Department of Interior Architecture and Environmental Design Faculty of Architecture								
	INAR 1110		Basic Design for Interior Architecture I			- 2023 S	pring Semester	
0		l	nstructors		Student Number Student Name			
-	tor: Prof.(PhD) Zeynep TUNA ULTAV					Studer	nt Name	
Res. Assi	stants: Res.Assist. Müge SEVER							
				EVALUATION		Grade	Total %	
			1.1. In-class Quality of the Work (as S Actively working during the course/stu Progressive quality of revision after HV Submission format Presentation of the work 1.2. Progressing Quality of the Work (dio hours V submission according to feedback as HW)	25%			
	EX.1	2%	Progressive quality of revision after SV Improvement in each submission (pos Submission format Presentation of the work 1.3. Mid & Final Submission + Present 2D quality of the work (<i>Criteria are defi</i>	itive - constant - negative) tation of the Work	25%			
			Craftsmanship & material usage Progressive quality of the work accord Submission format Presentation of the work	ing to critiques & feedbacks	50%			
			1.1. In-class Quality of the Work (as S Actively working during the course/stu Progressive quality of revision after HV Submission format	W) idio hours	25%	100	2%	
	EX.2	8%	Presentation of the work 1.2. Progressing Quality of the Work (Progressive quality of revision after SV Improvement in each submission (pos Submission format Presentation of the work	V submission according to feedback itive - constant - negative)	25%			
			1.3. Mid & Final Submission + Present 2D quality of the work (<i>Criteria are defi</i> Craftsmanship & material usage Progressive quality of the work accord Submission format Presentation of the work	ned for each assignment.)	50%			
			1.1. In-class Quality of the Work (as S	Total W)	100%	100	8%	
			Actively working during the course/stu Progressive quality of revision after HV Submission format Presentation of the work	V submission according to feedback	25%			
	EK.3	15%	1.2. Progressing Quality of the Work (Progressive quality of revision after SV Improvement in each submission (pos Submission format Presentation of the work 1.3. Mid & Final Submission + Present	V submission according to feedback itive - constant - negative)	25%			
EVALUATION			2D quality of the work (Criteria are defi Craftsmanship & material usage Progressive quality of the work accord Submission format Presentation of the work	ned for each assignment.)	50%			
6			1.1. In-class Quality of the Work (as S	fotal	100%	100	15%	
			Actively working during the course/stu Progressive quality of revision after HV Submission format Presentation of the work 1.2. Progressing Quality of the Work (dio hours V submission according to feedback	25%			
	EX.4	20%	Progressive quality of revision after SV Improvement in each submission (pos Submission format Presentation of the work	V submission according to feedback itive - constant - negative)	25%			
			1.3. Mid & Final Submission + Present 2D quality of the work (<i>Criteria</i> are defi Craftsmanship & material usage Progressive quality of the work accord Submission format Presentation of the work	ned for each assignment.)	50%			
			1.1. In-class Quality of the Work (as S	Total W)	100%	100	20%	
			Actively working during the course/stu Progressive quality of revision after HV Submission format Presentation of the work 1.2. Sketch Problem	dio hours	20%			
			Creativity Technical Representation Skills		5%			
	EX.5	20%	1.3. Progressing Quality of the Work (Progressive quality of revision after SV Improvement in each submission (pos Submission format Presentation of the work	V submission according to feedback itive - constant - negative)	25%			
			1.4. Mid & Final Submission + Present 2D & 3D quality of the work (<i>Criteria</i> ar Craftsmanship & material usage Progressive quality of the work accord Submission format Presentation of the work	e defined for each assignment.)	50%			
			Concept & Design Idea	Total	100% 60%	100	20%	
	FINAL JURY	30%	Presentation Board & Model Technical Drawings		20% 20%			
			Participating the course actively	fotal	100%	100	30%	
	PARTICIPATION	5%	(desk critiques in one-to-one and gene	ral sessions) Total	100%			
					Total Tern	100 n Grade r Grade	5%	
-				Construction of the	Lene	Linde		
	Signatures	-		Grading Scale*	A	95-100	4	
	ərginatülfes		\$ 100	ystem	A- B+	90-94 85-89	3.7	
		ystem	P 70	ind ∻emester grading in OBS system	В	80-84	3	
		ading s	U 40	ading in	B- C+	75-79 70-74	2.7 2.3	
Zey	Prof.(PhD) nep TUNA ULTAV	In-term grading system	+ 100 + 70	ister gr	C C-	65-69 60-64	2	
		<u> </u>	<u>+</u> 70 - 40	imes-br	D+	55-59	1.3	
	* Gra	ding Scale mig	NS 0	应 r according to the students favour.	F	50-54 0-49	0	

culty of Are	chitecture		DHIROMATINA RESON	I			Mimarlık Fakült
	INAR 1120		Basic Design for Interior Architecture II	20	022 - 202	23 Spring S	emester
			Instructors	Student No			
	of.(PhD) Burkay PASI				St	udent Name	
dem Ç	ETİN, Lect. Işık ÖRSE st. Selin GÜLEROĞLU		Prof.(PhD) Eda PAYKOÇ ÖZÇELİK, Assist.Prof.(PhD)				
			EVALUATION		G	rade	Total %
			1.1. Progressing potential of the work	25%		aue	
			Regarding and applying suggestions in critiques to the project during progress- revealing the process Revision acceleration in each submission (Positive, Negative				
			or Static) 1.2. In-class quality of the work	25%			
			Studying actively during the studio hours	2070			
			Revision effort after HW submission				
	Exercise 1	20%	Submission Format 1.3. Mid & final submission and presentation of the work	50%			
			3D quality of the work (specialized for each of the	50%			
			assignment) Media and material usage				
			Regarding and applying suggestions in critiques to the project during progress- revealing the process Oral presentation of the final work				
			TOTAL	100%			
			2.1. Progressing potential of the work	25%			
			Regarding and applying suggestions in critiques to the project during progress- revealing the process Revision acceleration in each submission (Positive, Negative or Static)				
			2.2. In-class quality of the work	25%			
			Studying actively during the studio hours				
			Revision effort after HW submission Submission Format				
	Exercise 2	15%	2.3. Mid & final submission and presentation of the work	50%			
_			3D quality of the work (specialized for each of the assignment)				
EVALUATION			Media and material usage				
			Regarding and applying suggestions in critiques to the				
EVA			project during progress- revealing the process Oral presentation of the final work				
				100%			
		30%	3.1. Progressing potential of the work	25%			
			Regarding and applying suggestions in critiques to the project during progress- revealing the process Revision acceleration in each submission (Positive, Negative or Costio)				
			or Static) 3.2. In-class quality of the work	25%			
			Studying actively during the studio hours				
			Revision effort after HW submission				
	Exercise 3		Submission Format 3.3. Mid & final submission and presentation of the work	50%			
			3D quality of the work (specialized for each of the assignment)				
			Media and material usage				
			Regarding and applying suggestions in critiques to the project during progress- revealing the process				
			Oral presentation of the final work				
			TOTAL	100%			
			Concept and design idea Presentation board	60% 20%			
	Final Jury	30%	Technical drawings	20%			
			TOTAL Participation	100% 100%			
	Participation	5%	Desk critiques in one-to-one and general sessions	100 /6	-		
			TOTAL	100%			
				I	otal Ter	m Grade	0
					Lett	er Grade	
	((D L D) D)'		Signatures			ding Scale	
soc.Pro	of.(PhD) Burkay PASİ	N (Coord	iinator)	-	A	95-100	4
siet Dr.	of (PhD) Edg DAVKO	c		/sten	A- B+	90-94 85-89	3,7
อเอเ. Pf	of. (PhD) Eda PAYKO	Ŷ		3S sy	B+	85-89	3,3
sist. Pr	of. (PhD) Çiğdem ÇE	TİN		in Q	В-	75-79	2,7
	(·) yıgacın ye			ding	C+	70-74	2,7
t louis	ÖRSEL İMİR			r grad	c	65-69	2,5
ιşικ (estei	C-	60-64	1,7
				ΙĒ	H		
				s	D+	55-59	1,3
				End-semester grading in OBS system	D+ D	55-59 50-54	1,3 1

