Chatgpt 4o:

# **Revised Rubric – Week One: Choose Your Architect**

| **Criterion** | **Exemplary (5 points)** | **Good (4 points)** | **Satisfactory (3 points)** | **Needs Improvement (2–1 points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Architect Selection & Scope** | **Clearly identifies one architect from Book Two; selection fully adheres to course requirements and is explicitly stated in both the document and slides.** | **Architect is chosen from Book Two and referenced, but justification or clarity is slightly lacking.** | **Architect is referenced but selection feels ambiguous or not well integrated into the project.** | **Architect is unclear, not from Book Two, or missing from major sections of the assignment.** |
| **Organization & Document Setup** | **Document includes a clear Table of Contents and well-labeled sections: architect background, 10 buildings, biography, references, personal bio; layout follows recommended structure.** | **Most sections are included and logically ordered; slight formatting or clarity issues.** | **Key sections are present but formatting is inconsistent or disorganized.** | **Document lacks clear organization or is missing several required sections.** |
| **Biographical Content (750 Words)** | **Biography is ~750 words and deeply explores life, education, architectural philosophy, impact, first building, and building types with accurate references.** | **Covers most key biographical components with minor omissions or less depth in one or two areas.** | **Biography is present but either underdeveloped, overly brief, or missing multiple elements.** | **Biography is incomplete, lacks depth, or strays off-topic.** |
| **Citation of Architect Biography** | **Provides 5–10 quality academic references in correct APA format; most include DOIs or URLs and citations are well-integrated throughout.** | **5 or more academic references included with some formatting issues; minor source credibility questions.** | **Fewer than 5 references or multiple APA formatting issues; inconsistent integration into text.** | **Minimal or no references; mostly incorrect formatting or weak credibility.** |
| **Selection & Quality of Images** | **Each of the 10 buildings includes 3+ high-res exterior and 5+ interior images. Images are well-chosen, visually clear, and contextually relevant.** | **Most buildings include strong images, with only minor quality or quantity inconsistencies.** | **Some buildings are missing image types or include low-resolution or repetitive images.** | **Many buildings lack required images or use uncredited, irrelevant, or poor-quality visuals.** |
| **Image Citation & Attribution *(NEW)*** | **Every image is cited in APA style with clear attribution (photographer name and/or source URL); citations appear on slides and in document.** | **Most images are cited accurately, but there are a few formatting or source clarity issues.** | **Some images are cited, but many are missing photographer names or not in APA format.** | **Most image citations are missing, incorrect, or untraceable.** |
| **Coverage of 10 Famous Buildings** | **All 10 buildings are described with name, location, and a thoughtful 1–2 sentence significance statement. Supplemented with accurate images and references.** | **Covers 10 buildings with minor gaps in significance statements or missing context for some images.** | **Fewer than 10 buildings or several lack description or context; minimal image support.** | **Significant gaps in building list or poor execution of image descriptions and significance.** |
| **Slides/Presentation Version *(NEW)*** | **Slides mirror the document, use full-slide images with proper attribution, and follow layout expectations (TOC, portrait, personal bio, etc.).** | **Slides contain most required content with good visual structure; some small inconsistencies.** | **Slides are complete but feel text-heavy or visually weak; image placement or order is inconsistent.** | **Slides are incomplete, poorly formatted, or missing key sections and images.** |
| **Personal Bio & Photo** | **Includes a well-formatted personal bio page with a high-res photo and 1–2 sentence intro; placed correctly in both doc and slides.** | **Bio and photo included; quality or placement could be improved.** | **One part (bio or photo) is weak, low-res, or misplaced.** | **Missing bio and/or photo, or both do not meet requirements.** |
| **Overall Completeness & Presentation** | **Both document and slides are polished, complete, and professionally formatted. Submission is suitable for showcasing on the web.** | **Almost all requirements are satisfied with only minor formatting or presentation issues.** | **Meets basic requirements, but formatting, polish, or consistency is lacking.** | **Major components are missing or presentation lacks clarity and polish.** |

