



ACCEPTANCE FORM

(Date)

Dear _____,

You have been chosen to be the *Research Adviser* of:

Suggested topic is on the area of:

Please sign below if you accept the above-mentioned students for discipleship up until the completion of the research study and the candidates earning the degree.

Thank you very much for your kind cooperation.

Sincerely,

<name of your capstone teacher>
Research Teacher

Conforme:

Name of students/Section:

Signature over printed name

Date



PROGRESS REPORT

Name and Section of Proponents:

Adviser: _____

Research Title:

No.	Date	Place	Remarks	Adviser's Signature
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				

Noted by:

Research Teacher

Date



Research Form No. 03

PROPOSAL DEFENSE EVALUATION FORM

for Transaction Processing System, Management Information System, etc.

Name and section of Proponents:

(R1) _____

(R2) _____

(R3) _____

Research Title:

Adviser: _____ **Adviser's Rating:** _____

Key:

5 – Outstanding
4 – Very Good
3 – Good
2 – Fair
1 – Poor

Rating:

4.5 – 5.0 = 95 – 100
4.0 – 4.4 = 89 – 94
3.5 – 3.9 = 83 – 88
3.0 – 3.4 = 77 – 82

2.5 – 2.9 = 71 – 76
2.0 – 2.4 = 65 – 70
1.5 – 1.9 = 60 – 64
1.0 – 1.4 = Failed

No.	Assessment Criteria for Paper	Group Points
1	Comprehensive background of the study	
2	Clear statement of the problem	
3	Attainable research objectives	
4	Established significance of the research	
5	Clear scope and limitations of the study	
6	Comprehensive and logical literary review	
7	Consistent use of standard referencing procedure	
8	Thorough presentation of methodology	
9	Documentation of standard techniques and statistical tool	
10	Necessary inclusions (i.e. forms, reports)	
Average		

No.	Assessment Criteria for Oral Presentation	Points		
		R1	R2	R3
1	A well-prepared presentation of the proposal within the required time			
2	A clear delivery of the proposal by PowerPoint® presentation			
3	A clear understanding of key concepts that demonstrate depth			
4	A sufficient acquaintance with the relevant literature			
5	Ability to answer and explain inquiries and clarifications			
6	Punctuality and personal traits			
Average				

Recommendation:

Accepted with minor revision _____

Accepted with major revision _____

Rejected/failed and required to present again _____

Evaluated by:

Signature over printed name

Date



Research Form No. 04

PROPOSAL DEFENSE EVALUATION FORM
for Game Development, Application Development etc.

Name and section of Proponents:

(R1) _____

(R2) _____

(R3) _____

Research Title:

Adviser: _____ **Adviser's Rating:** _____

Key:

5 – Outstanding
4 – Very Good
3 – Good
2 – Fair
1 – Poor

Rating:

4.5 – 5.0 = 95 – 100
4.0 – 4.4 = 89 – 94
3.5 – 3.9 = 83 – 88
3.0 – 3.4 = 77 – 82

2.5 – 2.9 = 71 – 76
2.0 – 2.4 = 65 – 70
1.5 – 1.9 = 60 – 64
1.0 – 1.4 = Failed

No.	Assessment Criteria for Paper	Group Points
1	Comprehensive project context/ background of the research study	
2	Clear purpose of the research study	
3	Understandable description of the research study	
4	Attainable research objectives	
5	Clear scope and limitations of the research study	
6	Comprehensive and logical literary review	
7	Established research paradigm or framework	
8	Thorough presentation of Concept of the study	
9	Systematic and logical arrangement of conceptual process & operation	
10	Documentation of standard techniques	
Average		

No.	Assessment Criteria for Oral Presentation	Points		
		R1	R2	R3
1	A well-prepared presentation of the proposal within the required time			
2	A clear delivery of the proposal by PowerPoint® presentation			
3	A clear understanding of key concepts that demonstrate depth			
4	A sufficient acquaintance with the relevant literature			
5	Ability to answer and explain inquiries and clarifications			
6	Punctuality and personal traits			
Average				

Recommendation:

