Estabillo	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Renz Joshua B. Labiaga	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0

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				
Deanne Mitchill Agir	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Kyle Angelee Estabillo	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0
Renz Joshua B. Labiaga	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	0



PROJECT RATING:

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

CRITERIA	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
<i>Consistency of the application being presented to the requirements specification, analysis and design as documented in Chapter 3</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> The application is consistent with the requirements specification, analysis and design	<input type="checkbox"/> There is a little inconsistency between the requirements specification, analysis and design	<input type="checkbox"/> There are a lot of inconsistencies between the requirements specification, analysis and design	<input type="checkbox"/> The requirements specification, analysis and design are not consistent with the application
<i>Comprehensiveness/ Completeness of the Scope of the First Increment as presented by the group</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope has been incorporated completely in the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Most of the scope has been incorporated in the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Only a little of the scope has been incorporated in the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> The scope was not seen in the presentation
<i>Presentation of the User Interface</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not need modification	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs minor modifications	<input type="checkbox"/> Half of the UI needs modifications	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs major modifications
<i>Robustness of the system</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> The application executes perfectly without any errors	<input type="checkbox"/> The application executes with minor errors	<input type="checkbox"/> The application executes but has a few major errors	<input type="checkbox"/> The application does not execute as expected

OVERALL RATING: ☐No need for re-defense (Accepted with Minor/Major Revisions)
 ☐For roundtable
 ☐For re-defense

Rated by: _____

Dr. Dave E. Marcial
Panelist

TOTALS FOR THE THIRD ORAL DEFENSE

Individual Rating:

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

Project Rating: _____/4.0