## **Bonus: Transparency in Limitations (up to 2 extra points)**

**Awarded when students clearly acknowledge unavailable images, limited public data, or research barriers—and use smart workarounds (e.g., renderings or annotated placeholders).**

| **Points** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| **+2** | **Clear explanation for missing content with effort to include alternatives or notes.** |
| **+1** | **Acknowledges some gaps without much elaboration.** |
| **+0** | **No explanation provided; gaps left unaddressed.** |

## **Scoring Summary**

* **Total Points (Rubric): \_\_\_ / 50**
* **Slides Category (added): \_\_\_ / 5**
* **Image Citation Accuracy (added): \_\_\_ / 5**
* **Bonus (optional): \_\_\_ / 2  
   Final Total: \_\_\_ / 62**

Gemini:

# **Improved Rubric: Choose Your Architect Assignment**

**Note:** This rubric assumes both the Document (.doc/.docx) and Slides (.ppt/.pptx) versions are submitted. If a component is missing, points should be deducted accordingly (e.g., under 'Deliverable Completeness').

| **Criterion** | **Exemplary (5 points)** | **Good (4 points)** | **Satisfactory (3 points)** | **Needs Improvement (2–1 points)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Architect Selection & Scope** | Clearly identifies one architect *verified* from Book Two; selection fully adheres to course requirements and is explicitly stated. | Identifies an architect *likely* from Book Two; minor justification details lacking but overall meets requirement. | Identifies an architect, but there are ambiguities, or selection may not align with Book Two. | Fails to clearly identify an architect from Book Two or selection is off-scope; inadequate or missing selection. |
| **Organization & Structure (Doc & Slides)** | Both deliverables include clear TOCs and well-labeled sections (Background, Buildings, Bio, Refs, Personal Bio); layout follows recommended structures; Personal Bio page correctly placed in both. | Both deliverables include most required sections; minor issues with headings/order or Personal Bio placement. TOC present. | Sections included but not clearly distinguished/organized in one or both deliverables; Personal Bio placement incorrect. TOC may be missing/basic. | Document and/or Slides are poorly organized; critical sections missing or difficult to identify; incorrect Personal Bio placement; TOC missing. |
| **Biographical Content** | Comprehensive biography (approx. 750 words, +/- 10% tolerance) covers all required points (who, famous for, studied, significance, influence, first building, types); claims well-supported by citations. | Biography covers most required points (approx. 750 words); minor omissions or slightly less depth in one area. | Biography present but underdeveloped (<675 words or significant gaps) or lacks sufficient detail in multiple areas. | Biography significantly incomplete (<500 words), off-topic, or missing multiple key elements. |
| **Academic References (Bio)** | Provides 7-10 high-quality references (peer-review, academic books prioritized) in correct APA format; includes DOIs/links; claims fully supported. Supports use of reputable sites with justification. | Provides 5-7 quality references, mostly academic, in mostly correct APA format; most include DOIs/links. Most claims supported. | Provides fewer than 5 references OR significant APA errors OR reliance on non-academic sources without justification. Some claims unsupported. | Minimal (<3) or no credible academic references; citations largely incorrect, missing, or irrelevant. |
