

YAŞAR UNIVERSITY

Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Interior Architecture Master Program

INAR 5555 Advanced Lighting Design	2019-2020 Spring Semester

Instructors	s	
	Student No	
Assist. Prof. (PhD) Arzu CILASUN KUNDURACI	Student Name	

				Evaluation Criteria		Grade	%
			1a.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%		
		4-	1a.2.	Relevancy with the requirements	20%		
	(9	1a. Assignment 1	1a.3.	Analyzing the data	20%		
	20%	(25%)	1a.4.	Conclusions supported by the data	20%		
	TS ((2370)	1a.5.	Quality of the presentation	20%		
	ASSIGNMENTS (50%)			TOTAL	100%		
	N Z		1b.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%		
	SIG	1b.	1b.2.	Relevancy with the requirements	20%		
	1. AS	Assignment 2	1b.3.	Analyzing the data	20%		
	1	(25%)	1b.4.	Conclusions supported by the data	20%		
		(20/0)	1b.5.	Quality of the presentation	20%		
				TOTAL	100%		
lz		2a. Presentation 1		General scientific quality / Originality	30%		
9	(50%)		2a.2.	Relevancy with the requirements	30%		
I ĕ I	S (2			Conclusions supported by the data	30%		
EVALUATION	NO	(%10)	2a.4.	Quality of the presentation	10%		
Ē	PRESENTATIONS	2b. Presentation	2b.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	30%		
	Ē	2	2b.2.	Relevancy with the requirements	30%		
	RES		2b.3.	Conclusions supported by the data	30%		
	2. P	(%10)	2b.4.	Quality of the presentation	10%		
				TOTAL	100%		
	1/0	/w)	3.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%		
	06)	ne)	3.2.	Relevancy with the requirements	10%		
	3. FINAL PROJECT (30%)		3.3.	Conclusions supported by the data	25%		
	ابر <u>ا</u>	5	3.4.	Technical correctness of the final proposal (economic	25%		
	8	£	3.5.	Quality of the presentation	10%		
	3	14	3.6.	Progress	10%		
				TOTAL	100%		
				Total Term Grade			

Signatures		Grading Scale		
Assist. Prof. (PhD) Arzu CILASUN KUNDURACI	A	95-100	4	
	A-	90-94	3.7	
	B+	85-89	3.3	
	В	80-84	3	
	B-	75-79	2.7	
	C+	70-74	2.3	
	С	65-69	2	
	C-	60-64	1.7	
	D+	55-59	1.3	
	D	50-54	1	
	F	0-49	0	



YAŞAR UNIVERSITY

Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Interior Architecture Master Program

