URBAN DESIGN STUDIO-II, Analytic Rubric.

CO1 : Students shall address a mixed use urban design and development assignment, understand the tools and mechanism of development, the global versus local concerns, the importance of public participation in effecting the urban design process in an existing city and to develop both practical skills and critical thinking (12.5 Marks)

SI No.	FACTORS	Marks	Excellent Upto 100%	Good Upto 80%	Satisfactory Upto 60%	Poor Upto 40%	Emergent Upto 20%	Not acceptable 0
C2	Comprehend	12.5 Marks	Ability to Demostrate the application of Understanding	Ability to Demostrate a clear Understanding	Ability to Demostrate the basic Understanding	Unclear Understanding	Difficuty in Understanding	Unable to formulate and study.

CO2 : Study of a city with respect to understanding of its evolution in historic context, change and continuity, present issues and conflicts by analyzing the land use, movement pattern, socioeconomic and demographic patterns, visual environment, spatial structure and typology. (12.5 Marks)

SI No.	FACTORS	Marks	Excellent Upto 100%	Good Upto 80%	Satisfactory Upto 60%	Poor Upto 40%	Emergent Upto 20%	Not acceptable 0
C4	Analysis and Critical Thinking	12.5 Marks	Ability to constitute the framework for Data Collection	Ability to assist constituting the framework for Data Collection	Ability to understand the framework for Data Collection	Unable to structure the framework for Data Collection	Unable to formulate the framework for Data Collection	Description of criteria.

CO3 : Analyzing the various factors that determine the morphology of the city and the referencing of selected sites to the study. (12.5Marks)

SI No.	FACTORS	Marks	Excellent Upto 100%	Good Upto 80%	Satisfactory Upto 60%	Poor Upto 40%	Emergent Upto 20%	Not acceptable 0
C5	Synthesis	12.5 Marks	Does all or almost all of the following: * Accurately interprets evidenced urban attributes. * Identifies salient arguments (reasons/causes), pro and con. * Thoughtfully analyzes & evaluates major stakeholders point of view. * Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusion.	Does most or many of the following: * Accurately interprets evidenced urban attributes. * Identifies relevant arguments (reasons/causes), pro and con. * Offers analyses & evaluation of obvious stakeholders point of view. * Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusion.	Does most or many of the following: * Misinterprets evidenced urban attributes. * Unable to identify strong relevant arguments (reasons/causes). * Ignores or superficially analyses obvious stakeholders point of view. * Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusion.	Does all or almost all of the following: * Offers biased interpretation of evidenced urban attributes. * Unable to identify or dismisses strong relevant arguments (reasons/causes). * Ignores or superficially analyses obvious stakeholders point of view. * Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusion.	Does all or almost all of the following: * Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reasoning & critical thinking. * Offers biased interpretation of evidenced urban attributes. * Unable to identify or dismisses any relevant arguments (reasons/causes). * Ignores stakeholders point of view. * Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusion.	Description of criteria.

SI No.	FACTORS	Marks	Excellent Upto 100%	Good Upto 80%	Satisfactory Upto 60%	Poor Upto 40%	Emergent Upto 20%	Not acceptable 0
A3	Value	12.5 Marks	* Justifies key results; explains assumptions & reasons. * Fair mindedly makes design proposal decision based on evidence & reasons.	* Justifies some results; explains reasons. * Fair mindedly makes design proposal decision based on evidence & reasons.	* Justifies some results; seldom explains reasons. * Fair mindedly makes design proposal decision based on evidence & reasons.	* Justifies some results; seldom explains reasons. * Regardless of evidence or reasons, defends decision of design proposal.	* Unable to justify results; no reasons. * Regardless of evidence or reasons, defends decision of design proposal.	Unable to formulate and study.

CO4 : Identification and design of action areas and implementation in light of prevailing government policies and programmes including socioeconomic indices of development (12.5 Marks)

SI No.	FACTORS	Marks	Excellent Upto 100%	Good Upto 80%	Satisfactory Upto 60%	Poor Upto 40%	Emergent Upto 20%	Not acceptable 0
C6	Creativity	12.5 Marks	The design contains Very High Level of Creativity. (Novelty/ Originality; Usefulness/ Funtionality; and Appropriateness / Satisfies Context, Standards & Regulations)	The design contains High Level of Creativity. (Novelty/Originality; Usefulness/Funtionality; and, Appropriateness/Satisfies Context, Standards & Regulations)	The design contains Medium Level of Creativity. (Novelty/Originality; Usefulness/Funtionality; and, Appropriateness/Satisfies Context, Standards & Regulations)	The design contains Low Level of Creativity. (Novelty/Originality; Usefulness/Funtionality; and, Appropriateness/Satisfies Context, Standards & Regulations)	The design contains Very Low Level of Creativity. (Novelty/Originality; Usefulness/Funtionality; and, Appropriateness/Satisfies Context, Standards & Regulations)	Unable to formulate and study.
A4	Organizing	12.5 Marks	Ability to clearly defend the salient design components, features, and aspects in a way that clearly associates with the given urban context.	Ability to vaguely defend the salient design components, features, and aspects in a way that clearly associates with the given urban context.	Ability to vaguely defend few design components, features, and aspects in a way that vaguely associates with the given urban context.	Ability to vaguely defend few design components, features, and aspects in a way that doesn't associate with the given urban context.	Inability to defend design components, features and aspects w.r.t. given urban context	Unable to formulate and study.