



Aalto University  
 School of Arts, Design and Architecture  
 Department of Architecture  
 Building Design  
 ARK-E2013 Building Design Studio (12 cr)

Student Number(s)    Name(s)

Fall 2021, September 14th–December 15th

Correspondence of student's to teacher's evaluation

## Evaluation Matrix

			1	2	3	4	5	
Weight	Criteria	Description	Poor work with several major deficiencies. The process has required disproportionate amount of support.	Acceptable work with notable shortcomings. The process has required significant amount of support.	Good and independently produced work that addresses most essential topics. No or few additional merits.	Commendable work that demonstrates good understanding of the topic.	Excellent work that demonstrates deep understanding of the topic and exceptional skills.	Self-eval. by student (prt. grades)
15 %	Site use	Relationship to surrounding context. Quality of outdoor spaces. Orientation, entrances, and logistics.	Indifference to urban context and landscape design and/or major issues with logistics and entrances.		Basic recognition of context and mostly satisfactory landscape design concept. No major issues with orientation, entrances or logistics.		Exceptional sensibility to context and/or excellent landscape design concept. Orientation, entrances and logistics are well addressed.	
15 %	Façades and Volume	External appearance and identity. Composition, rhythm, scale, and utility of façades and building volumes.	Arbitrary articulation of façades and/or building volumes with major technical deficiencies.		Mostly functional building volumes. Façades meet basic technical criteria.		The design of façades and building volumes demonstrates high artistic ambition and technical skills.	
15 %	Space, Light, and Materials	Composition, rhythm, and scale of interior spaces. Utilization of daylight and building materials.	No visible intent to control scale and proportions and/or lack of basic understanding regarding the use of daylight.		The design concept demonstrates modest attempt to control scale and proportions. Adequate utilization of daylight.		The design concept demonstrates good control of scale and proportions. Use of daylight and building materials exceeds utilitarian demands.	
20 %	Utility	Functionality and circulation.	Serious issues with meeting even the basic functional criteria. Circulation is confusing and/or inefficient.		The design concept meets basic functional criteria. Orientation is satisfactory.		The design demonstrates good understanding of the use of the building. Orientation is intuitive. Circulation is efficient.	
20 %	Sustainability and Resilience	Consistency and economy of structural system. Utilization of natural resources. Adaptability.	The structural design concept is not feasible and/or the use of natural resources is disproportionate to the achieved value.		The structural design concept is somewhat reasonable. The use of natural resources is not disproportionate to the achieved value.		The structural design concept is economical and robust. The technical design is convincing. The use of natural resources is well-argued.	
15 %	Presentation	Clarity and appeal of presentation.	Significant amount of effort is required to understand the design concept from provided material and/or the presentation lacks ambition completely.		The documentation is understandable and technically mostly correct without notable artistic merit.		The documentation is clear and technically without major flaws. The presentation demonstrates artistic ambition and good technical skills.	