



# WIMMED 2020

**ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,  
AWARDS FOR ARCHITECTURE STUDENTS JURY REPORT**

## MimED2020 JURY REPORT 5-6 DECEMBER 2020

The jury met on an online platform at 10:30 am on Saturday, December 5, 2020, to determine the Architecture Education Association Students Awards [ArchED, "MimED" in Turkish]. The jury evaluation lasted until 18:00 pm on the same day and resumed at 10:30 am on Sunday, December 6, 2020. It ended at 12:15 pm on Sunday and was held in two sessions. Jury sessions were conducted under the head of Hülya Ertaş (MSc., XXI Architecture and Design Magazine) who was elected in the beginning of the first session by the jury members, with participation of Güldehan Atay (Assist. Prof. Dr., Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University), Ilgın Avcı (Architect, CAA. Studio), Elif Erdine (Dr., Architectural Association School of Architecture), Orhan Hacıhasanoğlu (Prof. Dr., Özyeğin University), Elif Kendir Beraha (Assist. Prof. Dr., İstanbul Bilgi University), Ana Nikezić (Assist. Prof. Dr., University of Belgrade), Hakan Tüzün Şengün (Instructor Dr., İstanbul Technical University) as jury members; Meriç Altıntaş (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University), Oya Yeşim Armağan (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University), Bahar Gökçen Kumsar (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University), Emirhan Kurtuluş (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University), Buse Özçelik (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University) and Ayşe Tuğçe Pınar (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University) as rapporteurs; Erenalp Büyüktopcu (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University), İpek Avanoğlu (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University), Çağdaş Kaya (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University) and Merve Kılıçbay (Res. Assist., İstanbul Technical University) as coordinators. George Kunihiro (Prof., Tsinghua University) and Brian McGrath (Prof., Parsons School of Design) from the jury members were not able to join both sessions.

A total of 814 projects from 62 different universities have been submitted, 135 projects in total have passed the digital pre-selection and were announced on 02 December 2020.

In the digital pre-selection;  
14 projects from the 1st year category,  
44 projects from the 2nd year category,  
57 projects from the 3rd year category,  
20 projects from the 4th year category passed.

The whole selection was examined by the jury members individually in a given 3 hours in the first session. The jury determined criterias for the evaluation such as conceptualization (conceptual coherence, originality, creativity and criticality), research of the program, context (relation with the site both physical and cultural terms), spatial quality (spatial organization, architectural solution, diverse organization of the volume), representation skill (original manifestation of the idea, diversity of the techniques and coherence of the panels), tectonic refinement, project development process and social responsibility. Subsequently, evaluations were made by all the jury members by examining the projects simultaneously and together based on criterias that were decided.

### JURY COMMENTS ON 1<sup>ST</sup> AND 2<sup>ND</sup> ROUND ELIMINATIONS

**1<sup>th</sup> Year Category:** It was seen that the projects that were eliminated in the first round had shortcomings in terms of spatial organization in general; the lack of representation of the model making which is considered important for the thinking process in first year architectural education, was considered as a deficiency. The projects that were eliminated in the second round were eliminated because they fell behind the general ranking in terms of spatiality and originality, although they were better thought and detailed than those eliminated in the first round.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Year Category:** It was decided that the projects that were eliminated in the first round could not reach a sufficient level in terms of spatialization and representation, and those that were eliminated in the second round did not contain qualities such as spatial quality, conceptual consistency, and original representation.

**3<sup>rd</sup> Year Category:** In the first round, projects that are insufficient in terms of architectural narrative/ scenario, architectural analysis and contextual relationship were eliminated. In the second round, it was decided to eliminate the projects that have a weak tectonic quality and representation methods.

**4<sup>th</sup> Year Category:** In the first round, the main criteria were handling the research process and the architectural solution; the projects that could not fulfil these needs were eliminated. In the second round, the insufficiency of the tectonic setting and the weak programmatic relations were determinant.

### FIRST YEAR CATEGORY

4 of the 14 projects were eliminated in the first round and 5 in the second round. 5 projects passed to the third round of evaluation.

#### 1<sup>th</sup> Round:

1004, 1007, 1010 and 1014 are unanimously eliminated since they have "0" votes.

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Round:

1005, 1009, 1011 and 1012 are eliminated by the majority of votes with "1" dissenting vote.  
1001 is eliminated by the majority of votes with "2" dissenting votes.

