



# UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF SOUTHERN PHILIPPINES

Alubijid | Balubal | Cagayan de Oro | Claveria | Jasaan | Oroquieta | Panaon | Villanueva

## DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

### PERFORMANCE INNOVATIVE TASK AND EXAMS

#### IT 221 – INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

#### RUBRICS

<b>Group Name:</b>	<b>Section:</b>
<b>Date:</b>	

#### 1. WEB APPLICATION PERFORMANCE TASK – 50 Points (PIT Proper)

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Weight	Score
<b>System Functionality</b>	All major features work as intended; includes CRUD, validation, and business logic.	Most features work; minor bugs present.	Several features are incomplete or malfunctioning.	x3	
<b>Backend API Design</b>	RESTful routes are well-structured and follow naming conventions; controllers are clean.	Mostly RESTful with minor inconsistencies.	Poorly designed endpoints or missing controllers.	x2	
<b>Database and ERD</b>	ERD is complete, clear, and follows normalization rules; DB schema implemented accordingly.	ERD has minor issues or some mismatches with DB.	ERD unclear or poorly connected to actual DB.	x2	
<b>Code Quality</b>	Clean, modular, and commented code. Follows Laravel standards.	Understandable code but with some messy areas.	Disorganized code with little to no comments.	x1	
<b>Frontend Usability</b>	Intuitive, responsive UI that connects well with API.	Basic UI with functional elements.	UI is hard to navigate or disconnected from backend.	x2	



## UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OF SOUTHERN PHILIPPINES

Alubijid | Balubal | Cagayan de Oro | Claveria | Jasaan | Oroquieta | Panaon | Villanueva

### DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

#### 2. Documentation & Presentation – 50 Points (Final Written Exam)

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Weight	Score
<b>Project Structure &amp; Flow</b>	Report/presentation is logical, clear, and complete.	Mostly clear with some disorganization.	Hard to follow or missing sections.	x3	
<b>Explanation of ERD &amp; Design Choices</b>	ERD and design decisions are clearly explained and justified.	Some explanation given but lacks depth.	Vague or missing explanation.	x2	
<b>API Documentation</b>	Endpoints, request/response formats, and sample calls are well-documented.	Some documentation but lacks consistency.	Minimal or no API documentation.	x2	
<b>Results &amp; Challenges</b>	Describes outcomes, problems faced, and solutions clearly.	Mentions results with limited reflection.	Lacks analysis of outcomes or challenges.	x2	
<b>Visual Quality &amp; Formatting</b>	Neat, readable slides with consistent formatting and citation where needed.	Mostly clear visuals; minor format issues.	Cluttered or hard to read.	x1	

#### 3. Oral Defense – 30 points (Final Laboratory Exam)

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Weight	Score
<b>Explanation of Features</b>	Clearly explains system features and how they work.	Explains most parts with some hesitation.	Cannot clearly describe features.	x2	
<b>Technical Understanding</b>	Shows solid grasp of Laravel, REST, and database structure.	Understands most concepts; some gaps.	Major technical misunderstandings.	x2	
<b>Delivery and Engagement</b>	Confident, fluent, and responsive during Q&A.	Slightly hesitant but understandable.	Poor delivery or avoids questions.	x1	
<b>Use of Visual Aids</b>	Uses diagrams or app demo effectively.	Uses some visuals but not impactful.	Lacks helpful visuals.	x1	