	ent of Interior Architect ronmental Design ^{chitecture}	ure	INAR			Çevre	İç Mimarlık ve Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi
	INAR 1112		Spatial Representations II	20)22-2023	Spring S	emester
			Instructors	Student No			
Assist. Pr	of. (PhD) Meltem Eran	ıl, Res.	Assist. (PhD) Cemre Çubukçuoğlu		Stu	Ident Name	1
			H. Can Külahcıoğlu, Lect. Burçin Akoğlu				
	Assistant Gamze Ene		······································	-			
		<i>.</i>					
			EVALUATION		Gr	ade	Total %
		1	1.1. Understanding the form & Presentation				
	Laboratory / Practice (Studio-Works)	20%	1.1.1. Sketch Drawing (10) 1.1.2. Textual Information/Annotations/Hatching (10) 1.1.3. Completeness (20) 1.1.4. Accuracy (20) 1.1.5. Layers and Line Quality (20)	- 100%			
			1.1.6. Dimensions (10)				
			1.1.7. Overall PDF quality (10) TOTAL	100%			
			2.1. Understanding the form & Presentation 2.1.1. Sketch Drawing (10) 2.1.2. Textual Information/Annotations/Hatching (10) 2.1.3 Completeness (20)	100%			
	Assignments (HWs)	20%	2.1.4. Accuracy (20) 2.1.5. Layers and Line Quality (20)	-			
			2.1.6. Dimensions (10)	1			
			2.1.7. Overall PDF quality (10)	1			
			TOTAL 3.1. Completeness	100% 50%			
			3.2. Accuracy	20%			
	Quiz-1	5%	3.3. Layers and Line Quality 3.4. Overall PDF quality	20%			
			TOTAL	10%			
	Participation	5%	-	100%			
			TOTAL 5.1. Part-1	100%			
EVALUATION	Midterm	15%	5.1.1. Sketch Drawing (10) 5.1.2. Textual Information/Annotations/Hatching (10) 5.1.3. Completeness (20) 5.1.4. Accuracy (20) 5.1.5. Layers and Line Quality (20) 5.1.6. Dimensions (10)	60%			
EVA			5.1.7. Overall PDF quality (10) 5.2. Part-2 5.2.1. Sketch Drawing (10) 5.2.2. Textual Information/Annotations/Hatching (10) 5.2.3.2 Completeness (20) 5.2.4. Accuracy (20) 5.2.5. Layers and Line Quality (20) 5.2.6. Dimensions (10) 5.2.7. Overall PDF quality (10)	40%			
			TOTAL 8.1. Workshop participation and model submission	100% 100%			
	Workshop	5%	TOTAL	100%			
	Final	20%	6.1. Part-1 Guideliness 10 Completeness 25 Accuracy 25 Layers Line Quality 20 Hatching 10 Textual Information/Annotations 10 6.2. Part-2 Guideliness 10 Completeness 20 Accuracy 20 Layers Line Quality 20 Overall PDF Quality 20 Textual Information/Annotations 10 TOTAL 7.1. Portfolio	60% 40% 100% 50%			
	Final Project	10%	7.2. Model Making	50%			
			TOTAL	100%			
				Т	otal Ter	m Grade	
					Lette	er Grade	
			Signatures		Gra	ding Scale	*
Res Accio	t. (PhD) Cemre Çubuk	cuočiu			A	95-100	4
		,5		Ę	A-	90-94	3,7
Assist. Pr	of. (PhD) Meltern Eran	ıl		End-semester grading in OBS system	B+	85-89	3,3
				DBS	В	80-84	3
Assist. Pr	of. (PhD) Çiğdem Çetir	n		g in C	B-	75-79	2,7
				radin	C+	70-74	2,3
				ter g	С	65-69	2
Lect. H. C	Can Külahcıoğlu			mes	C-	60-64	1,7
				as-br	D+	55-59	1,3
Lect. Burç	;in Akoğlu			^ت ا	D F	50-54 0-49	1
					F	0-49	U
* Gradine	Scale might chonge of	t the or	d of the semester according to the students favour.	I			
Staulity	sie inigin change a	. and ell					



Course Code: INAR 1122

Course Name: History of Art Culture

2022 - 2023 Spring Semester

 Instructors
 Student Number

 Lect. Derya Nüket ÖZER
 Student Name

 Res.Assist. Özüm Karadağ (course assistant)
 Student Name

			EVALUATION	Grade	Total %			
	1. Participation	5%	1.1. Active participatation to class discussions	100%				
	1. Participation	3%	TOTAL	100%				
			1.1. Correctness of given information	45%				
			1.2. Quality of analyze	45%				
	2. Midterm	25%	1.3. Correct use of the terminology	10%				
			TOTAL	100%				
			2.1. Quality of research	45%				
	2.Assignment 1	10%	2.2. Quality of analyze	45%				
		10%	2.3. Quality of file design	10%				
_			TOTAL	100%				
NOI			3.1. Quality of slide design and visual materials	35%				
JAT	3. Presentation	15%	3.2. Ouality of the information given	55%				
EVALUATION	5. Fresentation	15%	3.3. Correct use of the terminology	10%				
N N			TOTAL	100%				
		150	4.1. Quality of the background / literature review	20%				
			4.2. Quality of information given	25%				
	A Assistant 2		4.3. Quality of analyze	25%				
	4. Assignment 2	15%	4.4. Quality of file design	20%				
			4.5. Appropriateness of the in-text citations and reference list	10%				
			TOTAL	100%				
			5.1. Correctness of given information	45%				
	E Final	30%	5.2. Quality of analyze	45%				
	5. Final	30%	5.3. Correct use of the terminology	10%				
			TOTAL	100%				
	TOTAL TERM GRADE (%) TOTAL TERM GRADE (LETTER)							

Signatures		Grading Scale*					
Lect. Derya Nüket ÖZER		Α	95-100	4			
	tem l	A-	90-94	3.7			
	system	B+	85-89	3.3			
	End-semester grading in OBS	В	80-84	3			
	in in in in in in in in in in in in in i	B-	75-79	2.7			
	adin	C+	70-74	2.3			
	er gr	С	65-69	2			
	nest	C-	60-64	1.7			
	-ser	D+	55-59	1.3			
	Ē	D	50-54	1			
		F	0-49	0			

and	partment of Interior Architecture d Environmental Design ulty of Architecture	Cevre T	İç Mimarlık asarımı Bölür Mimarlık Fakült	nü	
	Course Code: INAR 2210	Interior Design I	:	2022 - 2023 Sp	ring Semester
		Instructors	Student N	umber	
Coordinato	or: Lect.(PhD) Özge Başağaç				
Instructors	51 -		Student M	Name	
Course As	sistant: Res.Assist. Begüm Sena Önal Özmal	atyalılar			
		EVALUATION	_	Grade	Total %
	Assignment(s) (Panel Critics-PC, Desk Critics-DC, Sketch	1.1. Panel Critics (PC) 1.2. Desk Critics (DC)	100%		
	Problem-SP) (20%)	1.3. Sketch Problems (SP)	100%		
	Laboratory / Practice (Reflection Forms, Book Review, Sketch Book, Attendance, im2023 Boards) (5%)	2.1. Reflection Forms, Book Review, Sketch Book, Attendance, im2023 Boards, Attention to Earthquake Awareness, Sustainability Issues, Accessibility, Post-Pandemic Conditions, Diverse Representation Methods in the Project	100%		
		3.1. Project Review 1			
		3.1.1. Case Study Analysis 3.1.2. User Profile Analysis	80%		
	Quiz	3.1.3. Project Theme Analysis			
	(Project Review 1) (Warm-up Phase Review)	3.1.3.1. Building Program 3.1.3.2. Concept Idea	-		
	(15%)	3.1.3.3. Keywords, Spatial Concept, Bubble and Graphic Diagrams, Moodboard,	20%		
		Material Board, Schematic Plans and Sketches 3.1.3.4. 3D and 2D Organization of Space Allocation	-		
		3.1.3.5. Physical/Digital Model of the Project Units			
		4.1 Project Review 2			
		4.1.1. Research / Analysis / Inspirations 4.1.1.1. Research on Selected User Profile	-		
		4.1.1.2. Research on Project Modules	10%		
		4.1.1.3. Analysis of Project Theme and Keywords			
NOI	Midterm (Project Review 2)	4.1.2. General Identification of Functions 4.1.2.1. Building Program	-		
EVALUATION	(10%)	4.1.2.2. Concept idea	15%		
EVA		4.1.2.3. Keywords, Spatial Concept, Bubble and Graphic Diagrams, Moodboard, Material Board, Schematic Plans and Sketches			
		4.1.2.4. 3D and 2D Organization of Space Allocation			
		4.1.3. Architectural Drawings 4.1.3.1. Technical Drawings (Plans, Sections, Elevations in 1/50 and 1/20)	60%		
		4.1.4. Physical/Digital Model of the Project	15%		
		5.1. Project Review 3			
		5.1.1. Project Brief (Textual Description/Concept Idea) 5.1.2. Functional Scheme, Building Program	5% 5%		
	Project	5.1.3. Architectural Drawings			
	(Project Review 3 / Pre-Final) (20%)	5.1.3.1. 1/100 Site Plan	60%		
		5.1.3.2. 1/20 Drawings 5.1.3.3. 1/10 Partial Drawings			
		5.1.4. Three-Dimensional Representations	10%		
		5.1.5. Physical/Digital Model of the Project 6.1. Project Review 4	20%		
		6.1.1 Project Review 4 6.1.1. Project Brief (Textual Description/Concept Idea)	3%		
		6.1.2. Functional Scheme, Building Program	2%		
	Final Examination (Project Review 4 / Final)	6.1.3. Architectural Drawings 6.1.3.1. 1/100 Site Plan			
	(30%)	6.1.3.2. 1/20 Drawings	65%		
		6.1.3.3. 1/10 Partial Drawings	100/		
		6.1.4. Three-Dimensional Representations 6.1.5. Physical/Digital Model of the Project	10% 20%		
				Total Term G	
				Letter G	aue
		Signatures		Grading	Scale*
Coordinate	or: Lect.(PhD) Özge Başağaç			A 95-1	
	 φ = −3 · φ · 3' 		Ē	A- 90-	
			S syste	B+ 85-	
			n OBS	B 80- B- 75-	
			dingi	B- 75- C+ 70-	
			ergra	C 65-	
		meste	C- 60-		
		End-semester grading in OBS system	D+ 55- D 50-		
			. ш	F 0-4	
* Grading S	Scale might change at the end of the semest	er according to the students favour.		· · · · ·	

