

# CSC784M / IMAGPRO

## Research Project Grading Form

Name of Proponents: 1.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 2.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 3.) \_\_\_\_\_

Group No. \_\_\_\_\_

## Evaluation Rubric

CRITERIA	DISTINGUISHED 4	PROFICIENT 3	MARGINAL 2	UNACCEPTABLE 1	SCORE
<b>Research Problem &amp; References</b>	Research problem is clear, concise, relevant, timely, specific, original, and manageable in scope. References are extensive (5 and above), highly reputable and cited, very recent, and written and cited (in-text) in the appropriate format.	Research problem: has a minor ambiguity, is somehow outdated, can be made more specific, has some similarity with already published works, or presents some difficulty in terms of scope. References are enough (3 to 4), reliable, fairly recent, and written and cited (in-text) in the appropriate format.	Research problem: has a major ambiguity, is generally outdated, is too broad or shallow, is hardly original, or is generally difficult to manage in terms of scope. References: too few (1 to 2), reliable but may be outdated.	Research problem is not identified, or too outdated, or not original. No reliable or fairly recent references and no in-text citations.	
<b>Solution / Methods &amp; Design</b>	Highlighted solutions and methods are highly relevant to addressing the research problem; Critical thinking is clearly demonstrated by showing the clear understanding of the task at hand and how to address it. Demonstrated the application of all relevant concepts and theories;	Highlighted solutions and methods are generally relevant to addressing the research problem; Critical thinking is generally demonstrated by showing some understanding of the task at hand and how to address it. Demonstrated the application of some relevant concepts and theories but missed some of such;	Highlighted solutions and methods are generally irrelevant to addressing the research problem; Critical thinking is vaguely demonstrated; Failed to demonstrate application of major relevant concepts and theories;	Highlighted solutions and methods are irrelevant to addressing the research problem; Critical thinking is not demonstrated; Failed to demonstrate any relevant concept or theory;	
<b>Prototype &amp; Performance Measure</b>	Prototype is fully operational and accurate; Employs standard or clearly established performance measures;	Prototype is operational but results have some inaccuracies; Performance measures are not standard or are inconsistent;	Prototype is malfunctioning or contains errors; Performance measures are questionable or are highly inconsistent;	Prototype is totally non-operational; Performance measures are inappropriate or are missing;	
<b>Oral Presentation</b>	Impressive and interesting presentation; Able to maintain audience's attention; Excellent communication skills and use of the language; Accurate and appropriate coverage for the presentation; Adhered to allotted time; Non-verbal skills (eye contact, gestures, etc.) showed good level of confidence and mastery; Makes excellent use of visual aids for discussion; Excellent ability to interact and answer questions from the audience or panel.	Good presentation; Somehow able to maintain audience's attention; Good communication skills and use of the language, though there were few grammatical errors or difficulties in sentence structure; Fairly accurate and appropriate coverage for the presentation, but missed a few important points; Presentation length was a little short or went a little beyond the allotted time; Non-verbal skills (eye contact, gestures, etc.) somehow showed confidence; Good visual aids for discussion; Generally able to interact and answer questions from the audience or panel.	Weak or dull presentation; Generally failed to maintain audience's attention; Showed difficulties in communication and the use of the language; Many grammatical and sentence structure errors were observed; Presentation failed to cover many important points; Presentation was either short or lengthy, as compared with the allotted time; Non-verbal skills (eye contact, gestures, etc.) were largely missing; Few visual aids for discussion; Was not able to answer some important questions from the	Poor or ambiguous presentation; Failed to maintain audience's attention; Poor communication skills and use of the language; Too many grammatical and sentence structure errors were observed; Important points were largely missing in the presentation; Presentation was either too short or too lengthy, as compared with the allotted time; Non-verbal skills (eye contact, gestures, etc.) were not demonstrated; Poor or missing visual aids for discussion; Was not	

			audience or panel.	able to answer almost all the questions from the audience or panel.	
<b>Technical Writing &amp; Paper Formatting</b>	Excellent skills in using formal English language; Paper is free of grammatical and sentence construction errors; Ideas in sentences are accurate, concise, clear and complete; Discussion flow is highly smooth; Proper citations were consistently observed; Consistently adhered to the prescribed paper format;	Good skills in using the English language; Paper contains a few grammatical and sentence construction errors; Ideas in sentences are somehow accurate, concise, clear and complete; Discussion flow is generally smooth; Proper citations were generally observed, with a few exceptions; Generally adhered to the prescribed paper format in all but one section;	Average skills in using the English language; Paper contains a significant and noticeable amount of grammatical and sentence construction errors; Two or three key sentences are contain ambiguity; Several sentences are incomplete, or are wordy; Discussion has poor continuity or flow; Citations were barely observed; Two or three sections did not adhere to the prescribed paper format;	Poor skills in using the English language; Paper contains a huge amount of grammatical and sentence construction errors; More than three key sentences contain ambiguity; Many sentences are incomplete, or are wordy; Discussion has no continuity; Citations were not observed; More than three sections did not adhere to the prescribed paper format;	
<b>Paper Submission</b>	The paper was submitted and accepted in a national or international conference or journal.	The paper was submitted and accepted in a local conference or journal.	The paper was submitted to a conference or a journal, but was not accepted or still has a pending acceptance at the time of grading.	The paper was not submitted to any conference or journal.	
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>___/24</b>

**Passing Score:** 16.8 points for undergraduate students; 19.2 points for graduate students.