INAR 5556 Literary Space Anaysis

2019-2020 Spring Semester

Instructors	Student No	
Assoc. Prof. (PhD) Zeynep TUNA ULTAV	Student Name	

1.1. Scientific quality of the paper 20%					Evaluation Criteria		Grade	%
1.1				1.1.	Scientific quality of the paper	20%		
Mid-Term (20%) 1.4. Accurate referencing 2.0%				1.2.	Relevancy with the requirements	20%		
1.5. Quality of the presentation 20% 100% 2a.1. General scientific quality / Originality 20% 2a.2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2a.3. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2a.4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2a.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2b.1. General scientific quality / Originality 20% 2b.2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2b.3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2c.6. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2			1.	1.3.	Richness of the argument	20%		
2007 2.1. General scientific quality / Originality 2.0 2.2. Relevance to the requirements 1.0 2.2. 2.4. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. 2.4. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. Richaes of the argument 1.5 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument 1.5 2.2. 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument 1.5 2.2.		M	1id-Term (20%)	1.4.	Accurate referencing	20%		
2007 2.1. General scientific quality / Originality 2.0 2.2. Relevance to the requirements 1.0 2.2. 2.4. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. 2.4. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. Richaes of the argument/critical reading 1.5 2.2. Richaes of the argument 1.5 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument 1.5 2.2. 2.2. 2.2. Richaes of the argument 1.5 2.2.				1.5.	Quality of the presentation	20%		
2a.2 Relevance to the requirements 10% 2a.3 The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2a.4 Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2a.5 Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2a.5 Accurate referencing 15% 2a.5 Volume 2a.6 Accurate referencing 15% 2a.6 Accurate refer						100%		
2a. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2a.4 Richness of the argument 15% 2a.5 Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2a.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2a.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2b.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2c.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2b.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2b.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2c.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2b.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2b.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2c.7 Writing style 2b.6 Richness of the argument/critical reading 2b.6 Richness	1			2a.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%		
Assignment 1 2a.4 Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2a.5 Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2a.7 Writing style 10% 2a.8 Progress 5% 100% 2a.8 Progress 5% 2a.8 Progres				2a.2.	Relevance to the requirements	10%		
Assignment 1 2a.4 Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2a.5 Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2a.7 Writing style 10% 2a.8 Progress 5% 100% 2a.8 Progress 5% 2a.8 Progres				2a.3.	The appropriateness of the issues raised	15%		
Assignment 1 2a.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2a.6. Accurate referencing 15% 15% 2a.7. Writing style 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 5% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 10% 2b.2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2b.3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b.4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2b.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b.7. Writing style 10% 2b.8. Progress 5% 2b.7. Writing style 10% 2c.7. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c.7. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c.7. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c.8. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c.8. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c.8. Progress 5% 2c.8. Progr				2a.4.	Richness of the argument/critical reading	15%		
26.6. Accurate referencing 15% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 100% 2b.1. General scientific quality / Originality 20% 2b.2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2b.3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b.5. 2b.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2b.8. Progress 5% 2b.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2b.8. Progress 5% 2b.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b.6. Accurate referencing 2b.6. Accurate ref				2a.5.		10%		
2a.7. Writing style 10% 2a.8. Progress 5% 100% 2a.8. Progress 5% 100% 2b.1. General scientific quality / Originality 20% 2b.2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2b.3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b.3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b.4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2b.5. Progress 5% 2b.5. Progress 5% 2c.5. Progress 2c.5. Progress 5% Progress 5% 2c.5. Progress 5% 2c.5. Progress 5%			Assignment 1	2a.6.		15%		
2a.8. Progress 5% 20%				2a.7.		10%		
Value Company Compan				2a.8.		5%		
2b. 2 Relevance to the requirements 10% 2b. 3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b. 6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b. 7. Writing style 10% 2b. 8. Progress 5% 70TAL 100% 2c. 2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c. 3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2c. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2c. 5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2c. 6. Accurate referencing 15% 2c. 7. Writing style 10% 2c. 8. Progress 5% 2c. 7. Writing style 10% 2c. 8. Progress 5% 2c. 7. Writing style 10% 2d. 8. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2d. 8. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2d. 8. Richness of the argument/critical						100%		
2b. 2 Relevance to the requirements 10% 2b. 3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2b. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2b. 6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b. 7. Writing style 10% 2b. 8. Progress 5% 70TAL 100% 2c. 2. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2c. 3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2c. 4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2c. 5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2c. 6. Accurate referencing 15% 2c. 7. Writing style 10% 2c. 8. Progress 5% 2c. 7. Writing style 10% 2c. 8. Progress 5% 2c. 7. Writing style 10% 2d. 8. Relevance to the requirements 10% 2d. 8. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2d. 8. Richness of the argument/critical				2b.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%		
2b.								
2b. 2b. 2b. 2b. 2b. 2b. 2c. 2c.				2b.3.				
20.5 20.5				2b.4.		15%		
Absignment 2 2b.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2b.7. Writing style 10% 2b.8. Progress 5% 100% 2c.2. General scientific quality / Originality 20% 2c.3. The appropriateness of the issues raised 15% 2c.4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2c.6. Accurate referencing 2c.6. Accurate referen			7	-		-		
Variance Variance			Assignment 2		,			
Vacantiary Vac					Š			
VOOD Care								
Value Valu								
Variable Variable				2c.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	_		
Variety Vari								
Variety Vari								
Note								
Value Valu				-				
Variety Vari			Assignment 3			 		
Variety Vari				-				
Variable Variable								
Variable Variable								
Variance Variance				2d.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	-		
Value Valu				_		10%		
2d.8 Progress 5%		(%)		-		-		
2d.8. Progress 5%		S (2						
2d.8 Progress 5%		N		_				
2d.8 Progress 5%		Ξ	Assignment 4	_				
2d.8 Progress 5%		SiG			_	10%		
TOTAL 100%		AS		_		5%		
2e.1. General scientific quality / Originality 20%		2.						
2e.2 Relevance to the requirements 10%				2e.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	_		
2e. 2e. 2e.5 2e.5 2e.6 Accurate referencing 15% 2e.7 Writing style 2e.8 Progress 5% TOTAL 100%	z			_		10%		
2e. Assignment 5 2e.4. Richness of the argument/critical reading 15% 2e.5. Conclusions supported by the data 10% 2e.6. Accurate referencing 15% 2e.7. Writing style 10% 2e.8. Progress 5% TOTAL 100%				_				
2e.7. Writing style 10%	일			-		-		
2e.7. Writing style 10% 2e.8. Progress 5% TOTAL 100%	N A			2e.5.				
2e.7. Writing style 10% 2e.8. Progress 5% TOTAL 100%	ΑĀ		Assignment 5					
2e.8. Progress 5% TOTAL 100%	Ш			_		-		
TOTAL 100%				_				
2f.1. General scientific quality / Originality 20%						100%		
1				2f.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%		