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Round:

1002, 1003, 1006, 1008 and 1013 are moved to the 3rd round.

**1013** > Success Award

**1006** > Encouragement Award

**1002** > Jury Special Award

**1008** > Jury Special Award

#### Notes on the Projects:

**1002 (Jury Special Award):** The humanistic approach is appreciated. It has original and creative ideas. Its representation is refined and graphically successful. However, the relationship with the environment, especially the water, is found weak. It has been awarded the jury special award.

**1003:** Atmosphere, relation with context, originality, creativity found favourable. Research of the program and technical drawings could be elaborated more.

**1006 (Encouragement Award):** Contextualization of the project, being sensible to lighting conditions and circulation are strong aspects. Architectural considerations are well thought out for a 1st year. Conceptual approach situated at a high level including social layers and mentions

as well as physicals. Since the spatial hierarchy between the programs that the project proposes needs to be considered more, the project has been awarded the encouragement award.

**1008 (Jury Special Award):** It is found to be successful in terms of the ecological frame that it is set upon. The means of architectural language in the sense of expression and organizing spaces is successful. It is an environmentally sensitive and modular solution. Hard work is appreciated. The program of the project and the spatial organization produced by the programs should be monitored more closely. Since it is hard to follow spatial organisation and its atmosphere, it has been awarded the jury special award.

**1013 (Success Award):** Research and scenario built by the student is well developed. It is brave for a 1st year student. It is much stronger and complex than its counterparts. It is so punctual at research and creative at the design stage. It has the original concept and architectural solutions. Well balanced representation techniques, representation of light, and connection with the environment is successful. For these reasons, the project has been awarded the success award.

### SECOND YEAR CATEGORY

20 of the 44 projects were eliminated in the first round and 9 in the second round. 15 projects passed to the third round of evaluation.

#### 1<sup>th</sup> Round:

2001, 2004, 2008, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2025, 2026, 2033, 2034, 2036, 2038, 2040 and 2044 are unanimously eliminated since they have "0" votes.

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Round:

2005, 2007, 2014, 2027, 2032, 2037, 2039 and 2041 are eliminated by the majority of votes with "1" dissenting vote.  
2009 is eliminated by the majority of votes with "2" dissenting votes.

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Round:

2002, 2003, 2006, 2012, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2024, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2035, 2042 and 2043 are moved to the 3rd round.

**2012** > Success Award  
**2028** > Encouragement Award  
**2018** > Jury Special Award  
**2031** > Jury Special Award  
**2035** > Jury Special Award  
**2042** > Jury Special Award  
**2043** > Jury Special Award

#### Notes on the Projects:

**2002:** Architectural solution, layout and organization is good. The constructive elements are detailed and the sections have a good quality. It has a well organized architectural organization and good graphical representation. However, the relationship of the facade with its environment is found homogeneous and monotonous since it has a similar quality at every point.

**2003:** Despite the lightness of the structure which is highly valued, the spatial quality should be better. Scaffolding that connects contexts, the atmosphere and the relationship between open and semi open spaces found favorable. But, it seems like an unfinished project. The project was not defined well enough in the sense of architecture.

**2006:** It is in a dialog with the context. There is a good solution for environmental relations, using topography in architectural design in a successful way. However, the technical drawings are insufficient to show the relationship between the proposal and the adjacent buildings.

**2012 (Success Award):** Sensitivity to the context, the idea of bridge building, the combination of sensitivity and courageousness are strong. The program is found to be innovative and diverse. The fact that it is integrating environmental concerns and ecosystems into the proposal is a positive remark. It is very mature for a 2nd year project. It is sophisticated and ecologically concerned. The project tries to understand the environment and to find a way of dealing with it delicately. It finds a representation itself as a language for an infrastructural project with ecological concerns. Considering and analyzing the place and environment is a very well, balanced and environmentally-friendly architectural solution. There is too much effort and hard work. For these reasons, the project has been awarded the success award.

**2018 (Jury Special Award):** With an utopian and speculative approach, the research part is stronger than the architectural project. It possesses an original idea. It makes suggestions about sustainable design solutions like rainwater collection and filtration tubes, and integrates these with the architectural solution of new dwellings. The idea of integration to existing damaged buildings is good. However, there are some problems with the architectural solution regarding plans and so on. Representation could be stronger. For these reasons, it has been awarded the jury special award.

**2019:** The gentle way to dwell in space with articulation and circulation is appreciated. Literary reference is strong but the project is not developed architecturally very well. The narration is strong however the construction of the project is weak.