and	partment of Interior Architecture 1 Environmental Design Jly of Architecture	Cevre T	İç Mimarlık asarımı Bölür Mimarlık Fakült	nü		
	Course Code: INAR 2220	Interior Design II	:	2022 - 2023 S	pring Se	mester
		Instructors	Student N	umber		
Coordinato	or: Assoc.Prof.(PhD) Gülnur Ballice		otadent it			
Instructors	Prof.(PhD) Maya Nanitchkova Öztürk, Lect.	Tuğba Turan Fidanboy, Lect. M. Haluk Tatari	Student M	Name		
Course As	sistant: Res.Assist. Begüm Sena Önal Özmalı	atyalılar				
		EVALUATION		Grade		Total %
	Assignment(s) (Panel Critics-PC, Desk Critics-DC, Sketch Problem-SP)	1.1. Panel Critics (PC) 1.2. Desk Critics (DC)	100%			
	(20%) Laboratory / Practice (Reflection Forms, Book Review, Sketch Book, Attendance, im2023 Boards) (5%)	1.3. Sketch Problems (SP) 2.1. Reflection Forms, Book Review, Sketch Book, Attendance, im2023 Boards, Attention to Earthquake Awareness, Sustainability Issues, Accessibility, Post-Pandemic Conditions, Diverse Representation Methods in the Project	100%			
		3.1. Project Review 1				
		3.1.1. Case Study Analysis	80%			
	Oute	3.1.2. User Profile Analysis 3.1.3. Project Theme Analysis				
	Quiz (Project Review 1) (Warm-up Phase Review)	3.1.3.1. Building Program				
	(15%)	3.1.3.2. Concept Idea 3.1.3.2. Konverde Spatial Concept Bubble and Craphic Disgrame. Meedbeard	20%			
		3.1.3.3. Keywords, Spatial Concept, Bubble and Graphic Diagrams, Moodboard, Material Board, Schematic Plans and Sketches				
		3.1.3.4. 3D and 2D Organization of Space Allocation 3.1.3.5. Physical/Digital Model of the Project Units				
		4.1 Project Review 2				
		4.1.1. Research / Analysis / Inspirations				
		4.1.1.1. Research on Selected User Profile 4.1.1.2. Research on Project Modules	10%			
		4.1.1.3. Analysis of Project Theme and Keywords				
N	Midterm	4.1.2. General Identification of Functions				
EVALUATION	(Project Review 2) (10%)	4.1.2.1. Building Program 4.1.2.2. Concept idea	15%			
EVAL		4.1.2.3. Keywords, Spatial Concept, Bubble and Graphic Diagrams, Moodboard, Material Board, Schematic Plans and Sketches	1070			
		4.1.2.4. 3D and 2D Organization of Space Allocation				
		4.1.3. Architectural Drawings	60%			
		4.1.3.1. Technical Drawings (Plans, Sections, Elevations in 1/50 and 1/20) 4.1.4. Physical/Digital Model of the Project	15%			
		5.1. Project Review 3				
		5.1.1. Project Brief (Textual Description/Concept Idea)	5%			
	Police	5.1.2. Functional Scheme, Building Program 5.1.3. Architectural Drawings	5%			
	Project (Project Review 3 / Pre-Final) (20%)	5.1.3.1. 1/100 Site Plan	60%			
	(20%)	5.1.3.2. 1/20 Drawings	0070			
		5.1.3.3. 1/10 Partial Drawings 5.1.4. Three-Dimensional Representations	10%			
		5.1.5. Physical/Digital Model of the Project	20%			
		6.1. Project Review 4	3%			
		6.1.1. Project Brief (Textual Description/Concept Idea) 6.1.2. Functional Scheme, Building Program	2%			
	Final Examination	6.1.3. Architectural Drawings				
	(Project Review 4 / Final) (30%)	6.1.3.1. 1/100 Site Plan 6.1.3.2. 1/20 Drawings	65%			
		6.1.3.2. 1/20 Drawings 6.1.3.3. 1/10 Partial Drawings				
		6.1.4. Three-Dimensional Representations	10%			
		6.1.5. Physical/Digital Model of the Project	20%	Total Term	Grade	
				Letter		
<u> </u>						
		Signatures		Grading	g Scale*	
Assoc.Prot	f.(PhD) Gülnur Ballice		_		-100	4
Prof.(PhD)	Maya Nanitchkova Öztürk		ystem		D-94 5-89	3,7 3,3
- (,			JBS s		0-84	3
Lect. Tuğba	a Turan Fidanboy	End-semester grading in OBS system		5-79	2,7	
Loct M U	aluk Tatari		gradir		D-74	2,3
Lect. M. Ha	alun idldii		ester		5-69 D-64	1,7
		-seme	-	5-59	1,3	
			End	-	0-54	1
* Grading C	Scale might change at the end of the semeste	er according to the students favour		F O	-49	0
L Stading a	mgm onange at the chu of the selfleste					

ind Envi	nent of Interior Architec ironmental Design urchitecture	ture	INTEGRA HAGHTECTURE INTEGRA HAGHTECTURE INTEGRATING RECENT			Çevre	İç Mimarlık ve Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültes
	INAR 2222		History of Design II	20	022 - 202	23 Spring S	emester
		1				1	
	raf Dr. Burkay Daain (Coordina	Instructors	Student No		udent Name	
	rof. Dr. Burkay Pasin (D) Özge Başağaç	Coordina			51	udent Name	
	ist. Müge Sever						
					-		
			EVALUATION		Gi	rade	Total %
			1.1. Correctness of "true-false" answers	25%			
			1.2. Correctness of "choose the description" answers	25%			
	Midterm	25%	1.3. Correctness of "identification of the period/ style/ building/ furniture in the visuals" answers	25%			
			1.4. Correctness of "identify the style/ period for the building"	25%			
			answers				
			TOTAL 2.1. Completeness of the answers	100% 20%			
			2.1. Completeness of the answers 2.2. Quality and relevancy of the information	20%			
	Assignment 1		2.3.Originality	20%			
	(Movies)	5%	2.4. Level of interpretation	30%			
			2.5. Fluency in the use of English	10%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			3.1. Completeness of the answers	20%			
	Assignment 2		3.2. Quality and relevancy of the information 3.3.Originality	20%			
	(Movies)	5%	3.4. Level of interpretation	30%			
			3.5. Fluency in the use of English	10%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			4.1. Completeness of the answers	20%			
-			4.2. Quality and relevancy of the information 4.3.Originality	20%			
No.	Assignment 3 (Seminar Brief)	5%	4.3. Level of interpretation	30%			
EVALUATION			4.5. Fluency in the use of English	10%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			5.1. Completeness of the answers	20%			
			5.2. Quality and relevancy of the information	20%			
	Assignment 4 (Movies)	5%	5.3.Originality 5.4. Level of interpretation	20%			
			5.5. Fluency in the use of English	10%			
			TOTAL	100%			
	Quiz	15%	6.1. Correctness of the answers	100%			
		_	TOTAL	100%			
			7.1. Complete submission on SAKAI Page and Presentation	30%			
	Presentation	1.0%	7.2. Completeness (10 pts each)	50%			
	Presentation	10%	7.3. Correct referencing (both for text & visuals)	10%			
			7.4. Fluency of the text/ Use of English TOTAL	10%			
			8.1. Correctness of "true-false" answers	25%			
			8.2. Correctness of "choose the description" answers	25%			
			8.3. Correctness of "identification of the period/ style/	25%			
	Final Exam	30%	building/ furniture in the visuals" answers	20%			
			8.4. Correctness of "identify the style/ period for the building" answers	25%			
			TOTAL	100%			
				1	Total Ter	rm Grade	
					Lett	er Grade	
			Signatures		Gra	ading Scale	*
	rof Dr Durley D 1 1	Onert	-			-	
SUC. PI	rof. Dr. Burkay Pasin (Coordina	a.uri <i>j</i>	-	A	95-100	4
				sterr	A-	90-94	3,7
				S sy:	B+	85-89	3,3
				OB	В	80-84	3
				ig in	B-	75-79	2,7
ect. (Ph	D) Özge Başağaç			adin	C+	70-74	2,3
				ar gr	С	65-69	2
				este	C-	60-64	1,7
				End-semester grading in OBS system	D+	55-59	1,3
				Ēnd	D	50-54	1
					L		•
					F	0-49	0



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

INAR 2234 Materials and Methods of Construction II 2022 - 2023 Spring Semester Instructors Student No Assist.Prof. (Phd) Zeynep Sevinç Karcı Assist.Prof. (Phd) İlknur Uygun, Lect. (PhD) Aylin Gazi Gezgin, Lect. Rena Ballar, Lect.Burçin Akoğlu dent Name Res. Assist. Selin Karagözler Güleroğlu EVALUATION Grade Orthographic drawings (40) 40% Materials (30) 30% MIDTERM 20% Creativity uniqueness (30) 30% TOTAL 100% Orthographic drawings (30) 30% Depth of analysis (20) 20% ASSIGNMENT I 10% Completeness (30) 30% Accuracy (20) 20% TOTAL 100% Orthographic drawings (30) 30% Depth of analysis (20) 20% ASSIGNMENT II Completeness (30) 30% 20% Accuracy (20) 20% TOTAL 100% Depth of analysis (40) 40% Completeness (30) 30% PRESENTATION 10% Accuracy (30) 30% TOTAL 100% EVALUATION Plan 1/50 (10 Points) 10% Layout, Barscale , Dimensioning, Lettering, İmage (3) Accuracy (7) 1/20 Plan and Section (30 Points) 30% Layout, Barscale(3), Dimensioning, Lettering, Lw (5) (8) Accuracy+M variety (22) Details of Project 1 (15) 5 each 15% Mat+acuracy FINAL 30% RCP (10) 10% Legend (3) Accuracy(7) System drawings (20) 20% Accuracy(8) Details of Studio Project (15) 5 each 15% Drawing technique (7) Accuracy(8) TOTAL 100% Orthographic drawings (40) 40% Presentation techniques (30) 30% DESK CRITIOUE 10% Accuracy (30) 30% TOTAL 100% **Total Term Grade** Letter Grade Signatures Grading Scale Coordinator: Assist.Prof. (Phd) Zeynep Sevinç Karcı 95-100 А 4 A-90-94 3,7 semester grading in OBS system Assist.Prof. (Phd) İlknur Uygun B+ 85-89 3,3 В 80-84 3 Lect. (PhD) Aylin Gazi Gezgin B-75-79 2,7 C+ 70-74 2,3 Lect. Rena Ballar С 65-69 2 60-64 1.7 C-D+ 55-59 1,3 Lect.Burçin Akoğlu End D 50-54 1 F 0-49 0

