

Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2012-13

Subject Area Committee Name:	ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN & DRAFTING
Contact person:	PETER GRAMLICH, x 4700
For LDC/DE: Core outcome(s) assessed:	N/A
For CTE: Degree or certificate* assessed:	AAS IN ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN & DRAFTING

The table showing the alignment of the degree outcomes with PCC's core outcomes is available at <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/core-outcomes/arch.html>

Please address the questions below and send to learningassessment@pcc.edu by **June 21, 2013** with Annual Report in the subject line

Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C Program Review Outline.

- 1. Describe changes that have been implemented towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that resulted from recent outcome assessments. These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc. Please be sure to describe the connection between the assessment results and the changes made.**

The Department of Architectural Design & Drafting has reviewed the work of each graduating student: after the fall 2012 term with the work produced in ARCH 201 (Residential Studio), and again after the spring 2013 term with the work produced in ARCH 203 (Residential Renovation Studio). These courses are those that best represent an Architectural Capstone project. Each class culminates in a final design review and the work becomes an important part of the students' portfolios as they move forward to graduation and employment.

From previous assessments, we believed that students needed more of the following:

1. Interaction and communication with clients, per the 4th degree outcome referenced below under question 2.
2. The ability to produce high-quality architectural drawings using a range of computer-aided drafting software, per the 2nd degree outcome referenced below under question 2.
3. The ability to complete all phases of the design and documentation process with consideration of its impact on the natural environment, per the 5th degree outcome referenced below under question 2.

We did this in response:

1. Each ARCH 203 student had a specific client for the remodel design: they met at least 3 times during the term, and their designs responded directly to client demands and wishes. While this has been customary for all past ARCH 203 classes, it was a stated goal to focus on this student-client dynamic and to allow the students to come to their own accords with the clients (without undue instructor guidance).
2. We have continuously upgraded software, and are using the 2013 iterations of Autocad, Revit and SketchUp. Since the ARCH 203 course requires both schematic design and construction documentation, each student uses Autocad and/or Revit, plus the structural design software Forte. We

have little doubt the graduates are well-equipped for the job market due to their relevant and current software skills.

3. The vision of architectural design through its impact on the natural environment is a relatively new trend in the field. Portland is a leader in this area and it is incumbent on all of us at PCC to consider more than just the needs and conditions of one building, site or client: good design is all a matter of how it integrates into the greater whole.

To this end, both ARCH 203 instructors have updated their lectures and course materials to reflect current best practices of sustainable design, community development, landscape design and site planning. There is also a conscious dovetail with other courses in the program, including ARCH 113 (Site Planning), ARCH 124 (Introduction to Building Systems), ARCH 134 (Energy Conservation Codes), ARCH 204 (Green Residential Studio), ARCH 224 (Active and Passive Building Systems) and ARCH 256 (Detail Drawing with Autocad).

For each outcome assessed this year:

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:

- The nature of the assessment (e.g., written work, project, portfolio, exam, survey, performance etc.) and if it is direct (assesses evidence mastery of outcomes) or indirect (student's perception of mastery). Please give rationale for indirect assessments (direct assessments are preferable).
- The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?
- Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report – OK to include in appendix). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.
- How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another).

Following are the AAS in Architectural Design & Drafting outcomes:

1. Design a residential or small commercial building responsive to site conditions, user requirements, codes and construction standards, and aesthetic considerations.
2. Produce architectural drawings using a range of computer-aided drafting software. Select and recommend building systems, structural systems, construction materials, and structural components responsive to the building's design.
3. Produce a set of construction documents that describe the construction requirements for a building, using accepted industry practices.
4. Communicate with design professionals, clients, and engineers, using industry specific terminology and graphics.
5. Complete all phases of the design and documentation process with consideration of its impact on the natural environment.

This assessment addressed all of the above, with a particular emphasis on outcomes 2 and 3. Detailed reviews and summaries of each students' work are attached with this document; this form is called the 'Degree Outcome Assessment', and is a scoring worksheet for degree outcome objectives 2 and 3 above. This assessment form is divided into 15 categories, and each student was assessed on a scale of 2-5 as noted below:

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Collectively, they indicate students are meeting and exceeding the degree outcomes and core requirements. The 6-credit Spring 2013 ARCH 203, Residential Renovation Studio, was selected as the course for review of students' capabilities. This course "covers as-built drawings, design and construction documents for a residential remodel//addition". The course was taught by Peter Gramlich and Elizabeth Metcalf (there were 2 sections) and the students' work was reviewed and rated by Adjunct Faculty members and experienced industry experts Michelle Mueller and Anne Marie Kuban on June 17, 2013.