**2020:** It has a very successful composition with its morphological approach. However, this approach could not be adapted or translated into an architectural language.

**2024:** Conceptual approach, manifestation and axonometric representation of the idea is strong. However, considering it is a second-grade student, it needs to be developed more in terms of structure and architectural tectonics.

**2028 (Encouragement Award):** It is a very detailed and analytical project. The connection with the city is good. It has a very coherent structural system and very detailed facade system. Representations are good for a 2nd year student. However, the atmosphere of the site and its reflection on the program can hardly be observed in the boards. Therefore, it has been awarded the encouragement award.

**2029:** The concept and solution is good. The section sketch on the first board is quite strong. However architectural tectonics are expected to be more detailed and there is a need to illustrate the life inside with different techniques. Although it has a strong reference and material solutions it is missing the spatial relations.

**2030:** It has a strong concept. Illustration and representation are very strong. As you keep zooming in you can see more details coming out. There is good work in the sections. In terms

of speculative projects, it is very well detailed in close inspection. The scenario studied well however, there is a legibility problem in terms of the program and the contextual relations. Architectural tectonics and spatial organization are expected to be more detailed and the project needs further ways of representations to show the variety of life inside.

**2031 (Jury Special Award):** The structure is developed. The original shape and the interior-exterior relations are found favorable. Contextual approach is elaborative. Hand drawings give a special quality. Organization of spaces and free spaces is well designed enough. Architectural tectonics and construction pattern of the structure should be elaborated more. Therefore, the project has been awarded the jury special award.

**2035 (Jury Special Award):** It has an original idea related with tectonics and concepts. There is a good relationship with the environment. The metaphoric story, narration and concept are very strong. Decomposition of a text by Perret is good. Circulation system works quite well, and integration with the city is quite well. Representation technique of collage, visual flow is also interesting. However, It is very weak in the sense of architectural approach; it is still schematic.

**2042 (Jury Special Award):** It is well detailed. The lightness in structure and representation are favorable. However, the atmosphere of the site and its reflection on the program can hardly be observed in the boards. Therefore, the project has been awarded the jury special award.

**2043 (Jury Special Award):** The project has a current theme. The structural logic is also interesting. The conceptually well-defined, integrated speculative and futuristic approach is positive. The level of detail and representation are successful. However, the contextual relationships are weak, and the insufficient discussion of the landscape and land conditions and the solutions related to the inclusive design were criticized. It has been suggested that the circulation in the units can be improved. Therefore, the project has been awarded the jury special award.

#### THIRD YEAR CATEGORY

31 of the 57 projects were eliminated in the 1st round and 12 in the 2nd round. 14 projects passed to the 3rd round of evaluation.

#### 1<sup>th</sup> Round:

3002, 3010, 3011, 3013, 3014, 3016, 3018, 3019, 3021, 3022, 3024, 3025, 3027, 3028, 3032, 3033, 3035, 3036, 3037, 3038, 3039, 3041, 3042, 3045, 3046, 3048, 3050, 3054, 3055, 3056 and 3057 are unanimously eliminated since they have "0" votes.

#### 2<sup>nd</sup> Round:

3001, 3004, 3007, 3015, 3017, 3020, 3023, 3026, 3034, 3051, 3052 and 3053 are eliminated by the majority of votes with "1" dissenting vote.

#### 3<sup>rd</sup> Round:

3003, 3005, 3006, 3008, 3009, 3012, 3029, 3030, 3031, 3040, 3043, 3044, 3047 and 3049 are moved to the 3rd round.

**3049** > Success Award

**3012** > Encouragement Award

**3009** > Jury Special Award

**3047** > Jury Special Award

#### Notes on the Projects:

**3003:** Despite the positive approaches and efforts in 3D composition, façade, and its contemporary language; the spatial relations and organization of masses were not found to be satisfactory enough. In the sense of architectural approach, the project needs further development.

**3005:** The design research and model-making aspects are very interesting, yet disconnected. The project itself, on the other hand, did not reflect the research process sufficiently. The architectonic qualities in model-making are missing and not sufficiently emerging in the project itself.

**3006:** The presentation and conceptual approach were found to be successful however, the spatial qualities were noted to be not developed well enough. The dialectic approach to communal spaces should be emphasized more through technical drawings.

**3008:** The relation and integration with topography was found successful, the relationship with rural context and atmospheric qualities created were appreciated. However, the architectural project was not developed well, there were undecided points.