		-								
			Relevance to the requirements	10%						
			The appropriateness of the issues raised	15%						
	2f.	2f.4.	Richness of the argument/critical reading	15%						
	Assignment 6		Conclusions supported by the data	10%						
			Accurate referencing	15%						
		2f.7.	Writing style	10%						
		2f.8.	Progress	5%						
			TOTAL	100%						
		2g.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%						
		2g.2.	Relevance to the requirements	10%						
		2g.3.	The appropriateness of the issues raised	15%						
	2f.	2g.4.	Richness of the argument/critical reading	15%						
	Assignment 7	2g.5.	Conclusions supported by the data	10%						
	7.55.giiiiciic 7	2g.6.	Accurate referencing	15%						
		2g.7.	Writing style	10%						
		2g.8.	Progress	5%						
			TOTAL	100%						
			TOTAL							
٠,	DARTICIDATION	3.1.	Contribution level to the topic of the day	50%						
3. F	PARTICIPATION (5%)	3.2.	Referencing to the delivered readings of the week	50%						
	(378)		TOTAL	100%						
	4a. Presentation	4a.1.	The appropriateness of the issues raised	30%						
2%)	1	4a.2.	The degree of critical evaluation of the readings	30%						
S (2		4a.3.	The overall quality of the presentation	30%						
O	(30%)	4a.4.	Fluency	10%						
AT	4b. Presentation	4b.1.	The appropriateness of the issues raised	30%						
F	2	4b.2.	The degree of critical evaluation of the readings	30%						
PRESENTATIONS (25%)		4b.3.	The overall quality of the presentation	30%						
4. PI	(70%)	4b.4.	Fluency	10%						
`			TOTAL		<u> </u>					
		3.1.	General scientific quality / Originality	20%						
		3.2.	Relevance to the requirements	10%						
		3.3.	The appropriateness of the issues raised	15%						
	_	3.3.	Richness of the argument/critical reading	15%						
	3.	3.3.	Conclusions supported by the data	10%						
Fina	al Project (30%)	3.3.	Accurate referencing	15%						
		3.3.	Writing style	10%						
			Progress	5%						
		3.3.	IFTOGLESS		TOTAL					
		3.3.								
		3.3.								

Signatures		(Grading Scale
Assoc. Prof. (PhD) Zeynep Tuna Ultav	А	95-100	4
į	A-	90-94	3.7
	B+	85-89	3.3
	В	80-84	3
	B-	75-79	2.7
	C+	70-74	2.3
	С	65-69	2
	C-	60-64	1.7
	D+	55-59	1.3
	D	50-54	1
	F	0-49	0



YAŞAR UNIVERSITY

Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Interior Architecture Master Program

INAR 5562 Home, Culture and Design

2019-

Instructors	Student No	
Assoc.Prof.Dr.Gülnur BALLİCE (Coordinator)	Student NO	
Res.Assist.Özüm KARADAĞ (Support Assistant)	Student Name	

		Grade	%	Total %		
		1 Quality of the content	40%			
	Assignments	2 Appropriateness to the requirements	40%			
	(24%)	3 Considering due date	20%			
		TOTAL	100%			
		1 Research and literature review	25%			
	Presentations	2 Submission of the required documents (Docomomo-TR)	25%			
	(21%)	3 Quality of the content	25%			
		4 Quality of the poster and presentation	25%			
z		TOTAL	100%			
EVALUATION	Mid-term (15%)	1 Research and literature review	25%			
K		2 Submission of the required documents (Docomomo-TR)	25%	•		
EV.		3 Quality of the content	25%			
		4 Quality of the poster and presentation	25%			
		TOTAL	100%			
		1 Research and literature review	25%			
		2 Submission of the required documents (Final Brief)	30%			
	Final	3 Quality of the content	30%			
	(40%)	4 Support for extra documents (Catalogue, web site, leaflet)	15%			
		TOTAL	100%			
		Total Term Grade				

Signatures	(Grading Sca	ale
Assoc.Prof.(PhD) Gülnur BALLİCE	95	А	4
	90	A-	3.7
	85	B+	3.3
	80	В	3
	75	B-	2.7
	70	C+	2.3
	65	С	2
	60	C-	1.7
	55	D+	1.3
	50	D	1
	0	F	0



Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Interior Architecture Master Program

INAR 5570 Indoor Comfort Management

2019-2020

Instructors	Student No	
Assist. Prof. (PhD) Belgin Terim Çavka (Coordinator)	Student No	
	Student Name	
Res.Assist. Selin Aktan		

Evaluation Criteria			Grade	%	Total %	
	Presentation 1 (15%)	1 Relevance to subject	30%			
		2 Richness of content	30%			
		3 Quality	40%			
		TOTAL	100%			
	Burnantation 2	1 Relevance to subject	30%			
	Presentation 2	2 Richness of content	30%			
_	(10%)	3 Quality	40%			
<u> </u>		TOTAL	100%			
.AU	Paper draft	1 Relevance to subject	30%			
EVALUATION	submission 3	2 Richness of content	30%			
	(15%)	3 Quality	40%			
	(13/6)	TOTAL	100%			
		1 Relevance to subject	30%			
	Paper Submission	2 Richness of content	30%			
	(45%)	3 Quality	40%			
		TOTAL	100%			
	Participation (15%)		100%			
		Total Term Grade				

Signatures	Grading Scale		ale
Assist. Prof. Dr. Belgin Terim Çavka	95	А	4
	90	A-	3.7
	85	B+	3.3
	80	В	3
	75	B-	2.7
	70	C+	2.3
	65	С	2
	60	C-	1.7
	55	D+	1.3
	50	D	1
	0	F	0



Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Interior Architecture Master Program

INAR 5590 Seminar 2019-2020 Spring

Student No	
Student No	
i	
Student Name	
i	

Evaluation Criteria			Grade	%	Total %	
	2. Outstanding depth of analysis by using appropriate research		15%			
		15%				
		3.Scientific depth in theoretical and conceptual frameworks	15%			
	Midterm (40%)	Knowledge and understanding of core material and literature	15%		rade % Tota	
		5.Effective use of visual materials	15%			
		6.Appropriate evaluation of outcomes and quality of discussion	15%			
EVALUATION		7.Clarity in use of language	10%			
]]		1.Apparent knowledge, clear structure and depth coverage on	15%			
EVA		2.Outstanding depth of analysis by using appropriate research methods	15%			
		3. Scientific depth in theoretical and conceptual frameworks	15%			
	Final(60%)	4.Knowledge and understanding of core material and literature	15%			
		5.Effective use of visual materials	15%			
		6.Appropriate evaluation of outcomes and quality of discussion	15%			
		7.Clarity in use of language	10%			
		Total Term Grade				
	*Students should attend minimum 4 INAR seminars presented within Graduate School of Na					Applied

*Students should attend minimum 4 INAR seminars presented within Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences Seminar Series.

Signatures		Grading Scale		
Assoc.Prof. (PhD)Zeynep Tuna Ultav	A	95-100	4	
	A-	90-94	3.7	
Prof.(PhD). Meltem Gürel	B+	85-89	3.3	
	В	80-84	3	
Assoc.Prof. (PhD)Gülnur Ballice	B-	75-79	2.7	
	C+	70-74	2.3	
Assist.Prof. (PhD)Belgin Terim Çavka	С	65-69	2	
	C-	60-64	1.7	
Assist.Prof. (PhD) Meltem Eranıl Demirli	D+	55-59	1.3	
	D	50-54	1	
	F	0-49	0	



Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences, Interior Architecture Master Program

INAR 5597 Interior Design Workshop

2019-2020 Spring

Instructors	Student No	
Lect. Sergio Taddonoi (Coordinator)	Student No	
Res.Assist.Müge Sever	Student Name	

	Evaluation Criteria				%	Total %
	Midterm	1 Originality of the intended project framework	50%			
	(Project Proposal) (30%)	2 Multi-media representations	50%			
		TOTAL	100%			
	Assignment I	1 Coherence of the project development with midterm project framework	50%			
_	(15%)	2 Multi-media representations	50%			
5		TOTAL	100%			
EVALUATION	Assignment II	1 Coherence of the project development with midterm project framework	50%			
E	(15%)	2 Multi-media representations	50%			
		TOTAL	100%			
	Final Duainat (400/)	1 Originality of the completed work and the theoretical references	50%			
	Final Project (40%)	2 Multi-media representations	50%			
		TOTAL	100%			
		Total Term Grade				

Signatures	Grading Scale		ale
Lect. Sergio Taddonoi	95	А	4
	90	A-	3.7
	85	B+	3.3
	80	В	3
	75	B-	2.7
	70	C+	2.3
	65	С	2
	60	C-	1.7
	55	D+	1.3
	50	D	1
	0	F	0