*Research Form No. 01*

**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*

*Research Form No. 02*

**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: Rating:**

5 – Outstanding 4.5 – 5.0 = 95 – 100 2.5 – 2.9 = 71 – 76

4 – Very Good 4.0 – 4.4 = 89 – 94 2.0 – 2.4 = 65 – 70

3 – Good 3.5 – 3.9 = 83 – 88 1.5 – 1.9 = 60 – 64

2 – Fair 3.0 – 3.4 = 77 – 82 1.0 – 1.4 = Failed

1 – Poor

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Assessment Criteria for Paper** | **Group Points** |  | **No.** | **Assessment Criteria for Oral Presentation** | **Points** | | |
|  | **R1** | **R2** | **R3** |
| 1 | Comprehensive background of the study |  |  | 1 | A well-prepared presentation of the proposal within the required time |  |  |  |
| 2 | Clear statement of the problem |  |  | 2 | A clear delivery of the proposal by PowerPoint® presentation |  |  |  |
| 3 | Attainable research objectives |  |  | 3 | A clear understanding of key concepts that demonstrate depth |  |  |  |
| 4 | Established significance of the research |  |  | 4 | A sufficient acquaintance with the relevant literature |  |  |  |
| 5 | Clear scope and limitations of the study |  |  | 5 | Ability to answer and explain inquiries and clarifications |  |  |  |
| 6 | Comprehensive and logical literary review |  |  | 6 | Punctuality and personal traits |  |  |  |
| 7 | Consistent use of standard referencing procedure |  |  | **Average** | |  |  |  |
| 8 | Thorough presentation of methodology |  |  | **Recommendation:** | |  |  |  |
| 9 | Documentation of standard techniques and statistical tool |  |  |  | *Accepted with minor revision* | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
| 10 | Necessary inclusions (i.e. forms, reports) |  |  |  | *Accepted with major revision* | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
| **Average** | |  |  |  | *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: Rating:**

5 – Outstanding 4.5 – 5.0 = 95 – 100 2.5 – 2.9 = 71 – 76

4 – Very Good 4.0 – 4.4 = 89 – 94 2.0 – 2.4 = 65 – 70

3 – Good 3.5 – 3.9 = 83 – 88 1.5 – 1.9 = 60 – 64

2 – Fair 3.0 – 3.4 = 77 – 82 1.0 – 1.4 = Failed

1 – Poor

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Assessment Criteria for Paper** | **Group Points** |  | **No.** | **Assessment Criteria for Oral Presentation** | **Points** | | |
|  | **R1** | **R2** | **R3** |
| 1 | Comprehensive project context/ background of the research study |  |  | 1 | A well-prepared presentation of the proposal within the required time |  |  |  |
| 2 | Clear purpose of the research study |  |  | 2 | A clear delivery of the proposal by PowerPoint® presentation |  |  |  |
| 3 | Understandable description of the research study |  |  | 3 | A clear understanding of key concepts that demonstrate depth |  |  |  |
| 4 | Attainable research objectives |  |  | 4 | A sufficient acquaintance with the relevant literature |  |  |  |
| 5 | Clear scope and limitations of the research study |  |  | 5 | Ability to answer and explain inquiries and clarifications |  |  |  |
| 6 | Comprehensive and logical literary review |  |  | 6 | Punctuality and personal traits |  |  |  |
| 7 | Established research paradigm or framework |  |  | **Average** | |  |  |  |
| 8 | Thorough presentation of Concept of the study |  |  | **Recommendation:** | |  |  |  |
| 9 | Systematic and logical arrangement of conceptual process & operation |  |  |  | *Accepted with minor revision* | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
| 10 | Documentation of standard techniques |  |  |  | *Accepted with major revision* | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |
| **Average** | |  |  |  | *Rejected/failed and required to present again* | | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |

**Evaluated by:**

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

*Signature over printed name Date*

*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

**Signature of Panelists: Conforme:**

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

*Panel 1*  *Proponent 1*

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

*Panel 2* *Proponent 2*

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

*Panel 3* *Proponent 3*

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

(Date)

*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*

**CERTIFICATION**

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

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

**MR. LUCIO A. HERNANDEZ**

*Editor*

*Faculty, Languages and Literature Department*

*Research Form No. 07*

**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 FUNCTIONALIY | 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!

*Research Form No. 08*

**CAPSTONE PROJECT FINAL DEFENSE GRADING FORM**

**Name of Proponents: Defense Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

(R1) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Research Title:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(R2) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(R3) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Adviser:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Adviser’s Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I.DOCUMENTATION (100points)** | **POINTS** |
| 1. ***CHAPTER 1-3 (15 points)*** 2. Incorporate the revisions suggested by the panelists. |  |
| 1. ***CHAPTER 4 – Development of Project (40 points)*** 2. Appropriateness of functionalities of the software *(10pts)* 3. Justification of the software/ language used is well presented *(5pts)* 4. Correctness of the research instrument used *(10pts)* 5. Validity of the research instrument and techniques’ used *(10pts)* 6. Appropriate set of requirements *(5pts)* |  |
| 1. ***CHAPTER 5 – Findings of the Study (25 points)*** 2. Thoroughness of the presentation of results *(10pts)* 3. Correctness of interpretation of results *(15pts)* |  |
| 1. ***CHAPTER 6 – Summary, Conclusion, Recommendations (15 points)*** 2. Well-presented conclusions based on the results/ output obtained from the research done. *(10pts)* 3. Appropriate recommendations are indicated *(5pts)* |  |
| 1. ***Overall Presentation of Document (5 points)*** 2. 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** |
| 1. ***FUNCTONALITY (25 points)*** 2. Correct/ Accurate data entry - update, add, edit, delete, view etc. *(15pts)* 3. Complete search and viewing of record modules *(10pts)* |  |
| 1. ***COMPLETENESS OF PROGRAM (45 points)*** 2. Appropriate/ Correct error-handling routines.*(10pts)* 3. Objectives indicated in the system have been accomplished *(10pts)* 4. Correct system functionalities *(20pts)* 5. Accurate processing and computation *(5pts)* |  |
| 1. ***DESIGN (30 points)*** 2. A well-designed graphical user interface(GUI) *(10pts)* 3. Consistency of screen layout, windows/ form appearance/ hiding *(10pts)* 4. 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> <NAME OF PANEL 2>**

*Panel 1 Panel 2*

*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**<NAME OF PANEL 3>**

*Panel 3*

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

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ­­­­ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**
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