**3009 (Jury Special Award):** The adopted conceptual approach, theme and research of the project is found to be quite relevant to today's crisis. The architectural project was noted as strong and successful by means of its spatial compositions; open, semi-open, and closed space relations; integration with topography; organization of site plan, and expressions in technical drawings, sections, and 3D. The program was worked out very well, the contextual awareness is high, and the spatial hierarchy is strong. However, despite its strong initial ideas and conceptual framework, the architectural project was found to remain schematic at some points, not resolved well. It has been criticized that Dolapdere is not emphasized well enough as a spatial context, that the urban characteristics are not represented sufficiently and the project is built on an abstract plane. For this reason, the project was awarded the jury special award.

**3012 (Encouragement Award):** The project pays regard to the industrial heritage site in a prospering way and establishes a successful relationship. The representation technique was noted as successful, well balanced and refined. The attitude towards material use was found to be positive. However, the details of spatial quality and usage could have been enhanced; the relations and connections between spaces could be better constructed; it has been suggested that the relationship with the urban context needs to be improved. Therefore, the project has been awarded the encouragement award.

**3029:** The quality of the drawings, representation techniques, physical model and speculative character of the illustration style were found to be quite strong. However, the site relationship is rather ambiguous, not well-resolved; the architectural solution and details suggested were underdeveloped; and, the use of landscape as an environmental input was deemed incomplete.

**3030:** The project is architecturally well-solved; organization of spaces, consideration of different users, consistent representation of the facade and other elements in detail were found successful. However, the architectural solution proposed was not satisfactory in terms of examining the urban character of Beşiktaş Square and the contextual integration with the existing urban situation and everyday life was insufficient. The re-creation of the programmatic relationship with the Naval Museum and the removal of monumental elements in the area have been criticized.

**3031:** The conceptual approach was appreciated, but it was noted that this approach was not reflected in the architectural project sufficiently; the project was not adequately processed and detailed as a third-year project.

**3040:** The topographic relations, distribution of the architectural program, circulation scheme and level of detail were successful aspects of the project, but it was noted that the contextual decisions could not reach sufficient maturity. It has been criticized that an original proposal was not appropriately realized.

**3043:** The environmental analysis, architectural and spatial quality, and representation character were found to be successful, however, the relationship between indoor and outdoor spaces was found to be weak throughout the project. The spatial connections established by the open-spaces between the masses has been criticized as they suggest weak relations.

**3044:** The representations, atmospheric ideas, and the original programmatic approach that establishes a local-specific daily life were positive aspects of the project, however, it was noted that the proposed initial ideas were not reflected well in the architectural project, not detailed or represented sufficiently.

**3047 (Jury Special Award):** The relationship established with Karaköy district, Perşembe Pazarı and Haliç was found to be strong in various aspects. The architectural quality and spatial integrations proposed on different levels were satisfactory. The project is well-connected with the urban area and everyday life; it has strong environmental references, strong spatial relationship with its surrounding, micro program

proposals, therefore the contextual awareness was found to be successful; the representation of the idea, narration, and general concept were also succeeding and well-contextualized. However, it has been criticized that some apparent problems in the environment -such as heavy traffic load- were not discussed sufficiently in the proposal, the topographic character was not well reflected, and the programmatic proposal remained in a diagrammatic level at some points. It has been suggested that close-up representations can strengthen the narrative of the project. For this reason, the project was awarded with the special jury award.

**3049 (Success Award):** The project was found to be extremely strong in terms of its context, and the harmony between the analytical approach represented by diagrams, conceptual framework and architectural analysis was appreciated. The comprehensibility of the presentation, coherence of approaches, and the professional use of different representation methods in balance were positive aspects. The architectural solution and level of detail in the project were sufficient, and the interpretation of tectonic qualities through various representations has been found successful. Even though the project brings together different spatial situations and ecosystems which causes confusion, it was noted that this approach is related to the machine/factory conceptualization and strengthens the atmospheric character. For these reasons, the project has been awarded the success award.

#### FOURTH YEAR CATEGORY

8 of the 20 projects were eliminated in the 1st round and 3 in the 2nd round. 9 projects passed to the 3rd round of evaluation.

##### 1<sup>th</sup> Round:

4001, 4003, 4005, 4007, 4011, 4012, 4015 and 4020 are unanimously eliminated since they have "0" votes.

