Chatgpt 4o:

| **Criterion** | **Exemplary (5)** | **Good (4)** | **Satisfactory (3)** | **Needs Improvement (2-1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clarity of Main Question and Other Questions Not Chosen** | Clearly presents a thoughtful, well-articulated version of the selected CNfA question. Includes precise definitions of all technical terms (cognitive, architectural, neural). Rewrites the 4 unchosen questions in a clearly improved and conceptually meaningful form. | Presents a strong version of the main question with defined key terms. The other questions are rewritten but show less depth or clarity; or some technical terms in the main question lack full conceptual explanation. | Rewrites fewer than all 4 other questions, or the main question lacks clarity or technical explanation for multiple terms. | Fails to clearly present the main question or omits multiple unchosen questions. Most technical terms remain undefined or unclear. |
| **Quantity & Quality of Interior Images** | Includes all 25 required interior images plus 10 supporting and 5 contextual/challenging ones. All images are high-resolution, relevant, and appropriately categorized. | Includes at least 25 total images and most supporting/contextual ones; the majority are relevant and of acceptable resolution. | Includes fewer than 25 total images or misses some supporting/contextual images. Several images are low quality, repetitive, or weakly connected to the questions. | Significantly fewer than the required number of images. Many are low quality, off-topic, or not appropriately categorized. |
| **Organization & Slide Presentation** | Slides are professionally structured with clear titles, section dividers, and logical progression. Each of the 5 categories is distinctly labeled and well-organized. | Slides are generally coherent and labeled. All 5 categories are addressed, though organization or transitions may feel uneven. | Some categories or dividers are unclear or missing. Slides are only minimally structured. | Slides lack clear organization. Categories are hard to distinguish, and overall presentation is visually confusing or incomplete. |
| **Hypothesis Testing & Interpretation** | Clearly explains how each image supports or challenges the hypothesis. Provides insightful reasoning for each placement in the 2×2 matrix or table, with justifications based on observable features. | Adequately distinguishes supportive and challenging images. Includes basic reasoning, though analysis could be deeper or more precise. | Support vs. challenge distinction is attempted but poorly explained. Lacks clarity or depth in matrix/table placements. | Does not clearly distinguish between supportive and challenging images. Lacks meaningful interpretation of the hypothesis. |
| **Visual Interpretation of the Hypothesis** | Provides a well-labeled matrix or diagram. Accurately explains what each image confirms or contradicts, supported by strong visual and conceptual evidence. | Includes a visual matrix/table. Most image placements are correct, though some may lack full explanation or clarity. | Mentions confirmation and contradiction visually but lacks a clear matrix/table or sufficient rationale for placements. | No meaningful diagram or visual representation of support vs. contradiction is included. |
| **Depth of Analysis & Reflection** | Thoughtfully reflects on emerging patterns and includes possible exceptions or limitations. Shows sophisticated understanding of the hypothesis and its broader implications. | Identifies patterns and possible counterexamples. Shows a reasonable level of insight into the design logic or cognitive effects. | Some reflections or observations are present, but lack critical depth. Limited discussion of contradictory or ambiguous findings. | Largely descriptive or surface-level. Lacks reflection on design patterns or hypothesis testing. |
| **Overall Quality & Completeness** | Submission is comprehensive, well-edited, and polished. All deliverables are present. Strongly demonstrates mastery of assignment goals. | Mostly complete with minor omissions or inconsistencies. Presentation is mostly coherent and meets assignment expectations. | Meets most requirements but has noticeable gaps in quality, formatting, or content. | Submission is missing major components, lacks coherence, or does not meet key expectations for the assignment. |

Gemini:

