FINAL PROJECT RUBRIC

TITLE:	Smart AI study companion: Personalized Learning, Motivation, and Well-being System for Students.
SECTION:	3B **SCHEDULE:** TH / 6:30-7:00PM

IN – INDIVIDUAL GRADE   **AS** = ACTUAL SYSTEM
DO – DOCUMENTATION   **LE** = LEADER'S EVALUATION

	STUDENT NAME	STUDENT NO	IN	DO	LE	PROJECT GRADE
L	Canlas, Kenth Luigi B.	234-03138M				
2	Marcellana, Blessie Mae H.	234-03159M				
3	Ramos, Lory Diane N.	234-05742M				
4	Toledo, Jannela C.	234-05216M				

A. Student Presentation Evaluation Rubric

LEADER:	Canlas, Kenth Luigi B.	**STUDENT NO:**	234-03138M

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1.) Problem Definition & Objectives	Problem and objectives are clear, relevant, and innovative	Problem and objectives are clear	Problem is somewhat clear; objectives are general	Problem is unclear; objectives are weak	No clear problem or objectives
2.) Application Design & Architecture	Well-structured, scalable, and follows best practices	Logical design with minor issues	Basic design with limited structure	Poorly organized design	No clear design
3.) Use of Emerging Technologies	Effective and innovative integration of emerging technologies	Appropriate use of emerging technologies	Limited or basic use of emerging technologies	Minimal or incorrect use	No emerging technologies used
4.) Functionality & Implementation	Fully functional; all features work correctly	Mostly functional with minor issues	Basic functionality with some errors	Limited functionality	Application does not function
5.) Code Quality & Standards	Clean, readable, well-documented, and standard-compliant	Mostly clean code with minor issues	Acceptable code with inconsistencies	Poorly written code	Unreadable or missing code
6.) Documentation & Presentation	Complete, clear, and professional documentation and presentation	Good documentation with minor gaps	Basic documentation	Incomplete or unclear documentation	No documentation

TOTAL SCORE = _____ / 30   **EQUIVALENT GRADE = _____**

MEMBER 1:	Marcellana, Blessie Mae H.	STUDENT NO:	234-03159M

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1.) Problem Definition & Objectives	Problem and objectives are clear, relevant, and innovative	Problem and objectives are clear	Problem is somewhat clear; objectives are general	Problem is unclear; objectives are weak	No clear problem or objectives
2.) Application Design & Architecture	Well-structured, scalable, and follows best practices	Logical design with minor issues	Basic design with limited structure	Poorly organized design	No clear design
3.) Use of Emerging Technologies	Effective and innovative integration of emerging technologies	Appropriate use of emerging technologies	Limited or basic use of emerging technologies	Minimal or incorrect use	No emerging technologies used
4.) Functionality & Implementation	Fully functional; all features work correctly	Mostly functional with minor issues	Basic functionality with some errors	Limited functionality	Application does not function
5.) Code Quality & Standards	Clean, readable, well-documented, and standard-compliant	Mostly clean code with minor issues	Acceptable code with inconsistencies	Poorly written code	Unreadable or missing code
6.) Documentation & Presentation	Complete, clear, and professional documentation and presentation	Good documentation with minor gaps	Basic documentation	Incomplete or unclear documentation	No documentation

TOTAL SCORE = _____ / 30   EQUIVALENT GRADE = _____

MEMBER 2:	Ramos, Lory Diane N.	STUDENT NO:	234-05742M

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1.) Problem Definition & Objectives	Problem and objectives are clear, relevant, and innovative	Problem and objectives are clear	Problem is somewhat clear; objectives are general	Problem is unclear; objectives are weak	No clear problem or objectives
2.) Application Design & Architecture	Well-structured, scalable, and follows best practices	Logical design with minor issues	Basic design with limited structure	Poorly organized design	No clear design
3.) Use of Emerging Technologies	Effective and innovative integration of emerging technologies	Appropriate use of emerging technologies	Limited or basic use of emerging technologies	Minimal or incorrect use	No emerging technologies used
4.) Functionality & Implementation	Fully functional; all features work correctly	Mostly functional with minor issues	Basic functionality with some errors	Limited functionality	Application does not function

| 5.) Code Quality & Standards | Clean, readable, well-documented, and standard-compliant | Mostly clean code with minor issues | Acceptable code with inconsistencies | Poorly written code | Unreadable or missing code |
| 6.) Documentation & Presentation | Complete, clear, and professional documentation and presentation | Good documentation with minor gaps | Basic documentation | Incomplete or unclear documentation | No documentation |