| **Image Selection & Quantity (Per Building)** | For each of the 10 buildings: 3+ distinct, high-res exterior images AND 5+ distinct, high-res interior images provided. Images clearly demonstrate features and meet quality criteria (e.g., >1200px width suggested). | For most (8+) buildings: meets image count/type/quality requirements. Minor exceptions in count or resolution for 1-2 buildings. | For several (5-7) buildings: meets image count/type requirements, OR significant issues with resolution/quality across multiple buildings. | Fails to provide required image counts/types for most (<5) buildings OR images are consistently low-res/poor quality. |
| **Image Citation & Attribution (Doc & Slides)** | *Every* image includes: Building Name, Interior Description (if applicable), Photographer Name (or 'Unknown'), and Source URL. Format is clear and consistent. | Most images (80%+) include all required citation elements; minor inconsistencies or omissions. | Some images (50-79%) include required citation elements OR format is inconsistent OR multiple key elements (e.g., building name) are missing. | Majority of images lack required citation elements OR citations are largely incorrect/missing. |
| **Coverage of 10 Famous Buildings (Doc)** | Provides complete details for all 10 buildings: Name, Location, 1-2 sentence Significance, AND 2-3 relevant example image search queries for each. | Covers all 10 buildings; significance statements adequate; most image search queries provided, maybe less specific. | Details for fewer than 10 buildings OR several entries lack adequate info (e.g., significance) OR image search queries missing for multiple buildings. | Covers fewer than 8 buildings OR information is largely missing/incorrect for most entries; image search queries mostly absent. |
| **Personal Bio & Photo (Doc & Slides)** | Includes professionally formatted page with high-res photo and 1-3 sentence bio; placed correctly in *both* document and slides. | Personal bio/photo included in both; minor issues with placement, image quality, or bio length. | Personal bio/photo included in one format OR low-quality photo OR minimal bio (<1 sentence) OR incorrect placement in both. | Personal bio and/or photo missing from both deliverables OR does not meet quality/placement requirements. |
| **Deliverable Completeness & Formatting** | Both Doc and Slides versions submitted, complete, polished, professional; all requirements met; formatting adheres to guidelines (e.g., Doc images 2/page, Slides images full-slide). | Both versions submitted; minor formatting issues or content omissions; nearly all requirements satisfied. | One deliverable submitted OR both submitted but with significant formatting issues or content gaps (e.g., missing sections). | Major sections incomplete OR only one deliverable submitted and it is poorly formatted/incomplete OR neither submitted. |
| **Subjective Quality Assessment (Applied as 20% weight to total score)** | *Overall quality enhances the project significantly.* Thoughtful, high-impact image selection. Writing is polished, engaging, and demonstrates synthesis beyond basic AI output. Exceptional presentation/formatting enhances readability/professionalism. | *Overall quality is strong.* Good image choices. Writing is clear and well-edited. Good presentation. Evidence of refining AI output. | *Overall quality is adequate.* Image choices meet basic needs. Writing is generally clear but could use polish. Presentation is acceptable. | *Overall quality needs improvement.* Image choices seem arbitrary/poor. Writing lacks clarity/polish or seems overly reliant on raw AI output. Presentation poor. |