**Evaluation Rubric**

| **Criterion** | **Exemplary (5)** | **Good (4)** | **Satisfactory (3)** | **Needs Improvement (2-1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Clarity of Main Question and Other Questions | Clearly presents a thoughtful, well-articulated version of the chosen CNfA question, including comprehensive conceptual explanations of all technical terms. Presents all other questions of the architect in a revised and clear form. | Presents a clear and well-articulated version of the main question with comprehensive conceptual explanations of most technical terms. Presents all other questions of the architect in a revised form, though some may lack clarity. | Presents the main question with some clarity but may lack thorough articulation or include incomplete conceptual explanations of several technical terms. Presents fewer than all the other questions in revised form, or some revisions lack clarity. | Fails to present a clear or improved version of the main question or omits significant conceptual explanations of most technical terms. Misses multiple unchosen questions, or the revisions provided lack clarity. |
| Quantity & Quality of Interior Images | Collects all 25 images, including the required 10 supportive, 10 relevant, and 5 contextual/challenging images. All images are high-resolution, sharply focused, and directly relevant to the questions. | Collects 25 images. Most images are relevant and of acceptable resolution and clarity, with only minor instances of repetition or slight irrelevance. | Collects some images but may miss up to 5 of the required images or includes several low-resolution, blurry, or repetitive images. Relevance to the questions may be inconsistent. | Collects significantly fewer than 20 images; many are low-resolution, blurry, and/or irrelevant to the assignment. |
| Organization & Slide Presentation | Slides are professionally designed with clear, concise titles, consistent dividers, and a logical, seamless flow. The 5 categories are distinctly separated and labeled. | Slides are generally well-organized with clear titles and dividers. The 5 categories are addressed, though transitions may be slightly disjointed. | Slides show minimal organization; some titles, dividers, or category labels may be unclear or inconsistent. Flow between sections may be difficult to follow. | Slides are disorganized, making it difficult to distinguish categories, and exhibit a poor visual presentation that impedes understanding. |
| Hypothesis Testing & Interpretation | Clearly and thoroughly demonstrates how images strongly support or distinctly challenge the hypothesis. Offers detailed, insightful reasoning for each example’s placement in the 2×2 table, with explicit connections to the hypothesis. | Adequately distinguishes between supportive and challenging examples. Provides reasoning for image placement in the 2x2 table, though some explanations may lack depth or specificity. | Partially addresses supportive and challenging examples, but explanations are superficial or lack clarity in linking images to the hypothesis. Classification in the 2x2 table may be inconsistent. | Fails to clearly differentiate between supportive and challenging images. Provides no meaningful analysis of how images test the hypothesis, or reasoning is absent. |
| Visual Interpretation of the Hypothesis | Provides a clear, accurate, and detailed visual (diagram/table) that effectively illustrates what confirms and contradicts the hypothesis, supported by strong evidence and thorough explanations. | Includes a visual representation of the hypothesis that is mostly clear and addresses confirmations and contradictions, though some details may be lacking. | Presents a simplistic or unclear visual representation of confirmation and contradiction, with limited supporting evidence or explanation. | Provides no meaningful visual or diagram to differentiate between supportive and contradicting evidence. |
| Depth of Analysis & Reflection | Demonstrates thorough and nuanced reflection on patterns, limitations, and counterexamples, showing a comprehensive understanding of the material. | Observes and acknowledges some patterns and exceptions, demonstrating reasonable depth in analysis and reflection. | Offers limited observations with a lack of deeper insights, or misses the significance of contradictory examples. Reflection is superficial. | Provides little to no analysis or reflection on the significance of findings; work is primarily descriptive and lacks insight. |
| Overall Quality & Completeness | Delivers a polished, coherent set of slides/documents that comprehensively meets all requirements and strongly demonstrates the assignment's objectives. | Meets nearly all requirements with only minor gaps or inconsistencies. Presentation is generally coherent and complete. | Addresses most requirements but has notable gaps, inconsistencies, or areas needing improvement. | Fails to meet key requirements or lacks overall coherence in the final submission. |

Claude:

