



WIMMED 2021

ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
AWARDS FOR ARCHITECTURE STUDENTS JURY REPORT

MimED2021 JURY REPORT 4-5 DECEMBER 2021

The jury met on an online platform at 13:00 pm on Saturday, December 4, 2021, to determine the Architecture Education Association Students Awards [ArchED, "MimED" in Turkish]. The jury evaluation lasted until 20:30 pm on the same day and resumed at 11:00 am on Sunday, December 5, 2021. It ended at 21:00 pm on Sunday and was held in two sessions. Jury sessions were conducted under the head of Stefan Cristian Popa (Dr., Architectural Association) who was elected in the beginning of the first session by the jury members, with participation of Büşra Al (MSc. Architect, Plugofis), Sebla Arın Ensarioğlu (Assist. Prof. Dr., Bursa Uludag University) Ayşe Zeynep Aydemir (Assist. Prof. Dr., MEF University), Hasan Okan Çetin (Lecturer, Middle East Technical University) Senem Doyduk (Assist. Prof. Dr., Sakarya University), Ali Eray (MSc. Architect, PAB Architects), Spiros Papadopoulos (Dr., University of Thessaly), Nizam Onur Sönmez (Assoc. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Technical University), and Melis Varkal (MSc. Architect, Ofisvesaire) as jury members; Meriç Altıntaş Kaptan (Res. Assist., Istanbul Technical University) Başak Eren (Res. Assist., MEF University), İrem Korkmaz (Res. Assist., MEF University), and Emirhan Kurtuluş (Res. Assist., Istanbul Technical University) as coordinators; Sühan Artuğ (Res. Assist., Istanbul Technical University), Bahar Gökçen Kumsar (Res. Assist., Istanbul Technical University) Gülbin Lekesiz (Res. Assist., Özyeğin University), and Elif Öz Yılmaz (Res. Assist., Istanbul Technical University) as rapporteurs.

A total of 714 projects from 65 different universities have been submitted, 101 projects in total have passed the digital pre-selection and were announced on November 30, 2021.

In the digital pre-selection;
18 projects from the 1st year category,
24 projects from the 2nd year category,
31 projects from the 3rd year category,
28 projects from the 4th year category
passed.

1 project (1004) from the 1st year category, and
2 projects (4024 and 4006) from the 4th year
category among the projects that passed the
pre-selection were disqualified due to having

inscriptions that indicate the students' identity
on their boards.

Even if jurors considered several criteria such
as the level of research, originality, conceptual
coherence, the research of the context, and
the quality of representation, they decided to
discuss all projects within their specific context
without being limited to criteria. They started to
evaluate each category individually in the first
round. After the individual evaluation process,
they discussed the projects together. To sum up,
evaluations were made by all the jury members
by examining the projects simultaneously and
together based on projects' specific context.

FIRST YEAR CATEGORY

6 of the 18 projects from the 1st year category
were eliminated in the first round. 11 projects
passed to the second round of evaluation.

1th Round:

1011 was unanimously eliminated; 1015, 1008,
1009, 1017, 1003 were eliminated by the majority
of votes -with 1 dissenting vote, 2 dissenting
votes, 2 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 4
dissenting votes, respectively. 1001, 1002, 1005,
1006, 1007, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1016 and 1018
were moved to the 2nd round.

Notes on the Projects:

1003: The architectural program of this project
was appreciated. However, even if the program
is interesting and the space is developed to
some extent, the quality of the graphic materials
was found lacking in expressing the imagined
atmosphere.

1008: Although the project was praised as a fine
spatial exercise, and also for its experimentalism
and the use of novel techniques, in this instance,
spatial development was considered unrelated
to the intricacies of the real context or a well
developed architectural program or issue.

1009: Even if the main idea of this project was
found interesting, the project's total omission of
the interior volume or spaces of the parasitized
building was considered to prevent the
further development of the idea. The spatial
development and tectonic detailing were also
found insufficient.

1011: The project process was praised for its experimentalism and the use of novel techniques. However, in this instance, spatial development was found completely dependent on a context which is rather artificially defined or interpreted, mostly unrelated to the intricacies of the real context or issues; expressing more the quality of a random exercise, yet within a real urban situation. It was unanimously eliminated since it had no vote.

1015: The structural decisions were found interesting, however, with only formal parameters, the design approach was found too abstract. In addition, the relationship between the imaginary site and the project was found problematic.