**Subjective Quality Assessment (20% of Grade):** This component assesses the overall thoughtfulness and professionalism beyond basic requirement fulfillment. It considers:

* **Image Impact & Relevance (Approx. 5%):** Were the chosen images compelling, high-quality, and truly illustrative of the architect's work and building features?
* **Writing Quality & Synthesis (Approx. 10%):** Is the writing engaging, clear, well-edited, and does it show evidence of synthesis and critical thinking beyond merely compiling information (e.g., thoughtful integration of sources, original insights where appropriate, clear voice)?
* **Presentation & Polish (Approx. 5%):** Do both the document and slides demonstrate attention to detail in formatting, layout, consistency, and overall visual appeal? Is it easy to navigate and read?

Claude:

# **Architecture 101: Architect Profile Project Rubric**

| **Criterion** | **Exemplary (5 points)** | **Accomplished (4 points)** | **Developing (3 points)** | **Beginning (2-1 points)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Architect Selection & Documentation (10%)** | Selects architect specifically from Book Two; provides complete identification (full name, nationality, birth/death dates, accurate portrait) with proper attribution; selection rationale clearly articulated | Selects architect from Book Two; provides most identification elements with minimal errors; attribution present but may have minor formatting issues | Selects architect from approved source but documentation has some gaps or inaccuracies; attribution present but incomplete | Architect selection unclear or not from approved source; significant gaps in identification information; little or no attribution |  |
| **2. Research Quality & Source Evaluation (15%)** | Uses 7+ high-quality academic sources with diverse perspectives; critically evaluates source reliability with explicit criteria; consistently applies APA citation format with 100% accuracy including DOIs | Uses 5-6 quality sources with some diversity; shows evidence of source evaluation; APA format applied with 85%+ accuracy | Uses minimum required sources (5) with limited diversity; basic source evaluation; APA format applied with 70%+ accuracy | Fewer than 5 sources OR sources lack academic credibility; minimal source evaluation; inconsistent citation format with multiple errors |  |
| **3. Biographical Content (15%)** | 700-800 word biography comprehensively addresses all required elements; demonstrates synthesis of multiple sources; presents original insights about architect's significance; information flows cohesively with clear narrative arc | 650-850 word biography addresses most required elements; shows evidence of source integration; provides adequate analysis of architect's significance; information generally flows well | 600-900 word biography addresses some required elements; relies heavily on limited sources; provides basic analysis; some organizational issues affect flow | Biography significantly under/over word count; missing multiple required elements; minimal original analysis; poor organization disrupts comprehension |  |
| **4. Building Selection & Analysis (20%)** | Selects 10 diverse, representative buildings that collectively illustrate architect's evolution/significance; provides precise location, date, and context for each; significance statements demonstrate analytical depth and architectural understanding | Selects 10 buildings that adequately represent architect's work; provides location and date for each; significance statements show solid understanding of architectural principles | Selects required number of buildings but selection lacks diversity or representativeness; some location/date information missing; significance statements primarily descriptive rather than analytical | Fewer than required buildings OR selection fails to represent architect's significance; significant missing information; minimal or superficial significance statements |  |
| **5. Visual Documentation (15%)** | For each building: 3+ exterior, 5+ interior high-resolution images (min. 1200px width); images systematically document key architectural features; all images properly labeled with building name, feature identification, and complete attribution | For most buildings: required number of images at adequate resolution (800px+ width); images document architectural features; images labeled with basic identification and attribution | Some buildings lack required image quantity/quality; image selection somewhat random rather than systematic; inconsistent labeling or attribution | Most buildings lack required images; low-resolution or poor-quality images; minimal or missing labels and attribution |  |
| **6. Document Organization & Structure (10%)** | Document includes professionally formatted table of contents, clear section headings, logical progression, consistent formatting, and appropriate use of white space; navigation aids (page numbers, headers) consistently applied | Document includes table of contents, section headings, and generally logical organization; formatting mostly consistent; basic navigation aids present | Document has basic organizational structure but lacks some elements (e.g., TOC); inconsistent formatting; limited navigation aids | Disorganized document lacking clear structure; minimal or no formatting consistency; absent navigation aids |  |
| **7. Digital Presentation Format (10%)** | Both document and slides versions demonstrate professional-level design; slides effectively adapt content for presentation format (one image per slide with complete attribution); technical specifications (resolution, file format) meet or exceed requirements | Both versions show good design quality; slides adequately adapt content; technical specifications meet requirements | Both versions submitted but show inconsistent design quality; slide adaptation needs improvement; meets most technical requirements | One or both versions incomplete OR significant design/technical issues that impact usability |  |
| **8. Personal Professional Identity (5%)** | Professional-quality personal photo; thoughtfully crafted 2-3 sentence bio that effectively communicates relevant background and interest in architecture; properly positioned in both document and slides versions | Acceptable personal photo; 1-2 sentence bio communicates basic information; correctly positioned in both versions | Basic personal photo included; minimal bio information; positioning in one or both versions may not follow guidelines | Missing photo OR bio OR improper positioning that significantly detracts from professional presentation |  |

## **Overall Assessment**

**Total Score: \_\_/40** **Final Grade: \_\_**

### **Additional Comments:**

*[Provide specific feedback highlighting strengths and suggestions for improvement]*

## **Learning Objectives Assessment:**

* **Research Methodology**: [Comments on student's approach to research]
* **Architectural Analysis**: [Comments on student's understanding of architectural principles]
* **Professional Communication**: [Comments on student's ability to present information clearly and professionally]
* **Digital Literacy**: [Comments on student's technical skills in document creation]