Accepted with minor revision _____

Accepted with major revision _____

Rejected/failed and required to present again _____

Evaluated by:

Signature over printed name

Date



De La Salle University
D A S M A R I Ñ A S

College of Science and Computer Studies
(+6346) 481-1932 (+632) 8447832 local 3073

www.dasma.dlsu.edu.ph

Research Form No. 05



REVISION LIST/ VERDICT FORM

Name and section of Proponents:

(R1) _____
(R2) _____
(R3) _____

Research Title: _____

Verdict: _____ Accepted with No Revision _____ Accepted with Minor Revision
_____ Accepted with Major Revision _____ Rejected/ Need to present again

discovering. inventing. nurturing.



De La Salle University
D A S M A R I Ñ A S

College of Science and Computer Studies
(+6346) 481-1932 (+632) 8447832 local 3073
www.dasma.dlsu.edu.ph



Signature of Panelists:

Panel 1

Panel 2

Panel 3

(Date)

Conforme:

Proponent 1

Proponent 2

Proponent 3

discovering. inventing. nurturing.



De La Salle University
D A S M A R I Ñ A S

College of Science and Computer Studies
(+6346) 481-1932 (+632) 8447832 local 3073

www.dasma.dlsu.edu.ph

Research Form No. 06



ENDORSEMENT FORM TO THE EDITOR

Date: _____

Mr. Severino M. Perez

Languages Department

College of Liberal Arts

This University

Dear Sir:

This is to endorse to you the Capstone Project documentation of

(Names of Proponent)

entitled _____

for editing.

Respectfully yours,

<Name of Adviser>

Signature over printed name of Adviser

Endorsed by:

Ms. Marivic R. Mitschek

Chair, CSD





De La Salle University
D A S M A R I Ñ A S

College of Science and Computer Studies
(+6346) 481-1932 (+632) 8447832 local 3073
www.dasma.dlsu.edu.ph



CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that the undergraduate research entitled “**How to Cook: Pinoy Style an iOS Application**” submitted by **Angelica C. Ridaao, Eisha S. Papa, and Ronald C. Consorio**, was edited by undersigned.

MR. LUCIO A. HERNANDEZ

Editor

Faculty, Languages and Literature Department



discovering. inventing. nurturing.



QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SOFTWARE EVALUATION

NAME: (optional) _____

AGE: _____

Please Check one: <categories will depend on the study>

☐

Category 1

☐

Category 2

☐

Category 3

☐

Category 4

Please rate the software as follows:

5 – Strongly Agree

4 – Moderately Agree

3 – Agree

2 – Disagree

1 – Strongly Disagree

RATING		5	4	3	2	1
CRITERIA						
1.0 FUNCTIONALITY	1.1 The software can perform the tasks required.					
	1.2. The results is what is expected from the input.					
	1.3 The software prevents unauthorized access.					
2.0 RELIABILITY	2.1 The software is capable of handling errors.					
	2.2 The software resume working and restore lost data after failure					
	2.3 The system allows users to take corrective action once an error has been recognized by the system.					
3.0 USABILITY	3.1 Can easily comprehend how to use the system.					
	3.2 Can easily learn to use the system.					
	3.3 Can use the system without much effort.					
	3.4 The interface look good and appealing.					
	3.5 The use of terms are consistent throughout the system.					
	3.6 The layout is consistent					
	✓ Function of buttons					
	✓ System terminology related to pedagogic tasks					
	✓ Consistent positioning of error messages on the screen					
	✓ Clear prompts for input					



	✓ Informing users of systems progress					
	3.7 Information (and documentation) is provided by the system can easily be understood.					
4.0 EFFICIENCY	4.1 The system quickly respond to commands.					
	4.2 The system provides appropriate response time, processing time and throughput rates when performing the various functions under stated conditions.					
	4.3 Can locate operations and information quickly.					
	4.4 The software performs a sequence of operation (data input) with economy of motion.					
5.0 MAINTAINABILITY	5.1 The faults can be easily diagnosed.					
	5.2 The software continues functioning if changes are made.					
6.0 PORTABILITY	6.1 The software can be moved to other environment.					
	6.2 The software can easily be installed.					
	6.3 The software can easily replace other software					

COMMENTS/ SUGGESTIONS:

THANK YOU!



discovering. inventing. nurturing.