	Department of Interior Are and Environmental Desigr Faculty of Architecture	chitecture n		ç	evre Ta	İç Mimarlık ve sarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi	
	INAR 3302		Furniture Design		202	2 - 2023 Spring Sem	ester
		In:	structors	Student N	10		
Coordinate	or: Assist.Prof.(PhD) Eda P						
		YKOÇ ÖZÇELİ	K, Lect. Sergio TADDONIO, Lect. Can AYSAN, Lect. Ertan	Student Na	me		
	I, Lect. Altuğ TOPRAK Assistant: Res.Assist. İrem	n Deniz AKÇAM		-			
		· · ·					
			EVALUATION			Grade	Total %
			Project Scenario / Story Board 70%				
	Presentation	6%	Graphic Communication and Representation	30%			
	resentation	0.0	Total	100%		100	6%
			Furniture Project - Scenario / Concept	30%		100	0 /0
			Furniture Project - Design	20%			
	Project 1	8%	Furniture Project - Graphic Representation	30%			
			Mock-Up (1:2/1:3 Scale) - Mdf 3/4mm	20%			
			Total	100%		100	8%
			Furniture Project - Scenario / Concept	20%			
			Furniture Project - Design	40%			
	Midterm	20%	Furniture Project - Graphic Representation Cardboard Model (1:2 Scale)	20%			
			Total	100%		100	20%
			Project Scenario / Story Board	25%			
			Furniture Project - Design Furniture Project - Graphic Representation	25% 25%			
	Project 2	8%	Mock-Up (1:2/1:3 Scale) - Mdf 3/4mm	25%			
z							
EVALUATION			Total	100%		100	8%
			Classwork 1 - Completeness and Overall Quality	20%			
EX 1			Classwork 2 - Completeness and Overall Quality	20%			
			Classwork 3 - Completeness and Overall Quality Classwork 4 - Completeness and Overall Quality	15% 15%			
	Classworks	30%	Classwork 5 - Completeness and Overall Quality	15%			
			Classwork 6 - Completeness and Overall Quality	15%			
			Total	100%			
						100	30%
			Furniture Project - Design Furniture Project - Detailing	20% 40%			
			Furniture Project - Graphic Representation	10%			
	Project 3	8%	Cardboard Model (1:1 Scale)	30%			
			Total	100%			
						100	8%
			Furniture Project - Design	60%			
			Furniture Project - Representation				
	Final Project	20%	Prototype (1:1 Scale)				
	r mai r toject	20%	Configuration and Precision	40%			
			Finishing and Detail				
			Total	100%		100	20%
						Total Term Grade	
						Total Term Grade	
						Letter Grade	
						Grading Scale	
		Si	gnatures				
			1		A	95-100	4
	Assist.Prof.(PhD) Eda PAYKOÇ ÖZÇELİK	,		item	A-	90-94	3,7
<u> </u>	Lua PATRUÇ UZÇELIK	`		sks	B+	85-89	3,3
	Lect. Sergio TADDONIO	D		OB	В	80-84	3
				End-semester grading in OBS system	B-	75-79	2,7
	Lect. Can AYSAN			adir	C+	70-74	2,3
				er gr	С	65-69	2
				lest	C-	60-64	1,7
	Lect. Ertan DEMİRKAN	N		sen	D+	55-59	1,3
				Ē	D	50-54	1
	Lect. Altuğ TOPRAK				F	0-49	0
H			1				



INTERIOR DESIGN III

İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü _{Mimarlık Fakültesi}

INAR 3310

2022 - 2023 Spring Semester

Student Name

0-49

0

F

Student No

Instructors Assist.Prof. (PhD) N. Ebru KARABAĞ (Coordinator)

Res. Assist. Özüm KARADAĞ

			EVALUATION		Gr	ade	Total %			
		1	1.1 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GENERAL STRATEGIC APPROACH	30%						
			1.2 PROJECT PHASE 1 - SCHEMATIC DESIGN	50%						
	Presentation	5%	1.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION	20%						
			TOTAL	100%						
			2.1 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GENERAL STRATEGIC/TACTICAL APPROACH	25%						
			2.2 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - SCENARIO, USERS AND SPATIAL DESIGN	25%						
	Midterm	Midterm 15%	2.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D REPRESENTATION	25%						
	materin	10%	2.4 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING	25%						
				100%						
			3.1 PROJECT PHASE 2 - SCENARIO AND CONCEPT	40%						
			3.2 PROJECT PHASE 2 - 2D / 3D SCHEMATIC DESIGN	30%						
	Project 1	10%	3.3 PROJECT PHASE 2 - GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION	30%						
			TOTAL	100%						
			4.1 PROJECT PHASE 2 - ADVANCED CONCEPT DESIGN	20%						
			4.2 PROJECT PHASE 2 - 2D & 3D ADVANCED DESIGN	50%						
	Project 2	10%	4.2 PROJECT PHASE 2 * 20 & 30 ADVANCED DESIGN 4.3 PROJECT PHASE 2 - COLORS, MATERIALS, MOVABLE/IMMOVABLE FURNISHING, VITRINE AND LIGTHING							
			TOTAL	30%						
			5.1 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GENERAL STRATEGIC/TACTICAL APPROACH	20%						
NO	Project 3 1	10%	5.2 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - SCENARIO, USERS AND SPATIAL DESIGN 5.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D/3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING	30% 50%						
ATI			5.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D/3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING TOTAL	50% 100%						
EVALUATION										
S			6.1 STUDIO PRACTICE 1 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%						
			6.2 STUDIO PRACTICE 2 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%						
			6.3 STUDIO PRACTICE 2 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%						
				6.4 STUDIO PRACTICE 4 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%					
	Studio Practice	Studio Practice 25%	6.5 STUDIO PRACTICE 5 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%						
			6.6 STUDIO PRACTICE 6 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	15%						
			6.7 STUDIO PRACTICE 7 - PROJECT PHASE 2 - Completeness	10%						
				6.8 STUDIO PRACTICE 8 - PROJECT PHASE 2 - Completeness	10%					
			6.9 STUDIO PRACTICE 9 - PROJECT PHASE 2 - Completeness	15%						
			TOTAL	100%						
			7.1 PROJECT PHASE 1	100						
						7.1.1 GENERAL STRATEGIC/TACTICAL APPROACH 7.1.2 RESIDENTIAL UNITS - SCENARIO, USERS AND SPATIAL DESIGN	10% 20%			
		25%		20%						
	Final Draigat		7.1.3 RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D/3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING	20%						
	Final Project		7.2 PROJECT PHASE 2	100						
			7.2.1 CONCEPT DESIGN	10%						
				20%						
			7.2.3 COLORS, MATERIALS, MOVABLE/IMMOVABLE FURNISHING, VITRINE AND LIGTHING	20%						
			TOTAL	100%						
				Tota	al Term	Grade				
					Letter	Grade				
			Signatures		Gra	ading Scal	e			
					A	95-100	4			
ssist.Pro	of. (PhD) N. Ebru KARA	ABAĞ		End-semester grading in OBS system	A-	90-94	3.7			
				syst	B+	85-89	3.3			
				3S å	в	80-84	3			
				0 u						
				i Di	B-	75-79	2.7			
				adir	C+	70-74	2.3			
				r gr	С	65-69	2			
				ste	C-	60-64	1.7			
		ane a								
				-se	D+	55-59	1.3			
				, , ,	D	50-54	1			



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü _{Mimarlık Fakültesi}

F

0-49

0

INAR 3320 INTERIOR DESIGN IV 2022 - 2023 Spring Semester Instructors Student No Lect. Sergio TADDONIO (Coordinator) Student Name Lect. Sergio TADDONIO, Prof. (PhD) Maya NANITCHKOVA ÖZTÜRK, Lect. Özge AÇAN Res. Assist. Özüm KARADAĞ

			Gr	Total %			
		1	1.1 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GENERAL STRATEGIC APPROACH	30%			
	Presentation	5%	1.2 PROJECT PHASE 1 - SCHEMATIC DESIGN	50%			
	Fresentation	3.0	1.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION				
			TOTAL	100%			
			2.1 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GENERAL STRATEGIC/TACTICAL APPROACH	25%			
			2.2 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - SCENARIO, USERS AND SPATIAL DESIGN	25%			
	Midterm	Midterm 15%	2.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D REPRESENTATION	25%			
			2.4 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING	25%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			3.1 PROJECT PHASE 2 - SCENARIO AND CONCEPT	40%			
	Project 1	10%	3.2 PROJECT PHASE 2 - 2D / 3D SCHEMATIC DESIGN	30%			
			3.3 PROJECT PHASE 2 - GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION	30%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			4.1 PROJECT PHASE 2 - ADVANCED CONCEPT DESIGN	20%			
	Project 2	Project 2 10%	PROJECT PHASE 2 - 2D & 3D ADVANCED DESIGN				
			4.3 PROJECT PHASE 2 - COLORS, MATERIALS, MOVABLE/IMMOVABLE FURNISHING, VITRINE AND LIGTHING	30%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			5.1 PROJECT PHASE 1 - GENERAL STRATEGIC/TACTICAL APPROACH	20%			
NO	Project 3	ect 3 10% 5.2 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - SCENARIO, USERS AND SPATIAL DESIGN		30%			
EVALUATION			5.3 PROJECT PHASE 1 - RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D/3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING	50%			
			TOTAL	100%			
EVA			6.1 STUDIO PRACTICE 1 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%			
			6.2 STUDIO PRACTICE 2 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%			
		Studio Practice 25%	6.3 STUDIO PRACTICE 2 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%			
			6.4 STUDIO PRACTICE 4 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%			
	Studio Practice		6.5 STUDIO PRACTICE 5 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	10%			
			6.6 STUDIO PRACTICE 6 - PROJECT PHASE 1 - Completeness	15%			
			6.7 STUDIO PRACTICE 7 - PROJECT PHASE 2 - Completeness	10%			
			6.8 STUDIO PRACTICE 8 - PROJECT PHASE 2 - Completeness	10%			
			6.9 STUDIO PRACTICE 9 - PROJECT PHASE 2 - Completeness	15%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			7.1 PROJECT PHASE 1	1 4 6 6			
			7.1.1 GENERAL STRATEGIC/TACTICAL APPROACH	10%			
		inal Project 25%	7.1.2 RESIDENTIAL UNITS - SCENARIO, USERS AND SPATIAL DESIGN	20%			
	Final Desirat		7.1.3 RESIDENTIAL UNITS - 2D/3D REPRESENTATION, COLORS, MATERIALS AND LIGTHING	20%			
	Final Project		7.2 PROJECT PHASE 2	1.00			
			7.2.1 CONCEPT DESIGN	10%			
			7.2.1 2D & 3D DESIGN	20%			
			7.2.3 COLORS, MATERIALS, MOVABLE/IMMOVABLE FURNISHING, VITRINE AND LIGTHING				
			TOTAL	100%			
				Tota	al Term	Grade	
					Letter	Grade	
			Signatures			ading Scal	
					A	95-100	4
Lect. Serg	jio TADDONIO			stem	A-	90-94	3.7
				yste	B+	85-89	3.3
							3
Prof. (Phi	0) Maya NANITCHKOV	A ÖZTÜ	ÜRK	g i	B-	75-79	2.7
				din	C+	70-74	2.3
				ĝ.	С	65-69	2
				ster			
Lect. Özg	e AÇAN			me	C-	60-64	1.7
1				0	D+		1.3
				<u>°</u>	D+	55-59	1.3
				End-semester grading in OBS sy:	D	50-59 50-54	1.5