3. Provide information about the results (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?

- **If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any appropriate benchmarks.**
- **Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning. Please show those specific results.**

Each individual student assessment is attached as a single PDF. The maximum score is 80, across the 15 categories. (Each of these is worth 2-5 points, with the exception of one, worth 5-10 points). The 12 student scores range from 57 to 76, which indicates clearly positive results, overall and individually. The scores were: 57, 58, 62, 63, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74 and 76.

If there are any broad areas of improvement that can be drawn from the data, as measured by lower student assessment scores, it may be possible to categorize these as follows:

- Assessment Categories 2-4: drawing set organization and coordination
- Assessment Categories 9 and 10: foundation and framing plans
- Assessment Categories 11 and 12: building sections

It is important to note that there are no deficiencies identified in the above, or in any other, categories. It is merely the case that the average scores are slightly (and only slightly) lower in these areas than in the others. This isn't a surprise, as these are areas requiring considerable industry-specific and technical knowledge, both in the academic and professional realms. As such, it behooves us to redouble our attention to these areas as we move forward.

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).

As stated in the response to Question 3 above, if there are any broad areas of improvement that can be drawn from the data, as measured by lower student assessment scores, it may be possible to categorize these as follows:

- Assessment Categories 2-4: drawing set organization and coordination
- Assessment Categories 9 and 10: foundation and framing plans
- Assessment Categories 11 and 12: building sections

It is important to note that there are no deficiencies identified in the above, or in any other, categories. It is merely the case that the average scores are slightly (and only slightly) lower in these areas than in the others. This isn't a surprise, as these are areas requiring considerable industry-specific and technical knowledge, both in the academic and professional realms. As such, it behooves us to redouble our attention to these areas as we move forward.

Addressing these fairly complex and crucial areas going forward, it may be wise to consider curriculum updates to some courses that overlap with the content we offer in ARCH 201 and ARCH 203, the Capstone courses.

- ARCH 256 (Detail Drawing with Autocad) can be modified to include more details showing standard construction techniques (we typically focus on 'energy-efficient' details, as certified by the Energy Trust of Oregon).
- The same ARCH 256 course, as well as ARCH 111 (Introduction to Residential Construction Documents), may be revised to include a more stringent focus on building sections. ARCH 256 requires students do an intensive building section, although it isn't 'standard' framed construction (of the sort the students do in ARCH 203 and, very likely, in ARCH 201); perhaps that can be changed. ARCH 111 does not require a building section, though it does ask students to draw construction details; perhaps that, too, can be updated.

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future? If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

We feel the assessment tool is working well. This is my first time through it, so I don't have a great deal of reference upon which to form a comparison ;-). But the 15 categories of the Degree Outcome Assessment absolutely speak to the material we teach in the Capstone courses, and are equally valid and relevant to the skills the industry is looking for.

We find the assessment tool and processes meaningful and pertinent, and are comfortable using the same assessment going forward.

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt.
- ◆ footprint square footage noted ✓
- ◆ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. ✓
- ◆ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format)
- ◆ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct - no ^{dims}
- ◆ building(s) located from property lines ✓
- ◆ driveways & easements dimensioned ✓
- ◆ finish floor elevation(s) indicated ✓
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at building corners ✓
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at lot corners ✓
- ◆ notes including: ✓ property address ✓
✓ legal description ✓ lot area ✓
✓ building coverage ✓ impervious area ✓
- ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ wall pattern clearly illustrated ✓
- ◆ windows and doors shown ✓
- ◆ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled) ✓
- ◆ door sizes indicated (or scheduled) ✓
- ◆ dimensions clear and complete ✓
- ◆ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown ✓
- ◆ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ◆ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails NA
- ◆ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ◆ rooms labeled ✓
- ◆ additional notes as required ✓
- ◆ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows ✓

