CpE/ECE Design Project 2
Final Defense - 1 Grading Rubrics Form (Midterm)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">SCHEDULE</td><td>Member 1:
Cabrera, Drysdale Rhys C.
2020-141290 | Research Head</td><td>PROPOSED TITLE</td><td>Client :
APC – School of Engineering</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2" rowspan="2">Date: 09 / 30 / 2023

Time : 4 PM – 5 PM
Room : 806</td><td>Member 2:
Carreon, Beniedik V.
2020-141244 | Hardware Head</td><td rowspan="2">Technical Title:

Aquaponics Smart Automation and Monitoring Control System - SMARTBAY</td><td>Chair :
Engr. Einstein D. Yong</td></tr>
<tr><td>Member 3:
Ellema, Jufel John B.
2020-140249 | Assistant Software</td><td>Lead Panel :
Engr. Sergio R. Peruda Jr.</td></tr>
<tr><td>X</td><td>Final Defense -1
(Midterm period)</td><td>Member 4:
Gapay, Millow J.
2020-140851 | Sofware Head</td><td rowspan="2">Short Title:

SMARTBAY</td><td>Panel Member 1 :
Engr. Stanley Glenn E. Brucal</td></tr>
<tr><td>X</td><td>Final Defense - 2
(Final term period)</td><td>Member 5:
Manes, Honniel
2020-141092 | Project Manager</td><td>Panel Member 2 :
Engr. Leonardo A. Samaniego Jr.</td></tr>
</table>

I. **Comments:** *for the group and project title*

II. For revisions

III. Additional requirements

IV. 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

Prototyping and Proofing Design		**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**N/A**	**REMARKS**
A1. Project Output	The prototype clearly demonstrates how the client's problem was solved. Testing was done in order to determine whether the project goals were met.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1		
A2. Project Specifications	Functions that the design must perform, focusing on basic functions and means for achieving those function was exhibited.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
A3. Project Test & Evaluation	Proof-of-concept testing is sufficient for an audience of technical professionals whom the project is likely to be of great interest.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
A4. Project Quality	Finished prototype is well constructed, functional and suitable for design verification.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
A5. Project Feature	Feature of the project prototype/model, with aspects that make it superior over other possible alternatives, were presented.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
Written Communication		**7**	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**N/A**	**REMARKS**
B1. Executive Summary	The project summary includes: a clear, coherent, easily readable & accurate paragraph; consists of complete sentences free from grammatical and factual errors and biases; and includes the right amount of detail.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
B2. Prototyping and Proofing Design	Fully describes the methods used including any technique, measurements and/or calculation in an organized, scientific, accurate, logical, and coherent way.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
B3. Results & Discussion	Objective metrics were used in the assessment and evaluation of the design objectives, while functional or procedural specifications for the functions.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	

B4. Summary of Results, Conclusion and Recommendations	Synthesizes the testing and evaluation results and fully explains conclusions derived from these activities with clear rationale, impact assessment, citing all relevant data, measurements and/or calculations. Recommendations were given to further improve the project.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
Learning Outcomes Assessment										
C1. Presentation Skills	The students presented their proposal in an organized manner. They showed effective presentation and communication skills, made evident in their presentation slides, manner of introducing the team, and highlighting only the key points.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	
C2. 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	N/A	
C3. Testing and Analysis	The students were able to provide an appropriate testing methodology that will gather, analyze, interpret and synthesize data to validate their design.	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	

V. *SUMMARY OF VERDICT*

At the conclusion of each **defense**, the 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 design project documentation, 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 AND member's average rating of at least four (4) in all of the criteria (from the majority of the panelist (i.e. 3 out of 4, or 2 out of 3) from the majority of the panelist (i.e. 3 out of 4, or 2 out of 3)**

Similarly, such decision is given to the members if the proponent are able to answer the questions from the panel members convincingly. However, minor revisions are necessary to complete the documentations, but they do not have to be presented again before the design project panel. The members must do the necessary changes as recommended by the panelists. The revised document must be submitted to the adviser together with the Design Project 2 Grading Rubrics Form which contains the list of recommendations and revisions. The client will then check the document and forward to the concerned panelist for review. The panelists will then review the submitted original and revised documents and verdict forms before sending back to the adviser. The adviser will then return the checked documents to the proponents for further modification or editing. This process continues until both parties (proponents and panelists) have agreed in the form and content of the documentations. After this, revised documents shall be submitted to the subject instructor, as scheduled, for re-defense scheduling and documents dissemination, or for the CONDITIONAL PASS be changed to PASS.

2. RE-DEFENSE

Another formal defense is necessary because the proponent/s failed to meet the passing rating of the panelists during the Design and Final defense. If required by the panelists, the group must immediately revise their documents or fix the prototype, duly checked by the client. Design project groups can receive a failing mark if they fail to comply with any of the requirements expected from them by the design project panel committee. **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.

Either the conditions or requirements given during the Final Defense have not been met after the Remedial Final Defense (as recommended by the majority of the panel members) or the group cheated. This decision should be a unanimous decision among the members of the panel, otherwise, a majority rule has to be observed. **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 panelists (i.e., 3 out of 4, or 2 out of 3).**

NOTE:

A. The final verdict should be agreed among the panel members and is considered final and irrevocable after the deliberation. However, since one of the major objectives of the Final Defense is to test the proponent's knowledge and contribution to the project in terms of design, implementation, testing, evaluation and intensive documentation, each member must pass criteria on (1) Communicating designs orally, and (2) Learning outcomes assessment. In such cases where not all members got a passing grade, yet the group got CONDITIONAL PASS from the oral examination, only the member with unsatisfactory (below 4) rating needs to repeat, either the defense or subject.

B. Engineering and Science Laboratory Head will be the key person in issuing Project Turn Over Form.

VI. Panel Recommendations: _____

(Refer to the statement above for the list of possible verdicts. Grades to individual members to be recommended by the official panel member composed of chair, lead panelist and one member.)

Name: Engr. Leonardo A. Samaniego Jr. _____ **Designation:** Panel Member 2 _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** September 30, 2023 _____

VII. SUMMARY OF GROUP RATINGS

Design Defense (Prototyping and Proofing Design)		Chair	Lead Panel	Member 1	Member 2	AVERAGE
A1	**Project Output**					
A2	**Project Specifications**					
A3	**Project Test and Evaluation**					
A4	**Project Quality**					
A5	**Project Feature**					
Final Defense (Written Communication)						
B1	**Executive Summary**					
B2	**Prototyping and Proofing Design**					
B3	**Results & Discussion**					
B4	**Summary of Results, Conclusion, and Recommendation**					
Learning Outcomes Assessment						
C1	**Presentation Skills**					
C2	**Documentation**					
C3	**Testing and Analysis**					
					PANELIST GROUP RATING	

Note: *This portion is to be accomplished by the CHAIR. The final verdict of the Chair is considered final and irrevocable after the deliberation. Print this portion for the chair only.*

VIII. Chair Verdict: _____

(Refer to page 4 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: Engr. Leonardo A. Samaniego Jr. _____ **Designation:** Panel Member 2 _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** September 30, 2023 _____