



F029

THESIS EVALUATION FORM

Title of thesis:

I. RUBRIC FOR WRITTEN THESIS

Criteria	Undeveloped	Developing	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Score	Comments
Research Question	50 points to 79 points The researchers failed to answer adequately the research question as well as any or all of the hypothesis/propositions. The researchers did not adequately meet the proposal objectives and/or failed to explain variances.		80 points to 100 points The researchers sufficiently answered the research question as well as the hypothesis/propositions. The researchers sufficiently met proposal objectives, explaining any deviations. Historical context, assumptions/biases, and/or ethical considerations are present/developed.			
Supporting Evidence and Body of Knowledge	10 points to 39 points Evidence/body of knowledge inadequately discussed Evidential support for argument, or use of evidence is selective or inadequate		40 points to 60 points Body of knowledge thoroughly discussed Evidence is sufficient and well utilized			
Methodology	50 points to 79 points Researchers deviated from the approved methodology/approach without sufficient justification. The researchers did not provide adequate description of actual methods and/or data analytical tools		80 points to 100 points Researchers adhered to the approved methodology/approach. When there were variances, these were properly justified. The researchers sufficiently provided detailed description of actual methods			



F029

	used.	and data analytical tools used.		
Data Gathering, Discussion of Findings, Analysis	100 points to 179 points Gathered only superficial information. Fact versus opinion not well distinguished Perspectives are limited Quantitative and/or symbolic tools were used inappropriately Evaluation, analysis, synthesis are limited	180 points to 240 points Data gathered was comprehensive and exhaustive Accuracy and relevance of evidence appropriately questioned Multiple perspectives considered Appropriate quantitative and/or symbolic tools are utilized Evaluation, analysis, synthesis was extensive		
Conclusions, Implications	100 points to 159 points Conclusions, implications, and/or consequences lacking or conclusions are loosely related to consequences or implications Significance of what was discovered or learned is unclear Assertions are unqualified or unwarranted Appropriate connections to local, national, global or civic issues are lacking or weak Ramifications of work not discussed	160 points to 200 points Conclusions, qualifications and consequences including value of thesis are presented and well developed. Significance of what was discovered or learned is clear. Assertions are qualified and well supported. Develops insightful connections to local, national, global or civic issues are discussed. Ramifications of work presented and discussed		
Writing	40 points to 79 points Language obscures meaning/unclear in places Grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors are distracting or repeated Writing style is incoherent Pages lack white space, paragraphs too long and not flowing Work is unfocused Organization is clumsy or mechanical	80 points to 100 points Language clearly and effectively communicates ideas Shows near flawless editing for grammar, syntax, punctuation, spelling Writing style is eloquent/engaging Pages have white spaces, paragraphs of adequate length and is flowing Work is focused Organization is clear and effective		



F029

	Sources not cited or not used correctly	Sources and citations used correctly		
TOTAL				

II. RUBRIC FOR ORAL PRESENTATION

Criteria	Undeveloped	Developing	Satisfactory	Outstanding	Score	Comments
Organization	0-10 points Speaker/s disorganized; jumped topics	11-20 points Speaker/s adequately organized	21-30 points Presentation follows logical sequence	31-40 points Speaker/s highly organized, easy to follow, smooth transitions		
Delivery	0-10 points Paper was read or seemed memorized. Speech was too fast/too slow/too soft. No eye contact. Delivery stiff and unsure	11-20 points Some parts of the presentation was delivered well, other parts were not. Attempts were made to adjust pace of delivery.	21-30 points In most instances, the presentation went smoothly. There were minor snags in delivery.	31-40 points Speech was smooth, clear and articulate. There was voice projection and pacing was effective. There was eye contact. Delivery was poised.		
Content	0-10 points Presentation was not apt to topic nor audience. Background information and/or assumptions were lacking.	11-20 points Content was adequate. There were attempts to provide background information	21-30 points Presentation was sufficient. In most instances, the content was appropriate.	31-40 points A general audience could understand the presentation. Key terms were defined and background information provided.		
Media and Resources	0-10 points Media and format were poor choice for content. Materials	11-20 points There were many media glitches. Some slides were	21-30 points Satisfactory media presentation. There were however some	31-40 points Excellent media format for content. All materials were		



ACM-

F029

	were confusing or distracting. Speaker/s not in business attire.	very distracting. Not all speaker/s were in business attire.	lapses.	clear and information was pertinent.		
Response to Questions	0-10 point Misunderstands questions; cannot answer convincingly. There was a lot of fumbling about.	11-20 points Some questions misunderstood and inadequately addressed. Group was easily rattled but managed to sail through.	21-30 points Group was able to answer most of the questions well. There were occasions though when group was not too confident about the subject matter.	31-40 points Group was able to answer questions well and with reference to own work. Showed knowledge of subject matter.		
TOTAL						

Component	Minimum Grade	Maximum Grade	Your Score	FINAL SCORE (Drop Last Zero)
Written Thesis	350	800		
Oral Presentation	0	200		
GRAND TOTAL	350	1000		

(* DLSU Grading System: 4.0: 97-100 3.5: 93-96 3.0: 89-92 2.5: 85-88 2.0: 80-84 1.5: 75-79 1.0: 70-74)

Additional Comments:



De La Salle University
Ramon V. del Rosario College of Business
Management and Organization Department

ACM-

F029

Panelists Signature over Printed Name and Date Signed