

Rubric Detail

Select [Grid View](#) or [List View](#) to change the rubric's layout. [More Help](#)

Name: **2024-A03**

Exit

Grid View

List View

	1.Low fail	2. Fail	3. Marginal fail	4. Pass
Research and creative imagination	0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%) Research and creative imagination are absent: Little or no evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity.	1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%) Research and creative imagination are minimal: Limited evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity. Opportunities for the project are not identified, or are severely limited by constraints.	2.35 (4.70%) ----- 2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%) Research and creative imagination are developing: Some evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity. Few opportunities for the project are identified, and are limited by constraints.	2.5 (5.00%) - 3.0 (6.40%) Research and creative imagination are functional: Demonstrated evidence of inquiry, analysis and creativity. New opportunities for the project are identified, partially constrained.
Form and spatial design	0 (0.00%) - 2.4 (4.80%) Creative 3D design ability is absent: Little or no evidence of	2.5 (5.00%) - 4.4 (8.80%) Creative 3D design ability is minimal: Limited evidence of spatial design skill, with a	4.5 (9.00%) - 4.9 (9.80%) Creative 3D design ability is developing: Some evidence of spatial design skill, but	5.0 (10.00%) - 5.4 (12.80%) Creative 3D design ability is excellent: Evidence of spatial design skill, with a

	spatial design skill.	problematic plan and uninteresting forms.	with some problem areas in the spatial resolution.	de is t De evi sp ski a l
Site analysis and site planning	<p>0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%)</p> <p>Site analysis, site planning ability and code compliance are absent: Little or no evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance.</p>	<p>1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%)</p> <p>Site analysis, site planning ability and code compliance are minimal: Limited evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance.</p>	<p>2.35 (4.70%)</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed #ccc;"/> <p>2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%)</p> <p>Site analysis, site planning ability and code compliance are developing: Some evidence of site analysis and site planning skills and code compliance, but with some problem areas.</p>	<p>2.5 (5.00%) (6.40%)</p> <p>Site ana plannin and cod complia functio Demon evidenc analysis plannin code co albeit to level.</p>
Application of building and environmental sciences	<p>0 (0.00%) - 2.4 (4.80%)</p> <p>Resolution of construction and environmental systems is absent: Little or no evidence of design resolution and synthesis of systems. Absence of constructible</p>	<p>2.5 (5.00%) - 4.4 (8.80%)</p> <p>Resolution of construction and environmental systems is minimal: Limited evidence of design resolution and synthesis of systems. Insufficient constructible detail.</p>	<p>4.6 (9.20%)</p> <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed #ccc;"/> <p>4.5 (9.00%) - 4.9 (9.80%)</p> <p>Resolution of construction and environmental systems is developing: Some evidence of design resolution and synthesis of</p>	<p>5 (10.00%) (12.80%)</p> <p>Resolut constru environ systems functio Demon evidenc resoluti synthes systems and con details a and sub resolved</p>

	detail.		systems. Systems and construction details lack coherence and/or are confused. Detailed design is crude.	design i
Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values	0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is absent: Little or no evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application.	1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is minimal: Limited evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application.	2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%) Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values is developing: Some evidence of heritage and socio-cultural analysis and application, but with some problem areas.	2. ----- 2.5 (5.00%) (6.40%) Ap he so an co va fur De evi he so an ap alk lim
First Nations voices and Country	0 (0.00%) - 1.2 (2.40%) Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is absent: Little or no evidence of First Nations analysis and application.	1.5 (3.00%) ----- 1.25 (2.50%) - 2.2 (4.40%) Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is minimal: Limited evidence of	2.25 (4.50%) - 2.45 (4.90%) Incorporation of First Nations voices and Country is developing: Some evidence of First Nations analysis and application, but with problem areas.	2.5 (5.00%) (6.40%) Incorpo First Na and Cou function Demon evidenc Nations and app albeit to level.

		First Nations analysis and application.		
Presentation	0 (0.00%) - 2.4 (4.80%) The presentation is absent: Little or no evidence of work. Presentation is substantially incomplete and incoherent.	2.5 (5.00%) - 4.4 (8.80%) The presentation is minimal: Limited evidence of work. Presentation is incomplete and/or incoherent.	4.5 (9.00%) - 4.9 (9.80%) The presentation is developing: Presentation is partly complete. Documents do not adhere to drawing conventions, and/or are lacking coherence and curation.	5 (10.00%) - 5.0 (12.80%) The presentation is functional: Presentation is general and coherent. Documents adhere to drawing conventions and the adopted graphic neutral impedes communication of ideas.

The rubric total value of 25.50 has been overridden with a value of 25.50 out of 50.

Feedback to Learner

Research and creative imagination: Design submission did not show research of precedents / case studies. The site planning shows some creativity in the planning, however overall building form lacks creative input and does not move beyond an extrusion of the plan.

Form and spatial design: The unit plans a largely thoughtful – however social spaces should be grouped (eg living / kitchen / lounge) at the northern edge of the apartment – kitchen should not be completely internal with no access to natural light. Roof plans have been considered and show a planning intent.

Site analysis and site planning: Site analysis is at a functional level but poorly communicated with micro diagrams and micro-micro text. The site planning is quite pleasing without being inspired and the graphics are pleasing. There is limited explanation as to why the site is planned as it is.

Application of building and environmental services: Construction detailing is not sufficient for a Masters level. Drawing is not set out clearly and does not depict all elements required for this subject. Environment systems are generic and diagrammatic – they do not accurately represent actual site

conditions or responses.

Application of heritage, socio-cultural and community values: There no evidence of the student understanding or responding to the adjacent uses eg the Avalon, the park, the retail area, the neighbouring units, the traffic, the river, adjacent architecture etc.

First Nations voices and designing on Country: Unbalanced with excessive hard surfaces. No evident research. Design does not integrate design principles and mis-applies designs as an artistic overlay.

Presentation: Elevations should not be shown grouped – they appear as a single elevation. No line weight definition and material depiction is unclear / not consistent or complete. Sections do not accurately depict the site conditions. Graphic quality of the plans is sufficient.

Name: **2024-A03**

Exit