	nent of Interior Architect ironmental Design urchitecture	ture	INTERCE ARCHTECTURE ENVIRONMENTAL BESIGN			Çevre	İç Mimarlık ve Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi
	INAR 3333		SUMMER PRACTICE (CONSTRUCTION SITE)	20	022 - 20	23 Spring S	Semester
		÷	Instructors	Student No			
Assist. Pı	rof. (PhD) Ecehan Özm	ehmet			St	udent Name	•
Res. Assi	ist. Selin Aktan						
			EVALUATION		G	rade	Total %
	The Internship Record Book	50%	1. Detailed content	100%			
	(Content)	50%	TOTAL	100%			
z	The Internship Record Book	20%	2. Visuals and attachments	100%			
EVALUATION	(Visuals)		TOTAL	100%			
ALU	The Internship Acquirements Report	25%	3. The Internship Acquirements Report and Presentation TOTAL	100%			
ш	and Presentation		4.Participation	100%			
	The Internship Evaluation Form	5%	TOTAL	100%			
					otal Te	rm Grade	
					Lett	ter Grade	
			Signatures		Gra	ading Scale	*
Assist. Pı	rof. (PhD) Ecehan Özm	ehmet			Α	95-100	4
				tem	A-	90-94	3.7
				syst	B+	85-89	3.3
				OBS	В	80-84	3
				ğ	B-	75-79	2.7
				radin	C+	70-74	2.3
				er gi	С	65-69	2
				mest	C-	60-64	1.7
				End-semester grading in OBS system	D+	55-59	1.3
				E	D	50-54	1
					F	0-49	0
) Scale might change a ed as Successful (S).	t the en	d of the semester according to the students favour. For Int	ernship Cours	ses grad	es equal or	higher 50

Г

d Envir	ent of Interior Architectu ronmental Design chitecture	ire	INAR		Çevre Tasa	Mimarlık ve rımı Bölümü imarlık Fakültesi
	INAR 3334		Professional Practices for Interiors	2022	- 2023 Spring S	emester
			Instructors	Student No		
t. (Pho	d) Özge Başağaç (Coo	rdinator			Student Name	
	Külahçıoğlu, Lect. Işık st. Selin Aktan	: Örsel İ	mir	-		
			EVALUATION		Grade	Total %
			1. Midterm			
	1. Midterm	20%	Complete submission on MOODLE Page Completeness of Company Requirements	10% 30%		
	1. Widdenn	20%	Depth of Analysis in Company report Technical Accuracy of Company report	30% 30%		
			TOTAL	100%		
			2. Assignments Complete submission on MOODLE Page (2 proposals)	10%		
		10%	Complete representation of all materials used on plan and	35%		
	2a. Assignment A1	of % 50	elevation drawings Complete dimensions on all drawings	35%		
			Legibility of the drawings	10%		
			Feasibility of the projects TOTAL	10% 100%		
			2. Assignments Complete submission on MOODLE Page	10%		
	2b. Assignment A2	10% of %	Quality of Revised drawings	30%		
	20. Addigiment AZ	50	Completeness of dimensions & materials Accuracy of dimensions & materials	30% 30%		
			TOTAL	30% 100%		
		10%	2. Assignments Complete submission on MOODLE Page	10%		
	2c. Assignment A3	of %	Completeness	45%		
		50	Accuracy TOTAL	45% 100%		
		15%	2. Assignments			
	2d. Assignment A4	of % 50	Completeness of the contract Technical accuracy of the contract	50% 50%		
		30	TOTAL	100%		
		15%	2. Assignments Complete submission on MOODLE Page	10%		
	2e. Assignment A5	of %	Completeness	45%		
			Accuracy TOTAL	45% 100%		
			2. Assignments Completeness of the submissions on MOODLE page	20%		
	2f. Assignment B1	15% of %	Technical accuracy of all submissions (20 pts each)	40%		
	21. Assignment DT	50	Format and overall quality Linguistic fluency	30% 10%		
			TOTAL	10%		
			2. Assignments Completeness of the answers	20%		
		5%	Quality and relevancy of the information	20%		
z	2g. Assignment C1	of % 50	Originality Level of interpretation	20%		
	2g. Assignment C1 of 50		Fluency in the use of English	10%		
DATIC			TOTAL 2. Assignments	100%		
EVALUATION				100%		
EVALUATIO			Completeness of the answers	20%		
EVALUATIO	2h. Assignment C2	5% of %				
EVALUATIO	2h. Assignment C2		Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation	20% 20% 20% 30%		
EVALUATIO	2h. Assignment C2	of %	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality	20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATIO	2h. Assignment C2	of %	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 10%		
EVALUATIO		of %	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL	20% 20% 20% 30% 10%		-
EVALUATIO	2h. Assignment C2 2i. Assignment C3	of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 10% 20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATIO		of % 50 5% of %	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 30%		
EVALUATIO		of % 50 5% of %	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 30%		
EVALUATIC		of % 50 5% of %	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 100% 20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 100%		
EVALUATIO	2i. Assignment C3	of % 50 5% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Using and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATIO		of % 50 5% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Level of interpretation Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 30%		
EVALUATIO	2i. Assignment C3	of % 50 5% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATIO	2i. Assignment C3	of % 50 5% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Final	20% 20% 20% 20% 30% 100% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATION	21. Assignment C3 2). Assignment C4	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Level of interpretation Fluency of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL	20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 30% 10% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATION	2i. Assignment C3	of % 50 5% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Users of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Final Completeness (20 pts each) Completeness (20 pts each)	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
EVALUATIO	21. Assignment C3 2). Assignment C4	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Final Complete submission on MODDLE Page Complete submission on MODDLE Page Complete submission on MODDLE Page Completeness (20 pts each)	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
	21. Assignment C3 2). Assignment C4	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Final Complete submission on MODDLE Page Completeness (20 pts each) Accuracy (20 pts each) Format and overall quality	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	al Term Grade	
	21. Assignment C3 2). Assignment C4	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Final Complete submission on MODDLE Page Completeness (20 pts each) Accuracy (20 pts each) Format and overall quality	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	al Term Grade Letter Grade	
	21. Assignment C3 2). Assignment C4	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Final Complete submission on MODDLE Page Completeness (20 pts each) Accuracy (20 pts each) Format and overall quality	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%		
	21. Assignment C3 2). Assignment C4	of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade	4
	21. Assignment C3 23. Assignment C4 3. Final Project	of % 50	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade	
	21. Assignment C3 23. Assignment C4 3. Final Project	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Grading Scale A 95-100	4
	21. Assignment C3 21. Assignment C4 3. Final Project Lect. (Phd) Özge Baş Lect. Can Külahçıoğlu	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Gradius Scale A 95-100 A- 90-94 B+ 85-89 B 80-84	4 3.7 3.3 3
	21. Assignment C3 23. Assignment C4 3. Final Project Lect. (Phd) Özge Baş	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Gradiug Scaler A 95-100 A- 90-94 B+ 85-89 B 80-84 B- 75-79	4 3.7 3.3 3 2.7
	21. Assignment C3 21. Assignment C4 3. Final Project Lect. (Phd) Özge Baş Lect. Can Külahçıoğlu	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Gradius Scale A 95-100 A- 90-94 B+ 85-89 B 80-84	4 3.7 3.3 3
	21. Assignment C3 21. Assignment C4 3. Final Project Lect. (Phd) Özge Baş Lect. Can Külahçıoğlu	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Gradius A 95-100 A- 90-94 B+ 85-89 B 80-84 B- 75-79 C+	4 3.7 3.3 3 2.7 2.3
	21. Assignment C3 21. Assignment C4 3. Final Project Lect. (Phd) Özge Baş Lect. Can Külahçıoğlu	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Gradius Scaler A 95-100 A- 90-94 B+ 85-89 B 80-84 B- 75-79 C+ 70-74 C 65-69 C 60-64 D+ 55-59	4 3.7 3.3 3 2.7 2.3 2 1.7 1.3
	21. Assignment C3 21. Assignment C4 3. Final Project Lect. (Phd) Özge Baş Lect. Can Külahçıoğlu	of % 50 5% of % 50 10% 50 30% 30%	Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English Completeness of the answers Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 2. Assignments Quality and relevancy of the information Originality Level of interpretation Fluency in the use of English TOTAL 3. Signatures Signatures	20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20% 20%	Letter Grade Gradity Scales A 95-100 A- 90-94 B+ 85-89 B 80-84 B- 75-79 C+ 70-74 C 65-69 C 60-64	4 3.7 3.3 3 2.7 2.3 2 1.7



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

2022 - 2023 Spring Semester

INAR 4410

	1		
Instructors	Student No		
Assist. Prof. (PhD) Ecehan Özmehmet	Student Name		
Res. Assist. Selin Aktan, Part-time Assistant Gamze Eneş			
	1		

