2026 First-year Portfolio Review Guidelines

Successful completion of the Portfolio Review is required for admission to the second year of the Bachelor of Architecture program. Admission into the B.Arch program is competitive. This milestone is designed to help you reflect on your growth, demonstrate your skills, and ensure you are prepared to succeed in the program. Refer to the 2025 Bachelor of Architecture Degree: Curriculum Flow Chart for details on how portfolio review fits into the curriculum.

Minimum Eligibility Requirements
To be eligible for progression, students must meet the following minimum requirements:

1. Completion of the following prerequisite courses with a minimum a grade of "C" or higher:
   - ARCH 1000: Intro to Architecture
   - ARCH 1001: Arch Studio I
   - ARCH 1002: Arch Studio II
   - ARCH 1241: Design Communication

2. Have a minimum KSU GPA of 2.50 and a minimum ARCH GPA of 2.50 at time of evaluation.

Portfolio Content
The portfolio should only contain student-designed work, such as the projects competed in Studio 1 and Studio 2. Space is limited in the portfolio, so the work should be curated to represent the student's strongest work.

Portfolio Format
The portfolio should be a single PDF file, not to exceed 20MB. The formatting requirements are the following:
   - 8.5" x 11" page size
   - 21 page limit (includes title page)
   - The PDF should be exported as "spreads." In this format, the document should contain one title page and ten spreads.
   - Students will be assigned a portfolio review number. This number should be used in place of their name. No identifying information of the student or faculty should be in the portfolio.

Portfolio Submission
Students must submit a digital portfolio to the Department of Architecture at the end of the Spring semester of their first-year. The portfolios will be submitted through a designated digital platform which will be shared as the deadline approaches. The student is responsible for ensuring they upload their portfolio on time. Any questions regarding the submission process should be addressed prior to the day of the deadline.

Deadline
The deadline for submission is May 6th at 11:59PM.

Evaluation
A committee of full-time faculty will assess each portfolio using the Portfolio Evaluation Rubric.

Notification of Results
Final admission decisions are made by the department Chair. Students will be notified of their admission status via their KSU email.

Contacts
For course progression questions contact advising: cacmadvising@kennesaw.edu
For portfolio review process questions contact the faculty coordinators: archportfolio@kennesaw.edu
For additional resources, see the portfolio section of the Department website: Department of Architecture

Portfolio Evaluation Rubric

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS:
The table with black text is to assist you in reviewing the portfolio. Please mark the fields that best describe your evaluation.

The table in red text is your final evaluation. This will be used to categorize the portfolios for admission decisions.

Category	Not Acceptable	Needs Improvement	Marginal	Acceptable
Process & Intent	Unclear intent; minimal development or process documentation	Intent is understandable but lacks depth; limited process shown.	Design intent is clear; shows evidence of process and some development over time.	Clearly communicates strong design intent; process is well-documented, iterative, and conceptually rich.
Design & Spatial Thinking	Weak understanding of spatial relationships; poor spatial logic.	Adequate spatial reasoning; designs are basic but functional.	Shows good spatial awareness; ideas are coherent and logical.	Demonstrates a strong understanding of space, form, scale, and organization; creative and innovative spatial solutions.
Drawing & Representation	Poor drafting or representation skills; unclear drawings or misuse of conventions.	Inconsistent drawing quality; lacks clarity or graphic control in places.	Mostly clear and legible drawings; solid graphic techniques.	Drawings are clear, detailed, and expressive; excellent use of line weights, composition, and media.
Craft & Model Making	Rough models; lacks care or precision in making.	Acceptable craft; some care evident, but inconsistencies in finish or material use	Good craftsmanship; models are mostly well-built with some variation	Exceptional craftsmanship; models are clean, precise, and intentional with thoughtful material use
Visual Language & Composition	Composition and visual language are often unclear; hierarchy is poorly established or distracting	Composition is adequate; hierarchy and clarity are inconsistent, with some areas lacking refinement.	Portfolio and work are composed; visual hierarchy and flow are mostly strong with minor lapses.	Portfolio and work are well-composed; strong visual hierarchy, clear flow, and creative compositions throughout

Does the portfolio demonstrate that the student is prepared to succeed in second year studio?

No	Somewhat	Yes
Portfolio is **not acceptable** for entry into second year.	Portfolio is **marginal.**	Portfolio is **acceptable** for entry into second year.