



SYSTEM INTEGRATION AND ARCHITECTURE 2

TITLE	A WEB - BASED ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR BARANGAY 369 USING NODE.JS, REACT AND MYSQL
BENEFICIARY	BARANGAY 369 Officials
ADDRESS	STA. CRUZ MANILA

MEMBERS PROFILE

		
LLOYD CEDRICK P. DE LA CRUZ	ELHIZE ELINETH ARCAÑO	MARK ANTHONY P. MONTAÑO
224-08543M	224-09114M	224-06342M
PROJECT LEADER	DOCUMENTATION LEADER	TECHNICAL LEADER
		
GENNY D. CIRUELA	AIRA LORAINNE S. TORRES	ARDEN B. MECASIO
224-06790M	224-09524M	224-08640M
QUALITY ASSURANCE LEADER	COMMUNICATION LEADER	TECHNICAL LEADER



SYSTEM INTEGRATION AND ARCHITECTURE 2
INITIAL PRESENTATION

TITLE: A WEB - BASED ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR BARANGAY 369 USING NODE.JS, REACT AND MYSQL				DATE:
MEMBERS				
1. Lloyd Cedrick P. De La Cruz– Project Leader		4. Genny D. Ciruela – QA Leader		
2. Arden B. Mecasio – Technical Leader		5. Elhize Elineth Arcaño – Documentation Leader		
3. Mark Anthony P. Montaño – Communication Leader		6. Aira Lorainne S. Torres – Communication Leader		

Documents and System Proposal Rubrics

#	Criteria	Excellent (10 pts)	Good (8 pts)	Satisfactory (6 pts)	Needs Improvement (4 pts)	Not Evident (0 pts)
1	Feasibility of the Concept	The system idea is highly practical and clearly achievable with available resources, time, and technology.	Concept is feasible with minor challenges.	Concept is somewhat feasible but requires major adjustments.	Concept is unrealistic without significant changes.	Concept is not feasible at all.
2	Attainability of Objectives	Objectives are clearly stated, measurable, and fully achievable within the project timeline.	Objectives are mostly attainable with minor revisions.	Objectives are vague or partially attainable.	Objectives are unrealistic or unclear.	No clear or defined objectives.
3	Clarity of Problem Statement	Problem is clearly defined and well-justified with real-world relevance.	Problem is mostly clear and relevant.	Problem is somewhat clear but lacks justification.	Problem is vaguely defined or poorly explained.	No clear problem identified.
4	Innovation and Originality	Proposal shows creativity, innovation, or a unique approach to solving the problem.	Some innovative ideas are present.	Concept has limited originality.	Concept is mostly common or derivative.	No innovation; entirely unoriginal.
5	System Scope and Coverage	Scope is well-defined, appropriate, and neither too broad nor too narrow.	Scope is generally appropriate; some elements need refinement.	Scope is somewhat clear; either slightly too broad or narrow.	Scope is vague or lacks focus.	Scope is not defined.
6	Target Users and Usefulness	Clearly identifies target users and explains how the system will benefit them.	Target users are identified; usefulness mostly clear.	General idea of users and usefulness is present.	Vague understanding of users or system relevance.	No clear users or usefulness discussed.
7	Proposed System Features	Features are well-explained, relevant, and aligned with the objectives and problem.	Most features are aligned and justified.	Some features are relevant; others need justification.	Features are unclear or do not support the problem/objectives.	Features are not presented.
8	Technical Viability	Technologies, platforms, and tools proposed are suitable and realistically applicable.	Most technologies are appropriate; minor issues.	Some tools/technologies are unclear or questionable.	Technologies are unsuitable or poorly justified.	No technologies proposed.

Total Pts: _____



COLLEGE OF COMPUTING STUDIES

INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATION RUBRIC

Criteria	Excellent (10)	Very Good (8)	Satisfactory (6)	Needs Improvement (4)
A.Organization & Flow	Presentation is very well-structured; ideas flow logically and smoothly.	Clear structure with minor lapses in flow.	Some organization present but a bit confusing at times.	Lacks clear structure; difficult to follow.
B. Clarity of Delivery	Speaks clearly, confidently, and at a good pace; audience easily understands.	Mostly clear and confident with minor issues in pace or clarity.	Sometimes unclear, too fast/slow, or monotone.	Hard to understand; frequent pauses or mumbling.
C. Visual Aids (Slides/Materials)	Slides are professional, well-designed, and enhance understanding.	Slides are clear and readable with minor design issues.	Slides are somewhat cluttered or text-heavy.	Poorly designed slides; distracting or unreadable.
D. Engagement & Confidence	Presenter shows strong confidence, engages audience, and maintains eye contact.	Good confidence with occasional reliance on notes.	Some confidence but often reads directly from slides/notes.	Very little confidence; avoids eye contact; heavily dependent on notes.
E. Time Management	Presentation is within allotted time, well-paced, and complete.	Slightly over/under time but covers most points.	Noticeably over/under time; some parts rushed or incomplete.	Poor timing; too short, too long, or important parts missing.
F. Team Collaboration (if group)	Smooth coordination among members; transitions are seamless.	Good coordination with minor gaps in transitions.	Some imbalance in participation; uneven transitions.	Poor coordination; one member dominates or others not prepared.
G. Professionalism	Attire, language, and demeanor are highly professional.	Mostly professional with minor lapses.	Acceptable but with noticeable lapses in professionalism.	Unprofessional attire, language, or behavior.

RESULT

NAME	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL PTS
1. Lloyd Cedrick P. De La Cruz								
2. Arden B. Mecasio								
3. Mark Anthony P. Montaño								
4. Genny D. Ciruela								
5. Elhize Elineth Arcaño								
6. Aira Lorainne S. Torres								



COLLEGE OF COMPUTING STUDIES

LEADER'S EVALUATION RUBRIC

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Very Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
A. Fulfillment of Designated Task/Role	Consistently fulfills assigned role with high accountability; goes beyond expectations.	Completes role effectively with only minor lapses.	Completes role but output requires some guidance.	Barely fulfills role; output incomplete or needs major correction.	Fails to fulfill role.
B. Participation from the Start of Project	Actively engaged from the very beginning; consistently contributes ideas, effort, and time.	Participates regularly from the start with minor lapses.	Shows some participation but inconsistent.	Rarely participates; minimal involvement.	No participation from the start.
C. Quality of Output	Work is excellent, well-prepared, accurate, and professional.	Work is good, clear, and mostly accurate with minor issues.	Work is acceptable but average; needs revisions.	Work is incomplete, poorly done, or frequently inaccurate.	No output delivered.
D. Behaviour	Always respectful, cooperative, and positive towards teammates.	Mostly respectful and cooperative with minor lapses.	Shows acceptable behavior with occasional issues.	Sometimes uncooperative, disruptive, or disrespectful.	Frequently uncooperative or shows poor behavior.

RESULT

NAME	A	B	C	D	TOTAL PTS
1. Arden B. Mecasio					
2. Mark Anthony P. Montaño					
3. Genny D. Ciruela					
4. Elhize Elineth Arcaño					
5. Aira Lorainne S. Torres					
6.					

SUMMARY RESULT

NAME	PROPOSAL	INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATION	LEADERS EVALUATION	TOTAL PTS	RATING
1. Lloyd Cedrick P. De La Cruz					
2. Arden B. Mecasio					
3. Mark Anthony P. Montaño					
4. Genny D. Ciruela					
5. Elhize Elineth Arcaño					
6. Aira Lorainne S. Torres					