

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
2) _____	9) _____
3) _____	10) _____
4) _____	11) _____
5) _____	12) _____
6) _____	13) _____
7) _____	14) _____
8) _____	15) _____
_____	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