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated ✓✓✓✓✓
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing ✓
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below ✓
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes ~~no sizes~~
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes ✓
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes) ✓
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing) ✓
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan) ✓
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement ✓
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted ✓✓
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted ✓
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation) ✓
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown ✓
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned ✓
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ all sides of building illustrated
- ◆ drawings are correctly titled
- ◆ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ◆ doors and window shown
- ◆ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ◆ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ◆ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ◆ graphic representation of materials
- ◆ roof slopes indicated
- ◆ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ◆ notes indicating non-typical items
- ◆ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ◆ accurate representation of details drawn
- ◆ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ◆ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ◆ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ◆ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#02

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>3</u>	9) <u>4</u>
3) <u>0</u>	10) <u>4</u>
4) <u>3</u>	11) <u>3</u>
5) <u>5</u>	12) <u>2</u>
6) <u>4</u>	13) <u>5</u>
7) <u>4</u>	14) <u>4</u>
8) <u>4</u>	15) <u>2</u>
8) <u>4</u>	16) <u>2</u>
<u>31</u>	<u>26</u>
Total Score: <u>57</u>	

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD X ◆ Revit _____ ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. *C*
- ♦ footprint square footage noted *C*
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. *C*
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions survey format *not*
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct *to 20*
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines *C*
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners *C*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners *C*
- ♦ notes including:
 - ✓ property address *C*
 - ✓ legal description
 - ✓ lot area
 - ✓ building coverage
 - ✓ impervious area
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

no topo lines...

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

too busy to read!

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated *C*
- ♦ windows and doors shown *C*
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled) *OK*
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled) *not at elevs*
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete *OK*
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown *C*
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer *C*
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails *OK*
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets *no*
- ♦ rooms labeled *C*
- ♦ additional notes as required *C*
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows *C*

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate ...

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate ...

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate ...

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate ...

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated *C*
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled *C*
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans *C*
- ♦ doors and window shown *C*
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners *C*
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown *C*
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g. *C*
- ♦ graphic representation of materials *C*
- ♦ roof slopes indicated *C*
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials *C*
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items *C*
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale *C*

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include: *now*
- ✓ typical eave ✓ typical footing
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#03

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>3</u>	9) <u>5</u>
3) <u>8</u>	10) <u>4</u>
4) <u>2</u>	11) <u>4</u>
5) <u>2</u>	12) <u>3</u>
6) <u>3</u>	13) <u>4</u>
7) <u>5</u>	14) <u>5</u>
8) <u>3</u>	15) <u>3</u>
	16) <u>4</u>
<u>24</u>	<u>32</u>
Total Score: <u>56</u>	

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ♦ AutoCAD X ♦ Revit ♦ Other (identify)

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ♦ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ♦ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ♦ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ♦ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ♦ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. *no*
- ♦ footprint square footage noted *no*
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. *✓*
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) *no*
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct *no?*
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines *no*
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned *no*
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated *unreadable*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners *✓*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners *✓*
- notes including:
 - ✓ property address *50% - 70%*
 - ✓ legal description *yes*
 - ✓ lot area *no*
 - ✓ building coverage *no*
 - ✓ impervious area *no*
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and ~~north arrow~~ *no*

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

c = correct

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated *c*
- ♦ windows and doors shown *c*
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled) *90%*
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled) *c*
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete *YES!*
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown *y*
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer *y*
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails *OK*
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets *OK*
- ♦ rooms labeled *y*
- ♦ additional notes as required *y*
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows *no*

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ all sides of building illustrated C
- ◆ drawings are correctly titled C
- ◆ drawings are coordinated with floor plans C
- ◆ doors and window shown C
- ◆ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners C
- ◆ decks, railings, and guardrails shown C
- ◆ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g. C
- ◆ graphic representation of materials
- ◆ roof slopes indicated
- ◆ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ◆ notes indicating non-typical items
- ◆ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing n/a
- ◆ accurate representation of details drawn
- ◆ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ◆ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ◆ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ◆ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#04

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>3</u>	9) <u>4</u>
3) <u>8</u>	10) <u>3</u>
4) <u>4</u>	11) <u>5</u>
5) <u>5</u>	12) <u>3</u>
6) <u>4</u>	13) <u>5</u>
7) <u>5</u>	14) <u>5</u>
8) <u>3</u>	15) <u>2</u>
16) <u>3</u>	
<u>32</u>	<u>30</u>
Total Score: <u>62</u>	

