Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Department of Architecture's BS-ARCH, Texas A&M University

Upon completion of the BS-ARCH program, the student will be able to…

1a. Visual Communication (TAMU 3) - communicate effectively through various mediums.

	Performance Indicator				
		Emerging	**Novice**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
a.	**Drawings**	1. a. 1 Drawings follow the norms and standards of architectural drawings, demonstrating the basic principles of projection systems.	1. a. 2 Drawings follow the norms and standards of architectural drawings, demonstrating a higher level of graphic delineation.	1. a. 3 Drawings follow the norms and standards of architectural drawings, demonstrating a higher level of graphic delineation and increased level of detail.	1. a. 4 Drawings follow the norms and standards of architectural drawings, demonstrating a higher level of graphic delineation and increased level of detail, facilitating the development of a design idea.
b.	**Models (physical - handmade)**	1. b. 1 Models demonstrate correct scale.	1. b. 2 Models demonstrate correct scale, architectural elements, and context.	1. b. 3 Models demonstrate craftsmanship in modeling, including correct scale, architectural elements, context, and materiality.	1. b. 4 Models demonstrate craftsmanship in modeling, including correct scale, architectural elements, context, materiality, tectonics, and details.
c.	**Models (digital)**	1. c. 1 Models demonstrate correct dimensions. And completeness per the scope of the project?	1. c. 2 Models demonstrate correct dimensions, architectural elements, and context.	1. c. 3 Models demonstrate craftsmanship in modeling, including correct dimensions, architectural elements, context, materiality, and digital fabrication techniques.	1. c. 4 Models demonstrate craftsmanship in modeling, including correct dimensions, architectural elements, context, digital fabrication techniques, materiality, tectonics, and details.
d.	**Graphic Design**	1. d. 1 Presentation boards demonstrate basic graphic design principles.	1. d. 2 Presentation boards demonstrate graphic design principles with a higher level of graphic delineation.	1. d. 3 Presentation boards demonstrate graphic design principles with a higher level of graphic delineation and increased level of detail, clearly presenting design concepts.	1. d. 4 Presentation boards demonstrate graphic design principles with a higher level of graphic delineation and expression, increased level of detail, clearly presenting design concepts and effectively

					conveying the design/project narrative.

Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Department of Architecture's BS-ARCH, Texas A&M University

b. Written Communication (TAMU 3) - communicate effectively through various mediums.

	Performance Indicator				
		Emerging	**Novice**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
a.	**Academic Writing**	1. a. 1 Writing demonstrates a basic understanding of architectural topics but lacks clarity, organization, or critical depth. Arguments are vague or unsupported, and engagement with architectural sources is minimal or misapplied. Ideas are present but underdeveloped or insufficiently supported.	1. a. 2 Writing shows developing clarity and structure. Ideas are generally organized and supported with limited architectural references. There is some attempt at critical analysis, though insights remain surface-level or generalized. Evidence is used inconsistently, and citation style may be partially accurate.	1. a. 3 Writing is well-structured and demonstrates clear architectural reasoning. Arguments are grounded in relevant precedents, theories, or texts. Analysis reflects a developing architectural voice and uses sources accurately. Citations are precise and according to academic standards.	1. a. 4 Writing exhibits critical depth, disciplinary insight, and conceptual clarity. Arguments are original and well-supported by theoretical and precedent-based evidence, demonstrating a command of architectural discourse. Citations are precise and according to correct formats and standards.
b.	**Technical Writing**	1. b. 1 Writing conveys basic technical content (e.g., program summaries or project descriptions) with limited organization. The language lacks clarity or precision in communicating architectural ideas to varied audiences. Terminology may be misused or vague.	1. b. 2 Writing communicates core technical aspects of architectural work with emerging structure. Language is generally clear but may occasionally lack precision or consistency. Terminology is mostly appropriate but may include minor inaccuracies or vague expressions.	1. b. 3 Writing is well-organized and effectively communicates core technical aspects of architectural work. Language is mostly precise, with few instances of vagueness or inconsistency. Terminology is used appropriately and accurately.	1. b. 4 Writing follows a clear structure based on usability. The language is clear, concise, and direct, tailored to its intended audience (clients, consultants, agencies). The writing reflects a solid understanding of the subject. Complex ideas are communicated with clarity and professionalism, integrating codes, materials, and technical intent seamlessly.

Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Department of Architecture's BS-ARCH, Texas A&M University

Upon completion of the BS-ARCH program, the student will be able to…

2. Critical Thinking (TAMU 2) - apply critical thinking skills to solve a design issue or problem.

	Performance Indicator				
		Emerging	**Novice**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
a.	**Analyze + Evaluate Data**	2. a. 1 Identifies basic data sources but demonstrates limited understanding of relevance or how data informs architectural decisions. Evaluation is superficial or inconsistent.	2. a. 2 Engages with relevant data types (site, climate, program) with emerging understanding. Shows ability to evaluate data implications but lacks depth or integration across domains.	2. a. 3 Effectively collects and evaluates data from multiple relevant sources. Demonstrates a clear understanding of the impact of data on design strategies and spatial decisions.	2. a. 4 Integrates diverse (qualitative and quantitative) data sets with critical precision, using them as a basis for meaningful design decisions. Data insights are synthesized and inform conceptual and spatial outcomes across scales and systems.
b.	**Design Solution**	2. c. 1 The design solution shows minimal engagement with the design conditions and lacks clear analysis. The response demonstrates limited understanding of the context.	2. c. 2 The design solution addresses the design conditions but with limited analysis or depth. The response shows a basic understanding of the context, though the approach may be general, predictable, or lacking in coherence.	2. c. 3 The design solution responds effectively to the design conditions and demonstrates thoughtful analysis. While not fully original, the approach reflects a clear understanding of the context and offers a reasoned, coherent solution.	2. c. 4 The design solution critiques the design conditions to the level of originality.

Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Department of Architecture's BS-ARCH, Texas A&M University

Upon completion of the BS-ARCH program, the student will be able to…

3. Integration (TAMU 1) - integrate architectural knowledge and skills to develop a design solution.

	Performance Indicator				
		Emerging	**Novice**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
a.	**History, Theory, and Criticism**	3. a. 1 Historical and theoretical perspectives are minimally referenced or misapplied. There is little evidence that these ideas inform the concept, space, or experience of the project. Connections may be superficial, fragmented, or inaccurate.	3. a. 2 Historical and theoretical perspectives are acknowledged in the project. However, their influence on concept, space, or experience is limited or inconsistently applied.	3. a. 3 Historical and theoretical perspectives clearly contribute to the concept, space, or experience of the project. The connections are logical and support the design intention, though they may not yet demonstrate a critical or transformative stance.	3. a. 4 Historical and theoretical perspectives reveal a critical stance that shapes the concept, space, and experience of the project. Integration is intentional, coherent, and elevates the project's intellectual depth.
b.	**Building Technology**	3. b. 1 The project incorporates basic technical concepts that are limitedly aligned with formal ideas. Technical elements may appear secondary to the design logic.	3. b. 2 The project demonstrates technical systems and their relevance to design. There is some effort to coordinate technical elements with formal or spatial intentions, but integration remains partial or inconsistent. Technical considerations may be treated additively rather than as integral components of the design.	3. b. 3 Technical systems are integrated into the design, supporting spatial and formal strategies. While not fully holistic, the work reflects growing fluency in aligning technical and architectural decisions.	3. b. 4 Technical systems are thoroughly synthesized into the project, reinforcing spatial, conceptual, and environmental goals. The work shows technical fluency and a holistic understanding of building integration at multiple scales.
c.	**User Need/Program Function**	3. d. 1 The project exhibits basic functional awareness but lacks responsiveness to program logic or user needs.	3. d. 2 The project demonstrates considerations of programmatic needs. However, responsiveness to user experience and program logic is limited or inconsistently applied.	3. d. 3 Programmatic requirements and user experience are addressed and influence key design moves. The project demonstrates a coherent spatial organization and functional logic, with growing sensitivity to how users engage	3. d. 4 User experience and programmatic logic are thoughtfully incorporated within the project, informing design decision-making across the scales from site to details.

				with the space across different scales.	

Portfolio Assessment Rubric – Department of Architecture's BS-ARCH, Texas A&M University

Upon completion of the BS-ARCH program, the student will be able to…

4. Social, Cultural, & Global Competence (TAMU 5) - create a design response towards an issue(s) (e.g., social, cultural, global, and environmental) across multiple scales.

	Performance Indicator				
		Emerging	**Novice**	**Proficient**	**Distinguished**
a.	**Social Responsibility**	4. a. 1 The project shows minimal awareness of social responsibilities. Issues such as safety, inclusivity, environmental impact, and public access are largely overlooked or superficially mentioned, with little evidence of thoughtful consideration.	4. a. 2 The project reflects a limited engagement with social responsibilities, acknowledging issues like safety, inclusivity, environmental impact, and public access, but addressing them unevenly and without clear integration into the design.	4. a. 3 The project demonstrates a consistent and thoughtful engagement with social responsibilities. Key issues such as safety, inclusivity, environmental impact, and public access are addressed clearly and integrated into major aspects of the design.	4. a. 4 The project exhibits a deep and proactive commitment to social responsibilities. It integrates considerations of safety, inclusivity, environmental impact, and public access in innovative and context-sensitive ways that enhance both the project's integrity and its broader social value.
b.	**Sustainability**	4. b. 1 The project minimally or generically applies sustainable strategies. Strategies are present but disconnected from the design's concept or resolution.	4. b. 2 Design incorporates basic sustainable strategies (e.g., daylighting, orientation, material choice) with growing awareness of their implications. Integration may remain superficial or partially resolved.	4. b. 3 Sustainable strategies are integrated into the design and visibly shape spatial, formal, and technical aspects of the project. Strategies align with environmental goals and design intent.	4. b. 4 Sustainability is fundamental to the project's identity and system logic. The project demonstrates a nuanced understanding of ecological impact and showcases innovative, regenerative, or context-specific strategies.
c.	**Cultural/Global Awareness**	4. c. 1 The project shows awareness of cultural or contextual factors. Project reflects generalized aesthetics without responsiveness to place, tradition, or users.	4. c. 2 Cultural or global references begin to shape the design concept or expression. Integration relies on surface-level forms or precedents, without deeper synthesis.	4. c. 3 The project demonstrates thoughtful engagement with cultural and global contexts. Spatial strategies, materials, or narratives respond to traditions, climate, or community values.	4. c. 4 Cultural and global awareness is fully integrated and critically interpreted. The design respects local context while engaging broader dialogues, offering spatial solutions that are both respectful and original.