

PRECEDENTS & PRACTICES STUDY IN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Assessment Criteria

LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
CRITERIA <i>(linked to objectives)</i>	EXCELLENT/ VERY GOOD	GOOD/ SATISFACTORY	LITTLE OR NO EVIDENCE
Able to understand, evaluate and coherently articulate the scope of presented examples	States significant practical and theoretical aspect of the work and draws relation to broader context Coherent presentation, content and structure of argument easy to follow	Some evidence of understanding significance of practical and theoretical aspect and relation broader context Logical argumentation but some breaks in structure and presentation	No evidence of understanding Unclear argument and content
Able to reflect critically on recent and current issues and theories in landscape architecture	States and reflects critically on crucial issues. Identifies significant areas of synergy between theory and design	States some interesting issues. Some reflection. Understands the interface between theory and design	No evidence of understanding on discourse and critical reflection
Able to communicate and consolidate relevant issues in discussions with peers.	Poses strong argument and draws rigorous conclusion Actively contribute to other discussions in tutorials and on website	States argument and summarises key points Frequent involvement in some discussions during tutorials and on website	Argument unclear, no evidence of propositions and conclusion Little or no involvement in discussions
Able to articulate influence on own study	Articulates reasons and methods of influence on own study	Some impact on own study mentioned	No engagement with subject
Follows specific <u>scholarly research conventions</u> and creative approach to presentation	Follows rigorous holistic investigation and presentation of selected practice Rigorous referencing and referencing style is named Rigorous visual presentation with creative appeal	Logical format. Some investigation into journals, magazines, books Uses a consistent, but unspecified referencing convention Coherent presentation with some originality in representation method	Structure unclear. Inconsistent or inadequate research sources; solely relying on internet sources Lacks appropriate references No or unprofessional visual presentation