

Studio	Instructors	Date
Student(s)	Jury member	

Evaluation matrix – Bachelor 3 graduation project

1 Appropriateness of sizing Command of the relation between users' bodies and space through sizing	--	-	±	+	++
2 Architectural composition Command of the architectural composition principles underlying the proposal's different elements and general layout	--	-	±	+	++
3 Uses and appropriation Understanding uses and appropriations and implementing them in the proposed design	--	-	±	+	++
4 Scales Understanding the rationale of the different scales partaking in the architectural synthesis (with separate documents for each scale)	--	-	±	+	++
5 Materiality Developping a consistent argument around materials and construction systems	--	-	±	+	++
6 Oral Command of oral communication through an appropriate narrative presenting the proposed design (vocabulary, references, rhetoric, etc.)	--	-	±	+	++
7 Representation Command of representation tools as means of both exploration and communication of the proposed design	--	-	±	+	++

Notes

Synthesis and grades	<p>PGD Summa cum laude / Highest honors (18-20) Remarkable outcome, with only few minor shortcomings</p> <p>GD Magna cum laude / High honors (16-17,9) Result above average despite a number of shortcomings</p> <p>D Cum Laude / Honors (14-15,9) Work of an overall good quality, despite a number of shortcomings</p> <p>S Satisfactory (12-13,9) Honest work even if presenting relevant shortcomings</p> <p>F Weak (10-11,9) The outcome satisfies to minimal requirements</p> <p>I Insufficient (7-9,9) Additional effort would be required to gain the teaching credits</p> <p>TI Very insufficient (0-6,9) Considerable additional effort is necessary</p>
----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Mark/20

Studio

Instructors

Jury member

Date

Evaluation matrix – Bachelor 3 graduation project

	--	-	±	+	++
	Very insufficient	Insufficient	Sufficient	Good	Excellent
1 Command of the relation between users' bodies and space through sizing	Erroneous sizings — Serious errors in sizing and dimensions	Inconsistent sizings — A number of elements and/or spaces show inappropriate sizing or dimensions	Reasonable sizing — The proposed arrangements present a reasonably appropriate command of sizing issues	Appropriate sizing — The proposed arrangements demonstrate a sense of comfort in uses, they reinforce the spatial qualities of the project	Convincing sizing — The proposed arrangements present appropriate sizes allowing a perfect match between spaces and intended uses. The proposed spaces rise above standard sizing rules to the benefit of liveable qualities.
2 Command of the architectural composition principles underlying the proposal's different elements and general layout	Missing architectural composition — The forms and spaces envisaged miss to establish relations between one another, and with the student's argument and objectives	Clumsy architectural composition — The forms and spaces envisaged are sketchy and/or lack congruance	Handled architectural composition — The forms and spaces envisaged are developed in a conventional manner, but do establish relations between one another, being consistent with the student's arguments and objectives.	Qualitative architectural composition — The proposed forms and spaces are laid out and arranged congruantly and consistently	Innovative and expressive architectural composition
3 Understanding uses and appropriations and implementing them in the proposed design	Impossible uses and appropriations — There is a mismatch between the proposed spaces and the aimed at programme and uses.	Fragmentary or inconsistent uses — The proposed spaces propose a generic or not fully-consistent match with the aimed at programme and uses	Addressed uses — The proposed spaces address in a conventional manner the aimed at programme and uses	Efficient resolution of uses — The proposed spaces propose convincing, qualitative and proficient solutions to accommodate the aimed at programme and uses	Resolution of uses adds value to the project
4 Understanding the rationale of the different scales partaking in the architectural synthesis <i>(with separate documents for each scale)</i>	Incomplete consideration of the different scales — The different scales with which the proposal interacts are unconvincingly developed	Inconsistent consideration of the different scales — The different scales with which the proposal interacts are only partially developed, or lack coherence	The different scales are addressed — The different scales with which the proposal interacts are all developed, are consistent, and serve the general argument	Good command of the different scales — The proposal conveniently addresses each of the specific issues of the different scales it interacts with, forming a comprehensive whole	Exploratory and consistent command of the different scales — The proposal combines exploratory solutions to each of the specific issues of the different scales it interacts with, into a consistent and original whole
5 Developing a consistent argument around materials and construction systems	The topic is not addressed — Building materials are not defined at all. Technical issues – construction systems, structures, stability ... – are not solved	The topic is clumsily addressed — Building materials are insufficiently defined. Technical issues – construction systems, structures, stability ... – lack definition or fail to contribute to the project as a whole	The topic is addressed — The main building materials – bearing elements, cladding, flooring, insulation – are defined and clearly represented. Technical issues – construction systems, structures, stability – have plausible solutions	The topic is well addressed — The main building materials – bearing elements, cladding, flooring, insulation – are well defined, clearly represented, and documented. Technical issues – construction systems, structures, stability – have convincing and well-argued for solutions. Technical terms are appropriately used	The topic is at the service of the architectural proposal — Building materials and technical systems are inextricably embedded into the architectural proposal reinforcing it. The terms of the "Form/Structure/Material" trilogy are closely related and serve the project as a whole
6 Command of oral communication through an appropriate narrative presenting the proposed design <i>(vocabulary, references, rhetoric, etc.)</i>	Missing narrative — Student gets flusters in front of the jury due to lack of preparation, oral argument unclear and not complementary to visual documentation. Student fails to heed and to establish constructive discussion	Clumsy narrative — The oral argument lacks complementarity with visual documentation	Handled narrative — The oral argument is complementary to visual documentation, clearly expressed but in an unoriginal, unimaginative and pedantic fashion	Qualitative narrative — Oral argument is complementary to visual documentation, clearly, concisely, and precisely expressed, with appropriate terms and vocabulary	Innovative narrative at the service of the project — The oral argument is relevant, sophisticated, and carefully prepared. It is complementary to visual documentation, clearly, concisely, and precisely expressed, with appropriate terms and vocabulary.
7 Command of representation tools as means for both exploring and communicating the proposed design	Incomplete and poorly elaborated visual documentation — Visual documents are incomplete, unelaborated. They lack rigour and meticulousness, testifying of insufficient effort dedicated	Clumsy representations and documents — Visual representations do not allow to understand the proposal and/or demonstrate insufficient effort and/or meticulousness	Handled documents and representations — The visual documentation is sufficient to understand the argument and proposal. They demonstrate a clear effort of researching appropriate means to convey information through conventional supports (drawing, sketches, maquettes, plans, ...)	Qualitative documents and representations — Appropriate choice of representation supports. Plans, sections and façades at the right scale serve the argument and the understanding of the proposed arrangement of both indoor and outdoor spaces. Different studies document the fabrication process of the presented documents	Visual representations add value to the project, sublimating its architecture — Appropriate choice of representation supports, scales of representation serve the argument and the understanding of the proposed arrangement of both indoor and outdoor spaces. Remarkable documents testify of an evident sensitivity to architecture and its representation