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD X ◆ Revit _____ ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt.
- ◆ footprint square footage noted
- ◆ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc.
- ◆ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) -
- ◆ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct
- ◆ building(s) located from property lines
- ◆ driveways & easements dimensioned
- ◆ finish floor elevation(s) indicated
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at building corners
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at lot corners
- ◆ notes including: ✓ property address
 ✓ legal description ✓ lot area
 ✓ building coverage ✓ impervious area
- ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ◆ windows and doors shown
- ◆ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ dimensions clear and complete
- ◆ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ◆ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ◆ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ◆ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ◆ rooms labeled
- ◆ additional notes as required
- ◆ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ framing layout clearly illustrated --
- ◆ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans --
- ◆ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing --
- ◆ framing plans show walls at level below +
- ◆ post locations shown with sizes †
- ◆ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes †
- ◆ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes) †/-
- ◆ attic access location (roof framing) †
- ◆ crawl space access location (foundation plan) †
- ◆ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement ? †
- ◆ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ◆ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ◆ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ◆ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ◆ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned --
- ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably ~~weak~~ ^{weak} in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ◆ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ◆ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ◆ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ◆ additional notes as required
- ◆ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably ~~weak~~ ^{weak} in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ all sides of building illustrated
- ◆ drawings are correctly titled
- ◆ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ◆ doors and window shown
- ◆ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ◆ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ◆ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ◆ graphic representation of materials
- ◆ roof slopes indicated
- ◆ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ◆ notes indicating non-typical items
- ◆ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing →
- ◆ accurate representation of details drawn
- ◆ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ◆ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ◆ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ◆ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#05

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
	9) <u>2</u>
2) <u>4</u>	10) <u>4</u>
3) <u>0</u>	11) <u>3</u>
4) <u>5</u>	12) <u>3</u>
5) <u>5</u>	13) <u>5</u>
6) <u>4</u>	14) <u>4</u>
7) <u>5</u>	15) <u>2</u>
8) <u>4</u>	16) <u>5</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>28</u>
Total Score:	<u>63</u>

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD
- ◆ Revit
- ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

little difference between new + existing

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. *ok*
- ♦ footprint square footage noted *y*
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. *y*
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) *no lines*
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct *y*
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines *y*
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned *y/n/a*
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated *y*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners *y*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners *yy*
- ♦ notes including:
 - ✓ property address
 - ✓ legal description
 - ✓ lot area
 - ✓ building coverage
 - ✓ impervious area
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow *y*

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

text too small

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated *y*
- ♦ windows and doors shown
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ♦ rooms labeled
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing) ~~no~~
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan) *n/a*
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction *no*
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ♦ doors and window shown
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ♦ graphic representation of materials
- ♦ roof slopes indicated
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - typical footing *note*
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

06

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>4</u>	9) <u>3</u>
3) <u>8</u>	10) <u>4</u>
4) <u>4</u>	11) <u>5</u>
5) <u>4</u>	12) <u>4</u>
6) <u>3</u>	13) <u>5</u>
7) <u>6</u>	14) <u>4</u>
8) <u>4</u>	15) <u>5</u>
16) <u>5</u>	
<u>32</u>	<u>35</u>
Total Score:	<u>67</u>

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ♦ AutoCAD X ♦ Revit _____ ♦ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ♦ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ♦ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ♦ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ♦ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ♦ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 4 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt.
- ◆ footprint square footage noted
- ◆ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc.
- ◆ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format)
- ◆ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct
- ◆ building(s) located from property lines
- ◆ driveways & easements dimensioned
- ◆ finish floor elevation(s) indicated ✓
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at building corners ✓
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at lot corners
- ◆ notes including: ✓ property address
✓ legal description ✓ lot area
✓ building coverage ✓ impervious area
- ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably ~~weak~~ ^{weak} in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable ~~in one or more criteria or weak~~ ^{in several}

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ◆ windows and doors shown
- ◆ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ dimensions clear and complete
- ◆ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ◆ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ◆ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails NA
- ◆ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ◆ rooms labeled
- ◆ additional notes as required
- ◆ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles ~~styles~~
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement –
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted –
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted –
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation) –
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ♦ doors and window shown
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ♦ graphic representation of materials
- ♦ roof slopes indicated
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale (-)

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#07

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
	9) <u>5</u>
2) <u>4</u>	10) <u>5</u>
3) <u>10</u>	11) <u>5</u>
4) <u>5</u>	12) <u>4</u>
5) <u>3</u>	13) <u>5</u>
6) <u>3</u>	14) <u>3</u>
7) <u>4</u>	15) <u>5</u>
8) <u>3</u>	16) <u>4</u>
<u>32</u>	<u>36</u>
Total Score: <u>68</u>	