Interior Design IV

			EVALUATION		Gra	ıde	Tot
			Project development and progress	50%			
	1. Desk Critics &		2D and 3D presentation quality	30%	1		
	Participation to Group	15%	Active participation to group discussions	20%	-		
	Discussions (x7)			100%	-		
			Research quality	25%	-		
			Presentation quality	25%			
	2. Panel Review I	6%	Conceptual statement	35%			
			Building programme	15%			
			TOTAL	100%	1		
			Conceptual statement	20%			
			Building programme	15%	1		
			Spatial quality	25%	-		
		Quality of technical (e.g., architectural lighting) solutions		10%	-		
	3. Panel Review II	7%			-		
			Use of materials and colour	10%			
			Construction	10%			
			2D and 3D presentation quality	10%			
			TOTAL	100%	1		
			Conceptual statement	15%			
				10%	-		
			Building programme		-		
z			Spatial quality	20%	-		
2	4. Panel Review III	7%	Quality of technical (e.g., architectural lighting) solutions	15%			
EVALUATION	4. I aller Review ill	1 10	Use of materials and colour	15%			
L A			Construction	15%			
N N			2D and 3D presentation quality	10%			
			TOTAL	100%			
				30%			
			Quality of the design concept		-		
			Presentation quality	20%	-		
	5. Submissions (x7)	15%	Quality of the information given	30%			
			Correct use of terminology	20%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			Design quality	60%			
	6. Quiz (Design	2D and 3D presentation quality	40%	-			
	Exercise) (x5)	20%			-		
			TOTAL	100%			
			Conceptual statement	15%			
			Building programme	10%			
			Spatial quality	20%			
	7. Final Review	30%	Quality of technical (e.g., architectural lighting) solutions, Attention to Earthquake Awareness, Sustainability Issues, Accessibility, Post-Pandemic Conditions, Diverse	15%			
	7.1 mai Keview		Representation Method				
			Use of maerails and colour	15%			
			Construction	15%			
			2D and 3D presentation quality	10%	1		
			TOTAL	100%			
					Total Ter	m Grade	
					Lett	er Grade	
			Signatures		Grading S	Scale	
st. Pro	of. (PhD) Ecehan Özmehme	et			A	95-100	
				Ĕ	A-	90-94	
				ste	B+	85-89	_
				j ŝ			:
					в	80-84	
				8			-
				ii OB	B-	75-79	
				ng in OB	B-	75-79	_
				ading in OB	B- C+	75-79 70-74	_
				· grading in OB	C+	70-74	:
				tter grading in OB	C+ C	70-74 65-69	:
				nester grading in OB	C+	70-74	:
				semester grading in OB	C+ C	70-74 65-69 60-64	:
				nd-semester grading in OB	C+ C C- D+	70-74 65-69 60-64 55-59	-
				End-semester grading in OBS system	C+ C C-	70-74 65-69 60-64	2

INAR 4420



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

2022 - 2023 Spring Semester

Interior Design Graduation Project

 Instructors
 Student No

 Assist. Prof. (PhD) Meltem Eranıl, Assist. Prof. (PhD) Belgin Terim Çavka
 Student Name

 Res. Assist. Selin Aktan, Part-time Assistant Gamze Eneş

			EVALUATION		Gr	ade	Tota
			Project development and progress	50%			
	1. Desk Critics &		2D and 3D presentation quality	30%	1		
	Participation to Group	15%	Active participation to group discussions	20%	1		
	Discussions (x7)		TOTAL	100%	1		
			Research quality	25%			
			Presentation quality	25%	+		
					-		
	2. Panel Review I	6%	Conceptual statement	35%	-		
			Building programme	15%	-		
			TOTAL	100%			
			Conceptual statement	20%			
			Building programme	15%			
			Spatial quality	25%			
	3. Panel Review II	7%	Quality of technical (e.g., architectural lighting) solutions	10%			
	5. Fallel Kevlew II	Use of materials and colour		10%			
			Construction	10%	1		
			2D and 3D presentation quality	10%	1		
			TOTAL	100%	1		
			Conceptual statement	15%			
			Building programme	10%	1		
			Spatial quality	20%	-		
:					-		
	4. Panel Review III	7%	Quality of technical (e.g., architectural lighting) solutions	15%	-		
			Use of materials and colour	15%	-		
			Construction	15%	-		
			2D and 3D presentation quality	10%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			Quality of the design concept	30%			
			Presentation quality	20%			
	5. Submissions (x7)	15%	Quality of the information given	30%	1		
	. ,		Correct use of terminology	20%	1		
		TOTAL	100%	1			
			Design quality	60%			
	6. Quiz (Design	20%	2D and 3D presentation quality	40%	+		
	Exercise) (x5)	20 /0	TOTAL	100%	+		
				15%			
			Conceptual statement	10%	-		
			Building programme		-		
			Spatial quality	20%	4		
	7. Final Review	7. Final Review 30%	Quality of technical (e.g., architectural lighting) solutions, Attention to Earthquake Awareness, Sustainability Issues, Accessibility, Post-Pandemic Conditions, Diverse Representation Method	15%			
			Use of maerails and colour	15%	1		
			Construction	15%			
			2D and 3D presentation quality	10%	1		
			2D and 3D presentation quality				
			TOTAL	100%	1		
					Total Te	erm Grade	
						erm Grade tter Grade	
						tter Grade	
:. Prof	f. (PhD) Meltem Eranıl		TOTAL	100%	Let	Scale 95-100	
:. Prof	f. (PhD) Meltem Eranıl		TOTAL	100%	Let Grading	tter Grade Scale	
	. ,		TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A	tter Grade Scale 95-100 90-94	3
	f. (PhD) Meltem Eranıl f. (PhD) Belgin Terim Çavk	(a	TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89	3
	. ,		TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A-	tter Grade Scale 95-100 90-94	3
	. ,	:a	TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89	3
	. ,	(a	TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+ B B B-	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79	3
	. ,	(a	TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+ B B- C+	tter Grade Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79 70-74	3 3 2 2
	. ,		TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+ B B B-	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79	3 3 2 2
	. ,	(a	TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+ B B- C+	tter Grade Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79 70-74	3 3 2 2 2
	. ,		TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A B+ B B- C+ C C C	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79 70-74 65-69 60-64	3 3 2 2 2 1
	. ,		TOTAL	100%	Let Grading A A- B+ B B- C+ C+ C C- C- D+	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79 70-74 65-69 60-64 55-559	3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1,
	. ,	:2	TOTAL		Let Grading A B+ B B- C+ C C C	Scale 95-100 90-94 85-89 80-84 75-79 70-74 65-69 60-64	4 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,

	ent of Interior Architect ronmental Design rchitecture	ture	HTERICA ARCHITECTURE INVERTIGATERTURE ENVEROPMENTAL DESIGN			Çevre	İç Mimarlık ve Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi
	INAR 4433		SUMMER PRACTICE (OFFICE)	2	022- 202	23 Spring S	Semester
			Instructors	Student No			
Assist P	of. (PhD) Ecehan Özm	ehmet	manuctors		St	udent Name	2
							-
Res. Assi	st. Selin Aktan			-			
				•	Ī		
			EVALUATION		G	rade	Total %
	The Internship Record Book (Content)		1. Detailed content	100%			
			TOTAL	100%			
z	The Internship		2. Visuals and attachments	100%			
ATIO	Record Book (Visuals)	20%	TOTAL	100%			
EVALUATION	The Internship	25%	3. The Internship Acquirements Report and Presentation	100%			
E E	Acquirements Report and Presentation		TOTAL	100%			
	The Internship	5%	4.Participation	100%			
	Evaluation Form		TOTAL	100%			
				Т	otal Te	rm Grade	
					Let	ter Grade	
			Signatures		Gra	ading Scale	9 *
Assist. Pı	rof. (PhD) Ecehan Özm	ehmet			Α	95-100	4
				em	A-	90-94	3.7
				grading in OBS system	B+	85-89	3.3
				OBS	В	80-84	3
				gin	B-	75-79	2.7
				radin	C+	70-74	2.3
					С	65-69	2
				mest	C-	60-64	1.7
				End-semester	D+	55-59	1.3
				Ē	D	50-54	1
	<u> </u>				F	0-49	0
* Grading considere	Scale might change a ed as Successful (S).	t the en	d of the semester according to the students favour. For Inte	ernship Cours	ses grad	es equal or	r nigher 50

Г



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

INAR 2251 Color, Texture and Textiles in Interiors 2022 - 2023 Spring Semester Instructors Student No Lect. Hasan Can Külahcıoğlu (Coordinator) Student Name Part-time Assistant Bengi Şentürk

			EVALUATION		G	rade	Total
ł		1	01. BRAND - Logo, Motto	2%			
			02. BRAND - Target Group & Location	2%			
			CONCEPT - About the Mood of the Hotel - Al integration	2%			1
	Assignment 01	10%	04. COLOR THEORY - in relation with concept 3 proposals	2%			
			06. CREATIVITY - uniqueness	2%	<u> </u>		
			TOTAL	10%			
t			01. BRAND - logo, motto, location, user profile	1%			
			02. ORTHOGRAPHIC - Plan & Sections	3%			1
		gnment 02 15% 04. MATERIALS - Surface, furniture, lighting, utilities	03. RENDERS - minimum 4	3%			1
	Assignment 02		04. MATERIALS - Surface, furniture, lighting, utilities	3%			1
	•		05. TEXTILES - carpet, curtain, upholstery	2%			1
			06. CREATIVITY - uniqueness	3%			
			TOTAL	15%			1
ł		01. BRAND - logo, motto, location, user profile	1%				
_			02. ORTHOGRAPHIC - Plan & Sections	2%			1
			03. RENDERS - minimum 4	2%			1
	Assignment 03	15%	04. MATERIALS - Surface, furniture, lighting, utilities	2%			1
ž	, loong	1.0.0	05. TEXTILES - carpet, curtain, upholstery	5%			1
			06. CREATIVITY - uniqueness	3%			1
			TOTAL	15%			-
ł			01. BRAND - logo, motto, location, user profile, social media integration	5%			1
	MIDTERM 2		02. CONCEPT - concept of the hotel - Al integration	5%			1
		25%	03. COLOR THEORY - in relation with concept 3 proposals	5%			1
		1-0.0	04. CREATIVITY - uniqueness	5%			1
			TOTAL	25%			1
ł			01. BRAND - logo, motto, location, user profile	5%			
			02, ORTHOGRAPHIC - Plan & Sections	5%			
			03. RENDERS - minimum 4	5%			
	FINAL	35%	04. MATERIALS - Surface, furniture, lighting, utilities	5%			
		00%	05. TEXTILES - carpet, curtain, upholstery	5%			
			06. CREATIVITY - uniqueness	10%			
			TOTAL	35%			-
		-		55%	Total Te	erm Grade	
					Let	tter Grade	
			Signatures		Grading	Scale	
Hasan	n Can Külahcıoğlu		Signatures		-		
Hasan	n Can Külahcıoğlu		Signatures	system	Grading A A-	Scale 95-100 90-94	3,