TOTAL SCORE = _____ / 30   **EQUIVALENT GRADE = _____**

MEMBER 3:	Toledo, Jannela C.	**STUDENT NO:**	234-05216M

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1.) Problem Definition & Objectives	Problem and objectives are clear, relevant, and innovative	Problem and objectives are clear	Problem is somewhat clear; objectives are general	Problem is unclear; objectives are weak	No clear problem or objectives
2.) Application Design & Architecture	Well-structured, scalable, and follows best practices	Logical design with minor issues	Basic design with limited structure	Poorly organized design	No clear design
3.) Use of Emerging Technologies	Effective and innovative integration of emerging technologies	Appropriate use of emerging technologies	Limited or basic use of emerging technologies	Minimal or incorrect use	No emerging technologies used
4.) Functionality & Implementation	Fully functional; all features work correctly	Mostly functional with minor issues	Basic functionality with some errors	Limited functionality	Application does not function
5.) Code Quality & Standards	Clean, readable, well-documented, and standard-compliant	Mostly clean code with minor issues	Acceptable code with inconsistencies	Poorly written code	Unreadable or missing code
6.) Documentation & Presentation	Complete, clear, and professional documentation and presentation	Good documentation with minor gaps	Basic documentation	Incomplete or unclear documentation	No documentation

B. LEADER'S EVALUATION

MEMBER 1:	Marcellana, Blessie Mae H.	**STUDENT NO:**	234-03159M

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1. Task Completion	Consistently completes all tasks on time and with high quality	Usually completes tasks with minor delay or revision	Completes basic tasks; average quality	Often misses deadlines or produces poor-quality work	Rarely completes tasks or avoids responsibility
2. Initiative	Proactively takes on tasks and helps without being asked	Often takes initiative when needed	Occasionally takes initiative	Rarely takes initiative unless directed	Never takes initiative
3. Attendance	Always present in meetings and activities	Misses very few meetings	Occasionally absent	Frequently absent	Rarely attends or completely absent
4. Teamwork	Highly respectful, cooperative, and supportive	Mostly works well with others	Acceptable behavior with some issues	Often uncooperative or difficult	Disruptive or disrespectful to others
5. Quality of Work	Submits excellent work that exceeds expectations	Work is complete and meets expectations	Average work with some errors	Low quality or incomplete work	Poor or no contribution at all

SCORE: _____ / 25   **EQUIVALENT GRADE: _____**

MEMBER 2:	Ramos, Lory Diane N.	**STUDENT NO:**	234-05742M

Criteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1. Task Completion	Consistently completes all tasks on time and with high quality	Usually completes tasks with minor delay or revision	Completes basic tasks; average quality	Often misses deadlines or produces poor-quality work	Rarely completes tasks or avoids responsibility
2. Initiative	Proactively takes on tasks and helps without being asked	Often takes initiative when needed	Occasionally takes initiative	Rarely takes initiative unless directed	Never takes initiative
3. Attendance	Always present in meetings and activities	Misses very few meetings	Occasionally absent	Frequently absent	Rarely attends or completely absent
4. Teamwork	Highly respectful, cooperative, and supportive	Mostly works well with others	Acceptable behavior with some issues	Often uncooperative or difficult	Disruptive or disrespectful to others
5. Quality of Work	Submits excellent work that exceeds expectations	Work is complete and meets expectations	Average work with some errors	Low quality or incomplete work	Poor or no contribution at all

SCORE: _____ / 25   **EQUIVALENT GRADE: _____**

MEMBER 3:	Toledo, Jannela C.	**STUDENT NO:**	234-05216M

C05216riteria	Excellent (5)	Good (4)	Satisfactory (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Poor (1)
1. Task Completion	Consistently completes all tasks on time and with high quality	Usually completes tasks with minor delay or revision	Completes basic tasks; average quality	Often misses deadlines or produces poor-quality work	Rarely completes tasks or avoids responsibility
2. Initiative	Proactively takes on tasks and helps without being asked	Often takes initiative when needed	Occasionally takes initiative	Rarely takes initiative unless directed	Never takes initiative
3. Attendance	Always present in meetings and activities	Misses very few meetings	Occasionally absent	Frequently absent	Rarely attends or completely absent

4. Teamwork	Highly respectful, cooperative, and supportive	Mostly works well with others	Acceptable behavior with some issues	Often uncooperative or difficult	Disruptive or disrespectful to others
5. Quality of Work	Submits excellent work that exceeds expectations	Work is complete and meets expectations	Average work with some errors	Low quality or incomplete work	Poor or no contribution at all

SCORE: _____/ 25   **EQUIVALENT GRADE: _____**