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ♦ AutoCAD
- ♦ Revit
- ♦ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ♦ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ♦ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ♦ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ♦ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ♦ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. \checkmark
- ◆ footprint square footage noted \checkmark
- ◆ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. \checkmark
- ◆ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) \checkmark
- ◆ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct \checkmark
- ◆ building(s) located from property lines \checkmark
- ◆ driveways & easements dimensioned \checkmark
- ◆ finish floor elevation(s) indicated \checkmark
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at building corners \checkmark
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at lot corners \checkmark
- ◆ notes including:
 - ✓ property address \checkmark
 - ✓ legal description \checkmark
 - ✓ lot area \checkmark
 - ✓ building coverage \checkmark
 - ✓ impervious area \checkmark
- ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ◆ windows and doors shown
- ◆ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ dimensions clear and complete
- ◆ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ◆ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ◆ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ◆ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ◆ rooms labeled
- ◆ additional notes as required
- ◆ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably ~~weak~~ ^{weak} in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ all sides of building illustrated
- ◆ drawings are correctly titled
- ◆ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ◆ doors and window shown
- ◆ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ◆ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ◆ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ◆ graphic representation of materials
- ◆ roof slopes indicated
- ◆ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ◆ notes indicating non-typical items
- ◆ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ◆ accurate representation of details drawn
- ◆ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ◆ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ◆ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ◆ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#08

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>4</u>	9) <u>3</u>
3) <u>10</u>	10) <u>3</u>
4) <u>4</u>	11) <u>5</u>
5) <u>5</u>	12) <u>4</u>
6) <u>5</u>	13) <u>5</u>
7) <u>5</u>	14) <u>5</u>
8) <u>5</u>	15) <u>2</u>
16) <u>4</u>	
<u>38</u>	<u>31</u>
Total Score: <u>69</u>	

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ♦ AutoCAD X ♦ Revit X ♦ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ♦ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ♦ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

not quite clearly label

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ♦ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ♦ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ♦ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

- 5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .
- ◆ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt.
 - ◆ footprint square footage noted
 - ◆ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc.
 - ◆ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format)
 - ◆ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct
 - ◆ building(s) located from property lines
 - ◆ driveways & easements dimensioned
 - ◆ finish floor elevation(s) indicated
 - ◆ grade elevations indicated at building corners
 - ◆ grade elevations indicated at lot corners
 - ◆ notes including: ✓ property address
 ✓ legal description ✓ lot area
 ✓ building coverage ✓ impervious area
 - ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow
- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

- 6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .
- ◆ overall layout and presentation
 - ◆ neatness and spelling
 - ◆ lineweights
 - ◆ text and dimension styles
 - ◆ material representations
 - ◆ drafting conventions
- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

- 7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .
- ◆ wall pattern clearly illustrated
 - ◆ windows and doors shown
 - ◆ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled) *on elevs.*
 - ◆ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
 - ◆ dimensions clear and complete
 - ◆ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
 - ◆ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
 - ◆ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
 - ◆ rod and shelf indicated at closets
 - ◆ rooms labeled
 - ◆ additional notes as required
 - ◆ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows
- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

- 8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .
- ◆ overall layout and presentation
 - ◆ neatness and spelling
 - ◆ lineweights
 - ◆ text and dimension styles
 - ◆ material representations
 - ◆ drafting conventions
- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

(E) COL, U.N.O.

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate ...

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated *so so/no*
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans *yes*
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing *yes*
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below *yes*
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes *n*
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes *yes*
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing) *n/a*
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan) *n/a*
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement *(a detail?)*
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted *n/a*
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted *yes*
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation) *n/a*
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown *yes*
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned *no*
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate ...

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions ←

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate ...

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction *yes*
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate ...

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated *y*
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled *y*
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans *y*
- ♦ doors and window shown *y*
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners *y*
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown *y*
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g. *y*
- ♦ graphic representation of materials *y*
- ♦ roof slopes indicated *y*
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials *y*
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items *y*
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale *y*

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing *MNE*
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn *nk*
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail *y*
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned *no*
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated *y*
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale *y*

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation *y*
- ♦ neatness and spelling *y*
- ♦ lineweights *needs work*
- ♦ text and dimension styles *y*
- ♦ material representations *y*
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#09