	А	95-100	4
em	A-	90-94	3,7
syst	B+	85-89	3,3
OBS	В	80-84	3
g in	B-	75-79	2,7
adin	C+	70-74	2,3
er gr	С	65-69	2
nest	C-	60-64	1,7
End-semester grading in OBS system	D+	55-59	1,3
End	D	50-54	1
	F	0-49	0

Department of Interior Architecture and Environmental Design

Faculty of Architecture



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü _{Mimarlık Fakültesi}

	INAR 2290			Visual Presentation Techniques for Interiors		2022-2	023 Spring Se	emester						
				Instructors	Student No									
ect. Ertar	n Demirkan (Coordinator)						Student Name							
es. Assis	st. İrem Deniz Akçam													
	,			EVALUATION	I	Grade		Total %						
				vork 1. Manual Rendering and Integration of Digital Media Tools vork 2. Essentials of Floor Plan Rendering	10%	_		-						
				vork 3. Advanced Floor Plan/Site Plan Rendering	10%			1						
		Classwork 4. Advanced Section Rendering	vork 4. Advanced Section Rendering	10%										
				rork 5. Advanced Section Rendering within Time of the Day	10%									
	Practice	25%		rork 6. Analysis of the Presentation Boards rorks_7.Creating Diagrams for Axonometric Views	10%			-						
				vork 8. Introduction to Post Production Techniques	10%			1						
				vorks_9 Creating Diagrams with Collage Techniques	10%			1						
				rork 10. PostProduction Techniques in Adobe Premier Pro	10%			1						
			TOTAL		100%									
	Assignmente			vorks 1. Digital Rendering Techniques	25%									
		10%		vorks 2. Benchmark for Architectural Presentation Boards	25% 25%			-						
	Assignments	10%		vorks 3. Site Plan Render of Studio Project vorks 4. Diagram Drawing of Studio Project	25%			-						
			TOTAL		100%			1						
				ch and Analysis	10%									
				Benchmark of Architectural Presentation Boards										
				Moodboards										
							Layou	It Design for Architectural Presentation Boards	90%	_				
_	Midterm	25%		Layout Design & Grid System Visual Language & Graphic Quality										
No		Widterni	Wildterni	Middenni	23%		Typography							
EVALUATION			-	Colour Scheme										
Ľ,				Hierarchy & Required Data										
ž				Legibility										
			TOTAL		100%									
			Findin	J Idea and Designing Concepts Implementation of 3D Rendering Software	100%	_								
		10%		Composition and Story										
	Case Study / Prefinal			Visual Language & Graphic Quality										
			ouse oracy , i remain	ouse study , i terma	,			e Study / Prennai 10%		Mixing Video and Creating Transitions				
				Creativity										
			TOTAL		100%									
			Resea	ch and Analysis Benchmark of Architectural Presentation Boards	10%	_								
				Moodboards										
			Layou	Design for Architectural Presentation Boards	90%	-								
	Final	20%		Layout Design & Grid System										
	Final	30%		Visual Language & Graphic Quality										
				Typography , Colour Scheme										
			-	Hierarchy & Required Data										
			TOTAL	Legibility	100%	-		-						
		-			100/8	Tota	I Term Grade							
							Letter Grade							
				Signatures			Grading Scale	•						
ot Ertor	n Demirkan					A	95-100	4						
Li tai					End- semester grading in OBS system	A-	90-94	3,7						
					syst									
					as,	B+	85-89	3,3						
					10	В	80- 84	3						
					i Br	B-	75-79	2,7						
					adir.	C+	70-74	2,3						
					j gr	С	65-69	2						
					ster	C-	60-64	1,7						
					me	D+	55- 59	1,3						
					se		50-54							
					-pu:	D	0- 49	1						





İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü ^{Mimarlık Fakültesi}

	INAR 3370		Kitchen and Bath Design	20)22 - 202	23 Spring S	Semester
			Instructors	Student N	umber		
oordina	ıtor: Lecturer Işık Örsel İ	mir					
				Student M			
istructo	rs: Lecturer Işık Örsel İ	mır		Student I	vanie		
les. Ass	istant : İrem Deniz Akça	Im					
		-	EVALUATION		Gr	rade	Total %
			1.1. Completeness	20%			
	Homework 1 Kitchen	10%	1.2. Content (Style, User Scenario, needs and material research)	80%			
			Total	100%			
			1.1. Number of Critiques taken in Studio	50%			
	Studio Studies Kitchen	6%	1.2. Progress in each critique	50%			
			Total	100%			
			1.1. User Profile, Scenario and Style	5%			
			1.2. Creativity	20%			
			1.3. Technical Drawings 1/20	30%			
	Midterm Submission - Kitchen	30%	1.4. Presentation Drawings 1/20	15%			
	Kitchen		1.5. 3D Drawings /renders	15%			
			1.6. Materials, Specifications and Budget	10%			
			1.7. Reflected Ceiling Plan	5%			
EVALUATION			Total	100%			
ATI	Homework 2		1.1. Completeness	50%			
ALU	Bathroom	10%	1.2. Content (Style, User Scenario, needs and material research)	50%			
EV	-		Total	100%			
	Studio Studies		1.1. Number of Critiques taken in Studio	50%			
	Bathroom	6%	1.2. Progress in each critique	50%			
			Total	100%			
			1.1. User Profile, Scenario and Style	5%			
			1.2. Creativity	20%			
			1.3. Technical Drawings 1/20	30%			
	Final Submission - Bathroom	30%	1.4. Presentation Drawings 1/20 1.5. 3D Drawings /renders	15%			
			1.6. Materials, Specifications and Budget	10%			
			1.7. Reflected Ceiling Plan	5%			
			Total	100%			
			1.1. Participation to Technical Trip	50%			
	Field Studies	8%	1.2. Submission of Technical Trip Report	50%			
	Tield Studies	0.0	Total	100%			
			l otai		otal Ter	m Grade	
				<u> </u>		er Grade	
				i			
			Signatures		Gra	ading Scale	•
ecturer	lşık Örsel İmir				Α	95-100	4
				E	A-	90-94	3.7
				ster			
				s,	B+	85-89	3.3
				B8	В	80-84	3
				Ē	B-	75-79	2.7
				ling	C+	70-74	2.3
				Jrac			
				ter ,c	С	65-69	2
				est	C-	60-64	1.7
				sem	D+	55-59	1.3
				nd-sem			
				End-semester grading in OBS system	D+ D F	55-59 50-54 0-49	1.3 1 0



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

INAR 4460

Contemporary Issues in Housing Interiors

Instructors

2022 - 2023 Spring Semester

Student Name

Student No

Assoc.Prof. (PhD) Gülnur Ballice

Res. Assist. İrem Deniz Akçam

			EVALUATION		Grade	Total %
			1.1. Readings and Presentations	50%		
	Assignments	30%	1.2. Review papers	50%		
			TOTAL	100%		
			2.1. Research and literature review	50%		
			2.1.1. Archive scanning			
	Case Studies (Project)	20%	2.1.2. Interviews			
			2.2. 2d and 3d drawings	50%		
			TOTAL	100%		
			3.1.Research and literature review	100%		
			3.1.1. Research on Suggested Topics for Final			
NO	Mid-term	15%	3.1.2. Annotated bibliography on the selected topic	4		
ATI			3.1.3. Report Submission			
EVALUATION			TOTAL	100%		
EV	Practice (Laboratory)		4.1. Research topic presentation (Individual)	50%		
		5%	4.2. Case study presentation (Group work)	50%		
			TOTAL	100%		
			5.1. Quality of the content and literature review	35%		
			5.2. Clarity of the aims and objectives	20%		
	Final Submission	30%	5.3. Clarity of the method for collecting and analyzing the necessary data	25%		
			5.4. Correct use of the terminology	10%		
			5.5.Appropriateness of the referencing	10%		
			TOTAL	100%		
				т	otal Term Grade	
					Letter Grade	

Signatures		Gra	ading Scale [;]	ł
Assoc.Prof. (PhD) Gülnur Ballice		Α	95-100	4
	em	A-	90-94	3,7
	grading in OBS system	B+	85-89	3,3
	OBS	В	80-84	3
	gin	B-	75-79	2,7
	adine	C+	70-74	2,3
	er gr	С	65-69	2
	End-semester	C-	60-64	1,7
	-sen	D+	55-59	1,3
	End	D	50-54	1
		F	0-49	0



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

F

0-49

0

INAR 4474	Interior Acoustics	2022 - 2023 \$	Spring Semester			
Instructors Student No						
Assist.Prof. (Phd) Zeynep Seving	Karcı (Coordinator)	Stude	nt Name			
Res. Assist. Selin Aktan						

			EVALUATION	Grade					
			1.1. Appropriateness of the given answers	50%					
	MIDTERM	20%	1.2. Correct use of the terminology	50%					
			TOTAL	100%					
			2.1. Research quality	40%					
			2.2. Presentation quality	20%					
	ASSGINMENT I	15%	2.3. Originality	20%					
		13%							
			2.4 Level of interpretation	20%					
			TOTAL	100%					
			3.1. Research quality	40%					
		4.50	3.2. Presentation quality	20%					
z	ASSGINMENT II	15%	3.3. Originality	20%					
Į			3.4. Level of interpretation	20%					
LUZ			TOTAL	100%					
EVALUATION			4.1. Depth of analysis	40%					
	PRESENTATION I	15%	4.2. Completeness	30%					
			4.3. Accuracy	30%					
			TOTAL	100%					
		30%	5.1. Presentation technique	30%					
	FINAL		5.2. Fluency in the use of English	30%					
			5.3. Originality	20%					
			5.4. Level of interpretation TOTAL	100%					
	DESK CRITIQUE	5%	6.1. Quality and relevancy of the information	50%					
			6.2. Originality	50%					
			TOTAL	100%					
	Total Term Grade								
						er Grade			
					Lett	el Glaue			
			Signatures		Gradir	ng Scale			
Coordina	tor: Assist. Prof. (PhD) Zeyne	p Sevinç Karcı		А	95-100	4		
				ε	A-	90-94	3,7		
				End-semester grading in OBS system	B+	85-89	3,3		
					В	80-84	3		
					В-		-		
						75-79	2,7		
					C+	70-74	2,3		
					С	65-69	2		
					C-	60-64	1,7		
						55-59	1,3		
				🖞	D	50-54	1		