# **Evaluation Rubric**

| **Criterion** | **Exemplary (5)** | **Good (4)** | **Satisfactory (3)** | **Needs Improvement (2-1)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Clarity of Main Question and other questions not chosen as the main one.** | Presents all 5 questions in revised form with the main question having complete conceptual explanations for 100% of technical terms (cognitive, architectural, and neuro terms). Main question demonstrates thoughtful restructuring that clearly improves upon the original version. | Presents all 5 questions in revised form with the main question having conceptual explanations for at least 75% of technical terms. Main question shows clear improvement over the original version, though other questions may be less thoroughly revised. | Presents at least 3 of the 5 questions in revised form. Main question includes conceptual explanations for 50-74% of technical terms OR the articulation could be improved in clarity/precision. | Presents fewer than 3 questions in revised form OR main question lacks conceptual explanations for most (>50%) technical terms OR main question shows minimal improvement over the original version. |
| **Quantity & Quality of Interior Images** | Collects exactly 25 interior images (5 in each of the 5 required categories) plus exactly 10 images that support the hypothesis and 5 that challenge it. All images are high-resolution, clearly visible, and directly relevant to the architect's work and chosen question. | Collects 23-25 interior images across the 5 categories plus 13-15 hypothesis-testing images. At least 80% of images are high-resolution and clearly relevant to the architect's work and chosen question. | Collects 20-22 interior images across the 5 categories plus 10-12 hypothesis-testing images. At least 60% of images are acceptable quality and relevant to the architect's work, though some may be repetitive or tangentially related to the chosen question. | Collects fewer than 20 interior images OR fewer than 10 hypothesis-testing images. Less than 60% of images are of acceptable quality OR many images are irrelevant to the architect's work or chosen question. |
| **Organization & Slide Presentation** | Slides include distinct, labeled dividers for all 5 categories of interior spaces. All images are labeled with source attribution. Presentation follows a logical sequence with consistent formatting throughout. Transitions between sections are smooth and intuitive. | Slides include labeled dividers for all 5 categories. At least 80% of images have source attribution. Presentation maintains consistent formatting with mostly logical progression between sections, though some transitions may be abrupt. | Slides include dividers for at least 4 of the 5 categories, though some labels may be imprecise. At least 60% of images have source attribution. Presentation has some inconsistencies in formatting or organization that occasionally impact clarity. | Slides lack clear dividers for 2 or more categories OR less than 60% of images have source attribution. Presentation lacks consistent formatting or logical sequence, making it difficult to follow the organizational structure. |
| **Hypothesis Testing & Interpretation** | Creates a complete 2×2 matrix with 2-3 images in each cell. Provides specific, detailed reasoning (2-3 sentences per image) explaining why each image belongs in its respective cell and how it directly relates to the hypothesis. | Creates a complete 2×2 matrix with at least 2 images in each cell. Provides clear reasoning (1-2 sentences per image) for most images, though some explanations may lack specificity about how they directly test the hypothesis. | Creates a 2×2 matrix with at least 1 image in each cell. Provides brief explanations for most images, though reasoning may be general or fail to clearly connect to specific aspects of the hypothesis for 40-50% of images. | Incomplete 2×2 matrix (missing cells) OR lacks explanations for more than 50% of images OR explanations fail to demonstrate how images test the hypothesis. |
| **Visual Interpretation of the Hypothesis** | Provides a clearly labeled 2×2 matrix with distinct headings that precisely reflect the hypothesis variables. Each cell contains properly sized, high-quality images with detailed annotations (2-3 sentences each) explaining how the visual evidence confirms or contradicts specific aspects of the hypothesis. | Provides a labeled 2×2 matrix with headings that reflect the hypothesis variables. Each cell contains properly sized images with annotations (1-2 sentences each) that explain their relationship to the hypothesis, though some connections may be general rather than specific. | Provides a basic 2×2 matrix with general headings related to the hypothesis. Most cells contain images with brief annotations, though some may lack clear explanations of how they specifically confirm or contradict the hypothesis. | Lacks a proper 2×2 matrix OR matrix headings don't clearly relate to the hypothesis OR most images lack annotations explaining their relationship to hypothesis confirmation/contradiction. |
| **Depth of Analysis & Reflection** | Includes a dedicated reflection section (at least 250 words) that identifies at least 3 specific patterns across the analyzed images, acknowledges at least 2 limitations or counterexamples to the hypothesis, and proposes at least 1 refined version of the hypothesis based on the visual evidence. | Includes a reflection section (at least 200 words) that identifies at least 2 specific patterns across the analyzed images, acknowledges at least 1 limitation or counterexample, and suggests how the hypothesis might be refined. | Includes a brief reflection (at least 150 words) that identifies at least 1 pattern and mentions potential limitations, though it may not propose refinements to the hypothesis or may overlook significant contradictory evidence. | Lacks a dedicated reflection section OR reflection is under 150 words OR fails to identify specific patterns or address limitations/counterexamples found in the visual analysis. |
| **Overall Quality & Completeness** | Delivers all required components at high quality: 1) slides with 25 categorized interior images, 2) complete 2×2 hypothesis testing matrix with 15 images, 3) thoughtful analysis of all images relative to the CNfA question, and 4) clear explanations of all technical terms. Presentation is polished with no errors or inconsistencies. | Delivers all required components with at most 1-2 minor omissions. Quality is consistently high across at least 80% of the submission. May contain minimal formatting inconsistencies or minor explanatory gaps that don't significantly impact understanding. | Delivers at least 3 of the 4 required components with acceptable quality. The submission addresses core requirements but contains noticeable gaps in either image collection, hypothesis testing, analysis depth, or term explanations affecting 20-40% of the content. | Missing 2 or more of the required components OR quality issues affect more than 40% of the submission. Significant gaps in image collection, hypothesis testing, analysis, or term explanations prevent the assignment from fulfilling its core objectives. |