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>5</u>	9) <u>5</u>
3) <u>8</u>	10) <u>5</u>
4) <u>4</u>	11) <u>5</u>
5) <u>3</u>	12) <u>5</u>
6) <u>4</u>	13) <u>5</u>
7) <u>5</u>	14) <u>4</u>
8) <u>4</u>	15) <u>3</u>
16) <u>5</u>	
<u>33</u>	<u>31</u>
Total Score: <u>70</u>	

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD X ◆ Revit _____ ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
 - 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
 - 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)
- details don't match*

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. *C*
- ♦ footprint square footage noted *C*
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. *C*
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) *C*
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct *C*
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines *no*
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned *NA*
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated *C*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners *C*
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners *C*
- ♦ notes including:
 - ✓ property address
 - ✓ legal description *lot area*
 - ✓ building coverage *impervious area*
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ♦ windows and doors shown
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ♦ rooms labeled
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ♦ doors and window shown
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ♦ graphic representation of materials
- ♦ roof slopes indicated
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

10

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
2) <u>5</u>	9) <u>5</u>
3) <u>10</u>	10) <u>3</u>
4) <u>4</u>	11) <u>5</u>
5) <u>4</u>	12) <u>5</u>
6) <u>5</u>	13) <u>5</u>
7) <u>4</u>	14) <u>5</u>
8) <u>4</u>	15) <u>5</u>
16) <u>5</u>	16) <u>5</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>38</u>
Total Score:	<u>74</u>

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD X ◆ Revit _____ ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. ✓
- ♦ footprint square footage noted ✓
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. ✓
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) ✓
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct ✓
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines ✓
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned ✓
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated ? not on addition
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners ✓
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners ✓
- ♦ notes including: ✓ property address ✓
✓ legal description ✓ lot area ✓
✓ building coverage ✓ impervious area ✓
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ♦ windows and doors shown
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ♦ rooms labeled
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ♦ doors and window shown
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ♦ graphic representation of materials
- ♦ roof slopes indicated
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#11

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
	9) <u>4</u>
2) <u>4</u>	10) <u>4</u>
3) <u>10</u>	11) <u>5</u>
4) <u>5</u>	12) <u>5</u>
5) <u>4</u>	13) <u>5</u>
6) <u>3</u>	14) <u>5</u>
7) <u>5</u>	15) <u>5</u>
8) <u>3</u>	16) <u>4</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>37</u>
Total Score: <u>71</u>	

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD
- ◆ Revit
- ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt. +/-
- ◆ footprint square footage noted ✓
- ◆ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc. ✓
- ◆ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format) ✓
- ◆ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct +/-
- ◆ building(s) located from property lines ✓
- ◆ driveways & easements dimensioned ✓
- ◆ finish floor elevation(s) indicated ✓
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at building corners ✓
- ◆ grade elevations indicated at lot corners ✓
- ◆ notes including: ✓ property address ✓
✓ legal description ✓ lot area ✓
✓ building coverage ✓ impervious area ✓
- ◆ drawing title, scale, and north arrow ✓

5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct

4 all content is provided with minor errors observed

3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar

2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional

4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor

3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria

2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ◆ windows and doors shown
- ◆ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ◆ dimensions clear and complete
- ◆ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ◆ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ◆ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ◆ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ◆ rooms labeled
- ◆ additional notes as required
- ◆ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct

4 all content is provided with minor errors observed

3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar

2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional

4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor

3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria

2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ all sides of building illustrated
- ◆ drawings are correctly titled
- ◆ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ◆ doors and window shown
- ◆ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ◆ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ◆ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ◆ graphic representation of materials
- ◆ roof slopes indicated
- ◆ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ◆ notes indicating non-typical items
- ◆ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ◆ accurate representation of details drawn
- ◆ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ◆ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ◆ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ◆ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ◆ overall layout and presentation
- ◆ neatness and spelling
- ◆ lineweights
- ◆ text and dimension styles
- ◆ material representations
- ◆ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

#12

pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
	9) <u>5</u>
2) <u>4</u>	10) <u>5</u>
3) <u>10</u>	11) <u>4</u>
4) <u>5</u>	12) <u>4</u>
5) <u>5</u>	13) <u>5</u>
6) <u>4</u>	14) <u>5</u>
7) <u>4</u>	15) <u>5</u>
8) <u>4</u>	16) <u>4</u>
<u>36</u>	<u>37</u>
Total Score: <u>73</u>	

