**Asia Pacific College**

**School of Engineering**

**Research Methods for ECE (ECEMETH)**

**Title Defense Grading Rubrics – Panelist**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHEDULE** | | **Proponents** | **PROPOSED TITLE** | **Adviser :** |
| **Date:**  **Time :**  **Room :** | |  | **Technical Title:** | **Chair :** |
|  | **Lead Panel :** |
| X | **Preliminary Defense**  ***(Midterm period)*** |  | **Member 1 :** |
| X | **Proposal Defense**  ***(Final term period)*** |  | **Short Title:** | **Member 2 :** |

1. **Comments :** *for the group and project title*
2. **For revisions**
3. **Additional requirements**
4. **Grading Rubrics:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PANELIST GRADING RUBRICS**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **7** | Exceptional | **6** | Very Good | | **5** | Good | **4** | Satisfactory | | **3** | Needs Improvement | **2** | Incomplete | | **1** | Undesirable | **N/A** | Not Applicable | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Methods and Procedure** | | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **N/A** | **REMARKS** |
| **A.1 Client Requirement** | The customer’s problem is clearly stated and shows obvious relevance and significance. Details, information and data are presented with no evidence of incorrect information, incomplete data, biases or implied solutions. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **A.2 Problem Statement** | Revised problem statement is clear and concise without unambiguous terms. It is expressed in a way sensitive to reader’s perception. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **A.3 Objectives** | Objectives are clearly presented in hierarchical structure and clustered accordingly. Appropriate metrics to determine the achievement of objectives are also presented | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **A.4 Constraints** | Limits and constraints for the design are clearly and precisely presented. Constraints are objectively measurable. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **A.5 Scope and Delimitation** | The scope of study explains what information or subject is being analyzed while delimitation allows to explain why certain aspects of a subject were chosen and why others were excluded. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **A.6 Significance of the study** | An explanation of the work's significance, its potential benefits and its overall impact and it attempts to explain to an audience why a researcher's work is worth performing. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.7 Conceptual Framework** | A system of concepts, assumptions, expectations, beliefs, and theories that supports and informs your research is a key part of your design |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.8 Metrics** | The metrics objectively assesses the achievement of the objectives. The tools are appropriate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.9 Local Related Studies** | A studies, inquiries, or investigations already conducted to which the present proposed study is relate or has similarity. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.10 Foreign Related Studies** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.11 Local Related Literature** | Compose of discussion of facts and principle to which the present study is related (it can be found from books, encyclopedias, professional journals, newspaper, and other publication). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.12 Foreign Related**  **Literature** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **A.13 Relevance of the RRL to the present study** | To explain the importance of the research you are conducting by providing valid arguments. The research needs to contribute to the elimination of a gap in the literature can be conducted to solve a specific problem. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes Assessment** | | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **N/A** |  |
| **B.1 Presentation Skills** | The students presented their proposal in an organized manner. They showed effective presentation and communication skills. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **B.2 Documentation** | The students were able to express effectively their ideas through their documentations. The presentation of ideas is clear, objective, organized and easy to comprehend. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **B.3 Mastery of Content** | They exhibited mastery of the content of their presentation. They were able to answer correctly the questions of the panel. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **B.4 Application of Knowledge** | The students were able to apply appropriately and accurately the knowledge of mathematics, natural science, engineering fundamentals and engineering principles in their design. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **B.5 Review of Related Literature** | The students were able to identify and research appropriate and accurate literature. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| **B.6 Reasoning Skills** | The students are able to apply broad reasoning using appropriate and accurate knowledge in creating and assessing their design. | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |

1. **Recommendations/Verdict: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

*(Refer to page no. 6 for the list of possible verdicts. Grades to individual member to be recommended by the official panel member composed of chair, lead panelist and one member.)*

**Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Designation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

***SUMMARY OF RATINGS***

*(This portion is to be accomplished by the CHAIR. The final verdict of the Chair is considered final and irrevocable after the deliberation*.***)***

*(Provide this copy to the chair only)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preliminary Defense Documentation** | | **Chair** | **Lead Panel** | **Member 1** | **Member 2** | **AVERAGE** |
| A1 | **Client Requirement** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A2 | **Problem Statement** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A3 | **Final Objectives** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A4 | **Constraints** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A5 | **Scope and Delimitation** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A6 | **Significance of the study** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A7 | **Conceptual Framework** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A8 | **Metrics** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A9 | **Local Related Studies** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A10 | **Foreign Related Studies** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A11 | **Local Related Literature** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A12 | **Foreign Related Literature** |  |  |  |  |  |
| A13 | **Relevance of the RRL to the present study** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Learning Outcomes Assessment** | |  | | | | |
| B1 | **Presentation Skills** |  |  |  |  |  |
| B2 | **Documentation** |  |  |  |  |  |
| B3 | **Mastery of Content** |  |  |  |  |  |
| B4 | **Application of Knowledge** |  |  |  |  |  |
| B5 | **Review of Related Literature** |  |  |  |  |  |
| B6 | **Reasoning Skill** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **OVERALL RATING** | | | | | |  |

At the conclusion of each **defense**, decision of the panel members can be summarized as follows:

**1. CONDITIONAL PASS (WITH REVISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS**)

This decision is given if the design project panel committee has approved the proposal documentation (containing the problem statement and conceptual design), with some minor revisions, and the students are able to show that they understand the project.  **The verdict should be attested by the group’s rating of at least (4) in all of the criteria from the majority of the panelist (i.e. 3 out of 4, or 2 out of 3).**

Once accepted, the design project topic, general objective, specific objectives, and scope and limitations of design prototype can no longer be changed. The specific objectives established at this stage must be met satisfactorily during the Design Project 1 stage. Design project groups are expected to comply with all the revisions and recommendations stated in **Design Project Agreement Form** and **Revised Design Proposal**. Failure to do so would result to the change of decision from CONDITIONAL PASS WITH REVISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS to REPEAT (R). Moreover, failure to comply with other requirements and/or deliverable set forth by the Subject Instructor and design project panelists would result in an **R** grade. Significant change in the general objective is not allowed and is tantamount to repeating RESMETH.

**2. REDEFENSE**

This decision is given if the design project panel committee has approved the general objective of the design project during the **Preliminary Defense**. However, the proponents need to conduct further study and clarify the problem statement and/or conceptual design. This decision is also given if the group is not able to show their understanding of the proposed topic. In this case, the students will undergo another defense/presentation of the same topic. **This verdict is given to a group who failed to achieve a rating of at least (4) in all of the criteria, from the majority of the panelist (i.e. 3 out of 4, or 2 out of 3).**

There are two (2) possible decisions from here: CONDITIONALPASS WITH REVISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS; and REPEAT.

**3. REPEAT.**

This decision is given if the problem statement and conceptual design has been rejected during the **Proposal Defense**. More so, to the design project group who has initially been given a decision of CONDITIONAL PASS (WITH REVISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS), or REDEFENSE, who failed to submit the required defense deliverables on or before the deadline set by the CPEMETH/RESMETH Instructor. **This verdict is given to a group who failed to achieve a rating of at least (4) in all of the criteria, from the majority of the panelist (i.e. 3 out of 4, or 2 out of 3).**