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi

F

0-49

0

Windink Fakanc

INAR 4476 2022 - 2023 Spring Semester Lighting Design for Interiors Instructors Student Number Assist. Prof. (PhD) İlknur Uygun (coordinator) Student Name Res. Assist. Selin GÜLEROĞLU EVALUATION Grade Total % 90% 2.1. Appropriateness of the given answers 1. Quiz I 5% 2.2. Correct use of the terminology 10% TOTAL 100% 2.1. Appropriateness of the given answers 90% 2. Quiz II 5% 2.2. Correct use of the terminology 10% TOTAL 100% 90% 2.1. Appropriateness of the given answers 2.2. Correct use of the terminology 10% 3. Quiz III 5% ΤΟΤΑΙ 100% 3.1. Daylighting principles 50% 4. Midterm 20% 3.2. Artificial lighting principles 50% TOTAL 100% 4.1. Clarity of the presentation 35% 55% 4.2. Ouality of the information given 5. Presentation 15% 4.3. Correct use of the terminology 10% EVALUATION TOTAL 100% 4.1. Clarity of the assignment 35% 4.2. Ouality of the information given 55% 6. Assignment 15% 4.3. Correct use of the terminology 10% TOTAL 100% 5.1. Lighting quality analysis 5.1.1. Quality of the information given 30% 5.1.2. Correct use of the terminology 5.2. Daylight analysis 5.2.1. Accuracy of daylight analysis / calculations 35% 5.2.2. Discussion of the results 7. Final 35% 5.2.3. Correct use of the terminology 5.3. Artificial light analysis 5.3.1. Accuracy of the artificial light analysis / calculations 35% 5.3.2. Discussion of the results 5.3.3. Correct use of the terminology 100% TOTAL **Total Term Grade** Letter Grade Signatures Grading Scale* Assist. Prof. (PhD) İlknur UYGUN (coordinator) А 95-100 4 End-semester grading in OBS system A-90-94 3.7 85-89 3.3 B+ В 80-84 3 75-79 2.7 B-C+ 70-74 2.3 С 65-69 2 60-64 1.7 C-D+ 55-59 1.3 D 50-54 1

Department of Interior Architecture
and Environmental Design
Faculty of Architecture



İç Mimarlık ve Çevre Tasarımı Bölümü ^{Mimarlık Fakültesi}

F

0-49

0

INAR 4483	Ecological Approaches in Design	2022 - 2023 Spring Semester			
	Instructors	Student Number			
Coordinator: Assist. Prof. (PhD)	Ecehan Özmehmet				
		Student Name			
Res.Assist. Selin Aktan		1			

			EVALUATION		Gi	rade	Total %
			1.1. Background Reseach	30%			
	Midterm	30%	1.2. Project Proposal	30%			
	Midderin		1.3 Ortiginality of the work	40%			
			TOTAL	100%			
			2.1. Correctness of the format	50%	-		
	Assignment I	10%	2.2. Quality and relevancy of the information	50%	-		
			TOTAL	100%			
	A !	150	3.1.Analysis (accuracy, quality, fluidity)	80%	-		
z	Assignment II	15%	3.2. Format TOTAL	20%	ł		
E E			4.1. Background Reseach				
EVALUATION			4.1. Background Reseach 4.2. Originality of the work	30% 30%	-		
N N	Presentation I	5%	4.3 360 Degree Student Rating	40%	ł		
			TOTAL	40 %	ł		
			5.1. Background Reseach	30%			
		10%	5.2. Originality of the work	30%	-		
	Presentation II		5.3 360 Degree Student Rating	40%	ł		
			TOTAL	100%	-		
	Final	30%	6.1. Final Report	40%			
			6.2. Presentation	40%	-		
			6.3. 360 Degree Student Rating	20%	1		
			TOTAL	100%	-		
						m Grade	
				Letter Gra			
Signatures Grading Scale*							
			- g				
Assist. Pr	rof. (PhD) Ecehan Özm	ehmet			Α	95-100	4
				E E	A-	90-94	3.7
				syste	B+	85-89	3.3
				BS	В	80-84	3
						75-79	2.7
						70-74	2.3
				a du	С	65-69	2
					C-	60-64	1.7
				End-semester grading in OBS system	D+	55-59	1.3
				End	D	50-54	1

	ent of Interior Architec ronmental Design ^{chitecture}	ture	THE CALL AND A THE CALL		Çevre	İç Mimarlık ve Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi
	INAR 4490		Portfolio Design for Interior Architects	2	022-2023 Spring Se	emester
			Instructors	Student No		
_ect. Rena	a Vanlı Ballar				Student Name	
Dec Accio	st. İrem Deniz Akçam					
100.7000						
			EVALUATION		Grade	Total %
			1.1. project list 1.1. Project information and images	100%		
	Assignment 1	4%	1.2 Project Analyses			
				100%		
			2.1. cover page and content	100%		
	Assignment 2	3%	2.1.1. Page dimension & design 2.1.2. Project selection & list order			
			TOTAL	100%		
			3.1. Sample project layout	70%		
			3.1.1 Layout creativity, types, font selection			
			3.1.2. Project readabilitiy & narrative creativity			
	Assignment 3	13%	3.2. Resume	30%		
			3.2.1. Design, font selection			
			3.3.2. Format, information TOTAL	100%		
			4.1. Page design	30%		
			4.1.1. Layout types			
			4.1.2. Layout design			
			4.2. Articulateness of organization	25%		
	Midterm	30%	4.2.1 Readability			
	Midterm	30%	4.2.2. Clarity of expression 4.3.Completeness of portfolio	30%		
			4.3.1. Creativiy level			
NO			4.3.2. Number of projects& pages			
ITAL			4.4.Resume /cv	15%		
EVALUATION			TOTAL	100%		
ш			5.1 Cover letter & Business card	100%		
	Assignment 4	5%	5.1.1 Business card & logo design 5.1.2 Firm research & letter format			
			TOTAL	100%		
			6.1 Web site design & QR code	100%		
	Assignment 5	5%	6.1.1 Project types & images			
		5%	6.1.2 Project and self information			
			TOTAL 7.1 Participation	100%		
	Participation	10%	7.1.1 Class participation	100%		
			7.1.2 Completeness of requirements			
			TOTAL	100%		
			8.1 Design & organization	30%		
			8.1.1.Layout design & types 8.1.2 Font & Titles			
			8.1.3 Readability			
			8.2. Completeness of portfolio	30%		
	Final	30%	8.2.1. Creativiy			
			8.2.2. Number of projects & pages			
			8.2.3. Project text & keywords 8.3. Business card	15%		
			8.4. Resume	10%		
			8.5. Website & QR code	15%		
			TOTAL	100%		
				Т	otal Term Grade	
					Letter Grade	
			Signatures		Grading Scale ³	k
ect. Rena	a Vanlı Ballar			s	A 95-100	4
				B	A- 90-94	3,7
				i Di	B+ 85-89 B 80-84	3,3 3
				adin	B- 75-79	2,7
				ir gr. ystel	C+ 70-74	2,3
				End-semester grading in OBS system	C 65-69 C- 60-64	2
				sem	D+ 55-59	1,7
				-pu	D 50-54 F 0-49	1

	ent of Interior Architectu ronmental Design rchitecture	ıre	INTERIOR ADDITICTURE			Çevr	İç Mimarlık ve e Tasarımı Bölümü Mimarlık Fakültesi	
	INAR 4494		EXHIBITION AND SET DESIGN	20	022 - 20	23 Spring S	Semester	
			Instructors	Student No				
Assist Pr	rof. (PhD) Ecehan ÖZM	FHMF				udent Name	9	
							-	
Res. Assi	st. İrem Deniz Akçam							
	_						_	
			EVALUATION		G	rade	Total %	
			1.1. Brand Context	30%				
			1.1.1. Analysis					
	Midterm	25%	1.1.2. Design reflections	0.000				
			1.2. 2D design outputs	30% 40%				
			1.3. 3D design outputs TOTAL	100%				
			2.1. Analysis of the Brand Identity 10%	29%				
			2.2. Analysis of Set Design Strategies 10%	29%				
z	Presentation 1,2 and 3	35%	2.3. Prefinal project outputs 15%	43%				
ATIC			TOTAL	100%				
EVALUATION	Practice	15%	3.1. Participation to the desk critics and completness of the requirements	100%				
			TOTAL 4.1. Design and Organization	100%				
		25%	4.1.1.Concept	70%				
	Final		4.1.2. Presentation Drawings					
			4.1.2.1. 2D Design					
			4.1.2.2. 3D Design					
			4.2. Project readabilitiy & narrative creativity	30%				
			TOTAL	100%				
		Total Term Grade						
					Let	ter Grade		
				_				
			Signatures		Gra	ading Scale	e*	
Assist. Pr	rof. (PhD) Ecehan ÖZM	EHME	Г		A	95-100	4	
				em	A-	90-94	3.7	
					B+	85-89	3.3	
						80-84	3	
		End-semester grading in OBS system	B-	75-79	2.7			
						70-74	2.3	
		gra	C+ C	65-69	2			
		ster	C-	60-64	1.7			
						55-59	1.7	
		s-pu	D+					
				Ē	D	50-54	1	
					F	0-49	0	
* Grading	Scale might change at	t the er	d of the semester according to the students favour.					