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ◆ AutoCAD _____
- ◆ Revit ~~_____~~
- ◆ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ◆ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ◆ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ◆ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ◆ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ◆ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt.
- ♦ footprint square footage noted
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc.
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format)
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners
- ♦ notes including: property address
 legal description lot area
 building coverage impervious area
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated *C*
- ♦ windows and doors shown *C*
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled) *C*
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled) *C*
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete *C*
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown *no. no*
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer *OK*
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails *C*
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets *no*
- ♦ rooms labeled *90%*
- ♦ additional notes as required *OK*
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows *OK*

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
- ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
- ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
- ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
- ♦ post locations shown with sizes
- ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
- ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
- ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
- ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
- ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
- ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
- ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
- ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
- ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
- ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
- ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
- ♦ required dimensions including:
 - ✓ typ. overhang(s)
 - ✓ floor - floor heights
- ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
 - ✓ floor system
 - ✓ roof system
 - ✓ exterior wall sys.
 - ✓ etc.
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale

- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ all sides of building illustrated
- ♦ drawings are correctly titled
- ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
- ♦ doors and window shown
- ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
- ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
- ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
- ♦ graphic representation of materials
- ♦ roof slopes indicated
- ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials
- ♦ notes indicating non-typical items
- ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale

- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ details include:
 - ✓ typical eave
 - ✓ typical footing
- ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
- ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
- ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
- ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
- ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale

- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Degree Outcome Assessment

Scoring Worksheet for Degree Outcome Objectives #2 and #3 Architectural Design and Drafting – Portland Community College

Student Work to be Evaluated:

In the course of completing the degree requirements for this program, students produce a complete set of construction documents for a typical 2-story residence. This work sample in full-size, printed format is used for this evaluation.

Student's name: _____

Evaluator: _____ date: _____

	pg. 1 scores	pg. 2 scores
		9) _____
	2) _____	10) _____
	3) _____	11) _____
	4) _____	12) _____
	5) _____	13) _____
	6) _____	14) _____
	7) _____	15) _____
	8) _____	16) _____
Total Score:	_____	_____

80 points are possible, 60 points or better is a passing score.

CAD Software:

1) Work sample was produced using CAD software:

- ♦ AutoCAD _____
- ♦ Revit _____
- ♦ Other (identify) _____

note: work is required to be produced with CAD software to meet degree outcome objective #2

Drawing Set Organization and Coordination:

2) The set of drawings is graphically consistent.

- ♦ Lineweights, text styles, and graphic styles are consistent from sheet to sheet
- ♦ Title block is used with consistency, sheet numbers and dates are accurate

- 5 excellent consistency, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 consistent and clean with minor, occasional inconsistencies
- 3 lineweights or graphics or text styles are inconsistent from sheet to sheet
- 2 many graphic elements are inconsistent from sheet to sheet

3) The building illustrated is coordinated throughout the set.

- ♦ Each drawing relates correctly and accurately to the other drawings in the set

- 10 no coordination errors observed
- 8 a minor coordination error observed (ex: window on plan not shown in elevation)
- 5 substantial coordination error(s) observed (ex: roofline shown differently plan vs. elev.)

4) The set of drawings in cross referenced completely and accurately.

- ♦ The sheet index correctly lists all sheets in the set
- ♦ Cross-reference targets accurately refer to appropriate drawings

- 5 all cross-referencing complete and accurate
- 4 a single omission or error observed, otherwise set is properly cross-referenced
- 3 multiple errors or omissions observed
- 2 set was not cross-referenced

Site Plan:

5) Site Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ building footprint(s) – heavy line wt.
- ♦ footprint square footage noted
- ♦ patios, decks, walks, retaining walls, etc.
- ♦ property lines w/ dimensions (survey format)
- ♦ building setbacks shown, noted, & correct
- ♦ building(s) located from property lines
- ♦ driveways & easements dimensioned
- ♦ finish floor elevation(s) indicated
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at building corners
- ♦ grade elevations indicated at lot corners
- ♦ notes including:
 - ✓ property address
 - ✓ legal description
 - ✓ building coverage
 - ✓ lot area
 - ✓ impervious area
- ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow

- 5 all site plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

6) Site Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Floor Plans:

7) Floor Plan contents - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ wall pattern clearly illustrated
- ♦ windows and doors shown
- ♦ windows sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ door sizes indicated (or scheduled)
- ♦ dimensions clear and complete
- ♦ bathroom and kitchen layouts shown
- ♦ equip. shown: HWH, furnace, washer, dryer
- ♦ stair layout shown w/ handrails and guardrails
- ♦ rod and shelf indicated at closets
- ♦ rooms labeled
- ♦ additional notes as required
- ♦ drawing titles, scale, and north arrows

- 5 all floor plan content is provided and is clear and correct
- 4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
- 3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
- 2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

8) Floor Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .

- ♦ overall layout and presentation
- ♦ neatness and spelling
- ♦ lineweights
- ♦ text and dimension styles
- ♦ material representations
- ♦ drafting conventions

- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
- 4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
- 3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
- 2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Foundation and Framing Plans:

- 9) Foundation and Framing Plan contents - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ framing layout clearly illustrated
 - ♦ drawings coordinated w/ floor plans
 - ♦ framing labeled w/ type, size, & spacing
 - ♦ framing plans show walls at level below
 - ♦ post locations shown with sizes
 - ♦ beams & headers shown & labeled with sizes
 - ♦ sheathing sizes indicated (plans or gen. notes)
 - ♦ attic access location (roof framing)
 - ♦ crawl space access location (foundation plan)
 - ♦ footing & stem wall sizes w/ reinforcement
 - ♦ slab thickness and reinforcement noted
 - ♦ spot footings w/ sizes & reinforcement noted
 - ♦ vapor barrier & crawl space vents (foundation)
 - ♦ exterior decks &/or patios shown
 - ♦ foundations fully and accurately dimensioned
 - ♦ drawing title, scale, and north arrow
- 5 all foundation and framing plan content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

- 10) Foundation and Framing Plan graphics - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ overall layout and presentation
 - ♦ neatness and spelling
 - ♦ lineweights
 - ♦ text and dimension styles
 - ♦ material representations
 - ♦ drafting conventions
- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Building Sections:

- 11) Building Section contents - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ sections chosen to show typical construction
 - ♦ drawings accurately illustrate the building systems at the scale chosen
 - ♦ required dimensions including:
✓ typ. overhang(s) ✓ floor - floor heights
 - ♦ notes explaining typical building systems:
✓ floor system ✓ roof system
✓ exterior wall sys. ✓ etc.
 - ♦ additional notes as required
 - ♦ drawing titles w/ section number & scale
- 5 all building section content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

- 12) Building Section graphics - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ overall layout and presentation
 - ♦ neatness and spelling
 - ♦ lineweights
 - ♦ text and dimension styles
 - ♦ material representations
 - ♦ drafting conventions
- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Exterior Elevations:

- 13) Exterior Elevation contents - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ all sides of building illustrated
 - ♦ drawings are correctly titled
 - ♦ drawings are coordinated with floor plans
 - ♦ doors and window shown
 - ♦ trim shown: windows, doors, & bld'g. corners
 - ♦ decks, railings, and guardrails shown
 - ♦ heavy ground line at final grade against bld'g.
 - ♦ graphic representation of materials
 - ♦ roof slopes indicated
 - ♦ general notes indicating typical finish materials
 - ♦ notes indicating non-typical items
 - ♦ drawing titles including drawing scale
- 5 all elevation content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

- 14) Exterior Elevation graphics - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ overall layout and presentation
 - ♦ neatness and spelling
 - ♦ lineweights
 - ♦ text and dimension styles
 - ♦ material representations
 - ♦ drafting conventions
- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several

Construction Details:

- 15) Construction Detail contents - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ details include:
✓ typical eave ✓ typical footing
 - ♦ accurate representation of details drawn
 - ♦ scale is appropriate to the level of detail
 - ♦ footing and stem wall sizes dimensioned
 - ♦ complete notes explaining all materials, systems and applications illustrated
 - ♦ drawing titles w/ detail number & scale
- 5 all construction detail content is provided and is clear and correct
4 all content is provided with minor errors observed
3 some content is missing or difficult to understand or similar
2 numerous errors or omissions in content observed

- 16) Construction Detail graphics - Evaluate . . .
- ♦ overall layout and presentation
 - ♦ neatness and spelling
 - ♦ lineweights
 - ♦ text and dimension styles
 - ♦ material representations
 - ♦ drafting conventions
- 5 excellent graphics, looks like it was produced by a working professional
4 good graphics, easy to read and understand, any errors are minor
3 noticeably weak in at least one of the evaluation criteria
2 unacceptable in one or more criteria or weak in several