##### 2<sup>nd</sup> Round:

4010, 4014 and 4018 are eliminated by the majority of votes with "1" dissenting vote.

##### 3<sup>rd</sup> Round:

4002, 4004, 4006, 4008, 4009, 4013, 4016, 4017 and 4019 are moved to the 3rd round.

**4006** > Success Award

**4009** > Encouragement Award

**4008** > Jury Special Award

**4013** > Jury Special Award

#### Notes on the Projects:

**4002:** Although the power of three-dimensional representations of the project was found to be positive, the connection it established with the urban context and Karaköy District was considered to be weak.

**4004:** Despite the hard-work put on the project, it is hard to observe, understand the relations between spaces. The student is thoughtful about the common spaces however these spaces are not highly connected to the other spaces and the whole complex. The problem is related to the main focus/ main approach of the student. She/ he wants to build some happiness instead of a grey, unhappy city and the way happiness shows itself in architecture is through colors, collage in her/his approach. This way itself is found to be a bit naïve for a 4th year student. The execution of the idea is a picture not a space itself.

**4006 (Success Award):** In this reconstruction project, there is a diversity and complexity in the positive sense. It is sensitive to its context, includes successful site analyses that pay attention to its historical environment and architectural language. At the same time it has high level and balanced graphical representation. For these reasons, the project has been awarded the success award.

**4008 (Jury Special Award):** Project has high level place and neighborhood analyses that evolved into an architectural design. The solutions proposed for the urban/ spatial problems, and the architectural detailing are sufficient. Architectural proposal has an original character. However, the coherence of the presentation and the representational quality could be developed. Everyday life and the spatial atmosphere could be emphasized more. Therefore, the project has been awarded the jury special award.

**4009 (Encouragement Award):** Research part of the project was conducted in a meticulous way that is similar to a master's thesis. It has good environmental and morphologic analysis,

refined and balanced representation of written and graphical ways. Because of the research part that is mainly about concepts and aesthetical approach, the project has been awarded the encouragement award.

**4013 (Jury Special Award):** The project has a systematic approach from urban level to sophisticated tactical solutions. It has qualified conceptual ideas. Architectural results are represented by expressive graphical techniques. However, considering this weakness in architectural program research, it has been awarded the jury special award.

**4016:** The project remained at a conceptual stage, not sufficiently developed, elaborated, and adequately expressed. For example, the design of the facade, which is supposed to be kinetic, is not resolved. The fact that the visual and architectural language is not clear enough makes the project difficult to read. Not being appropriately detailed is one of the causes of elimination.

**4017:** The spatial scenarios in the project appear to be highly qualified. Although the idea of thinking about the future of architectural education is quite strong, it is not thought how to integrate it with the rest of the city. At the same time, it lacks overall architectural solution, originality and creativity. With this solution, architecture is reduced to the program. Although each section works within itself, these sections lack architectural tectonics. In addition, it has very strict representations and generally ordinary expressions.

**4019:** The project is context sensitive and conceptually strong. It is observed that the collage technique is used successfully. The language of representation is successful in general. However, the programmatic approach of the project was found to be weak, complex and disconnected from conceptual ideas.

## AWARDS

### FIRST YEAR CATEGORY

**Success Award**  
Mert Kaan Alptekin,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

**Encouragement Award**  
Ezgi Nil Duru,  
MEF Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Gözde Beyza Kartal,  
Gazi Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Pelın Takımcılar,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

### SECOND YEAR CATEGORY

**Success Award**  
Seren Esen,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

**Encouragement Award**  
Irem Metin,  
MEF Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Zeynep Kuzucu,  
Yeditepe Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Taner Durgut,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Kevser Aksoy,  
MEF Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Naz Nar,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
İlkan Akçelik,  
Yeditepe Üniversitesi

### THIRD YEAR CATEGORY

**Success Award**  
Arda Coşan,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

**Encouragement Award**  
İlayda Nehir,  
MEF Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Muhammed Hasan Zelveci,  
Kadir Has Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Mustafa Gelgeç,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

### FOURTH YEAR CATEGORY

**Success Award**  
Naz Üstündağ,  
Aleyna Köksal,  
MEF Üniversitesi

**Encouragement Award**  
Şadiye Yağmur Durak,  
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Sıla Saygılı,  
Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi

**Jury Special Award**  
Selin Alara Bilgin,  
Nazlım Demir,  
MEF Üniversitesi

[www.mimed.org.tr](http://www.mimed.org.tr)