CAPSTONE PROJECT FINAL DEFENSE GRADING FORM

Name of Proponents:

(R1) _____

(R2) _____

(R3) _____

Defense Date: _____

Research Title: _____

Adviser: _____ **Adviser's Rating:** _____

I.DOCUMENTATION (100points)	POINTS
A. CHAPTER 1-3 (15 points) a. Incorporate the revisions suggested by the panelists.	
B. CHAPTER 4 – Development of Project (40 points) a. Appropriateness of functionalities of the software (10pts) b. Justification of the software/ language used is well presented (5pts) c. Correctness of the research instrument used (10pts) d. Validity of the research instrument and techniques' used (10pts) e. Appropriate set of requirements (5pts)	
C. CHAPTER 5 – Findings of the Study (25 points) a. Thoroughness of the presentation of results (10pts) b. Correctness of interpretation of results (15pts)	
D. CHAPTER 6 – Summary, Conclusion, Recommendations (15 points) a. Well-presented conclusions based on the results/ output obtained from the research done. (10pts) b. Appropriate recommendations are indicated (5pts)	
E. Overall Presentation of Document (5 points) a. Document has correct pagination, font style, font type, paragraph format, figure/ table labels, table of contents, bibliography etc.	
TOTAL POINTS (DOCUMENTATION)	
	40%



II.SOFTWARE (100points)	POINTS
A. FUNCTIONALITY (25 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Correct/ Accurate data entry - update, add, edit, delete, view etc. (15pts) b. Complete search and viewing of record modules (10pts) 	
B. COMPLETENESS OF PROGRAM (45 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Appropriate/ Correct error-handling routines.(10pts) b. Objectives indicated in the system have been accomplished (10pts) c. Correct system functionalities (20pts) d. Accurate processing and computation (5pts) 	
C. DESIGN (30 points) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A well-designed graphical user interface(GUI) (10pts) b. Consistency of screen layout, windows/ form appearance/ hiding (10pts) c. User friendliness (10pts) 	
TOTAL POINTS (SOFTWARE)	
60%	

GRADE: DOCUMENTATION (40%)_____ + SOFTWARE (60%)_____ =

Certified Correct:

(Signature of Panelist over Printed Name)

(Signature of Panelist over Printed Name)

(Signature of Panelist over Printed Name)



APPROVAL SHEET

This undergraduate research entitled _____ prepared and submitted by _____, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor in Science in Information Technology has been examined and has been recommended for acceptance and approved for oral examination.

<NAME OF ADVISER>

Adviser

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH PANEL

Approved by the Committee on Oral Examination with _____ grade.

<NAME OF PANEL 1>

Panel 1

<NAME OF PANEL 2>

Panel 2

<NAME OF PANEL 3>

Panel 3

Accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.**

<NAME OF IT RESEARCH COORDINATOR>

IT Research Coordinator, CSD

MS. MARIVIC R. MITSCHKE

Department Chair, CSD

DR. JOHNNY A. CHING

Dean, College of Science and Computer Studies



De La Salle University
D A S M A R I Ñ A S

College of Science and Computer Studies
(+6346) 481-1932 (+632) 8447832 local 3073

www.dasma.dlsu.edu.ph

Research Form No. 09



FINAL DEFENSE ENDORSEMENT FORM

DATE: _____

DEAR _____

(Name of Panelists)

It would be highly appreciated if you could come as one of the members of the Research Review Panel to evaluate the Research of:

NAME OF PROPONENTS:

TITLE OF RESEARCH:

SCHEDULE OF FINAL DEFENSE: DECEMBER 03, 2016/ SAT 8:00-5:00 PM/ICT 2F

Should you find any basic deficiency that would warrant postponement of the presentation, please inform the undersigned at least three (3) days before the schedule of the final defense.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Research Adviser

Research Teacher

CC: Research Teacher, Research Adviser, Capstone Coordinator

discovering. inventing. nurturing.