Updates on Assessment can be found at:
https://miatedjosaputro.com/2021/09/01/ad3-assessment-document/

5 ASSESSMENT 2 GRADING RUBRIC.

MODULE FACILITATOR: MIA A. TEDJOSAPUTO AND FIN CHURCH

24 November 2021

		Assessment 2 criteria (See Figure 1 of Document #1)		
		FAIL		PASS
LO	Learning Outcome	0% - 59%	60% - 75%	75-100%
1	To apply previously learned theoretical knowledge to a practical project.	Lack of consideration of **tectonic system**.	Basic consideration of tectonic system has been included but can be improved.	Well-illustrated and analysed tectonic system.
		Lack of consideration of **materials strategy**.	Basic consideration of materials strategy has been included but can be improved.	Well-illustrated and labelled materials strategy.
		Lack of consideration of **MEP strategy**.	Basic consideration of MEP strategy has been included but can be improved.	Well-illustrated and labelled MEP strategy.
		Lack of consideration of **sustainability strategies**.	Basic consideration of sustainability system has been included but can be improved.	Well-illustrated and analysed sustainability system.
		Lack of consideration of **urban analysis**.	Basic consideration or urban design strategies has been included but can be elaborated more.	Well-illustrated urban design strategies.
		Lack of **spatial analysis** and strategies.	Work investigates spatial characteristics adequately.	Spatial requirements of library design are well analysed and are elaborated in the design.
		Lack of **landscape design** strategy.	Basic consideration of landscape design but can be improved.	Landscape (softscape and hardscape) considerations as an integral part of the design.
		Lack of consideration of **holistic approach**.	There are attempts to think about the design holistically.	Holistic design thinking is exhibited and is illustrated clearly.
		Did not incorporate any takeaways from **previous lectures.**	Work mentions takeaways drawn from previous lectures.	Work illustrates elaborations from previous lectures, for example the guest lecture.
2	To analyse and re-evaluate design based on feedback and other peers' input	Archived of **weekly progress** is not submitted	N/A	Archived weekly progress is submitted
		Lack of attempt to **evaluate** the design	There are attempts to evaluate the design (public hearing, peer input, sun path testing using physical model, or a kind of simulation, etc)	Well elaborated and well documented attempt to evaluate the design, and progressing based on the evaluation.
		Lack of **design precedent** analysis (only stating the facts rather than analysis).	Design precedents are shown clearly and key take ways are mentioned.	Well documented design precedent analysis and direct implementation to the design is also presented.

3	To evaluate design based on previously developed design parameters	The work-in-progress design does not relate to the **self-defined brief**.	There are attempts to answer the design brief through design.	Well documented and elaborated design in relation to the design brief and design objectives.
		The **chosen site** is questionable for a library	Sufficient elaboration of site information and how the information shape the library design	Clear documentation on how site location has positive impact on the architecture.
		Site analysis is ignored	Site analysis is minimally considered as design input	Continuously developing the site analysis through the design development.
		Floor-to-floor calculations are not presented	Calculations are presented but questionable	Area calculation is presented succinctly, including floor by floor calculation.
		Local regulations are ignored	Local regulations are illustrated	A clear illustration of how local regulations shape the design development stage.
		Ambiance design is not considered	Ambiance design is mentioned but there is no supporting drawings to support the idea design	Ambiance design for library (internal materials, spatial characteristics, lighting, furnishings and function co-ordination) is well presented through series of evaluation.
4	To create a final design based on iterative process of (demonstrable) improvements	Work does not include documented **workflow**	There is a basic attempt on including the workflow	Workflow is well documented
		Minimum quantity of submissions is not achieved	Work presents the minimum quantity of submissions	Work shows learners include additional illustrations to effectively present his or her ideas
		No **physical model** exploration being documented	There is an attempt to show physical model explorations	Work shows effective ways to analyse physical models and how they relate to design progress
		Lack of consistency of **drawing convention**	Drawing convention is consistent but can be improved	Drawing convention aids legibility of design illustrations
5	To present the final design using taught presentation skills	**Presentation** (on Miro and verbal presentation) is not efficient and lacks coherency	Presentation achieves the minimum requirements but can be polished further.	Presentation is well articulated visually and verbally.
		Undefined specific library design **problems**.	Contextual analysis is presented and how constructing a library contributes to a positive change of the site is illustrated.	Needs analysis of building a library on the chosen site is presented clearly. Clearly stated existing design problems
		There is no reference to reflective journal and **reflective practice** (**feedback** from peers and facilitators) in designing.	There is a basic attempt to engage in reflective design practice. There is evidence that peer feedback is incorporated.	The reflective practice in design is well illustrated and archived. Peer feedback is consolidated and well documented.