1017: The jury regarded the contextual readings and spatial development of the project positively. However, the relationship with the existing structures and the final 3 dimensional expression were criticized as not expressing a similar level of sensitivity.

2nd Round:

1012 was unanimously eliminated; 1002, 1005, 1007, and 1014 were eliminated by the majority of votes -with 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 1 dissenting vote, 1 dissenting vote, respectively. 1001, 1006, 1010, 1013, 1016, and 1018 were awarded by following rewards:

1010 > Success Award

1018 > Encouragement Award

1001 > Jury Special Award

1006 > Jury Special Award

1013 > Jury Special Award

1016 > Jury Special Award

Notes on the Projects:

1001 (Jury Special Award): The project was considered highly positive with regard to its sensitive development of the architectural issue, confronting a social context through the conflicts and problems of a fictional character. The project was also praised in its development and lively expression of space with constant reference to the construction of the issue at hand. The final product is positively found experimental. However, the project was also considered somewhat less challenging (especially in terms of the spatial context) and

simple, compared to the others at this level, which may also be positive qualities depending on the context.

1002: The conceptual approach and the creation of a playful potential were regarded positively by the jury. However the relation with the existing built environment and the interaction between the elements of the spatial design found a bit underdeveloped. Also, the representational techniques of the pre-research might have been more descriptive.

1005: The sensitive design approach and the emphatic method followed were appreciated by the jury. Anyhow, the potentials of the existing space might have been reflected in the project with a more genuine strategy while improving the fluidity of the design schema.

1006 (Jury Special Award): In tackling the urban situation with its complexities through a superposition of apparently incompatible programs, the project was found courageous. The fluid organization of the lightweight spaces while preserving the void, and the development and expression of space were considered mature for this level. However, tectonic development and the definition of semi-closed spaces could be carried further.

1007: The project is inspiring in terms of its representation and process. The experimental approach is found positive. Hand-made productions and the project's language were found valuable for the first-year of architectural education. However, It is not clear how the structure and the site articulate each other. Besides, the second board does not include adequate material.

1010 (Success Award): The conceptual background and the social contextualization of the project were found very strong. Handling the existing situation, which is a complicated problem, was appreciated. The project was found sensitive in its readings of the existing buildings, through fragments of daily life. However, the level of architectural intervention and spatial definition were found incomplete by several jury members.

1012: The fictive tectonics created by the flexible structure which is produced by variable

combinations of a simple module found interesting by several jury members. The potential of presenting a spatial character was also admired. Although, the massive opaque body of the final design was criticized as creating a border and damaging the holistic urban experience of the user.

1013 (Jury Special Award): The project is inspiring in terms of its process and representational quality. The jury appreciated the profoundness of the main idea. Various types of sections as the unifying representational strategy is also found strong. However, the coming together of the fragmentary spatial elements, the manner and strategy of how these discrepant elements are collaged together, but also with the fictive context were considered unconvincing.

1014: The project process was praised for its experimentalism and the use of novel techniques. The use of viewpoints for carving out spaces from a set of prismatic spaces was found highly interesting. However, due to an abstracting out of all the perceptions, qualities and motives of potential viewers through the choice of drones as viewers, and a solidification of the rather random distribution of such viewpoints as abstract locations for the viewing event, considered simply as a geometric function, the project still runs the risk of separating the spatial formation from the intricacies or issues of the given urban context and/or architectural problematizations / events / programs. Which, in this instance, resulted in the quality of a random exercise, although intricate and inspiring.

1016 (Jury Special Award): The experiential character and the general approach of the project was found interesting. In more detail, how the project develops a dynamic experiential program, together with its constantly changing fluid space were found interesting. Proposals for how environmental parameters could be used to achieve this dynamic experience were found experimental and playful. In addition, the project presents a set of powerful images to express the imagined atmosphere. However some elements and aspects of the representation (esp. axonometrics and color usage) were considered diminishing the power of expression.

1018 (Encouragement Award): The development of the spaces through the carving of a void with respect to children's activities and perceptions was found highly interesting and successful. How the project tries to relate to the urban context was also considered positively. The level at which units, spaces, and elements are clearly described was also praised. However, the exterior development of the project was found unrefined and not adequately related to the interior formations.

SECOND YEAR CATEGORY

13 of the 24 projects from the 2nd year category were eliminated in the first round. 11 projects passed to the second round of the evaluation.

1th Round:

2006, 2019, 2021, 2023, 2024 were unanimously eliminated; 2010, 2020, 2013, 2008, 2009, 2017, 2005, and 2014 were eliminated by the majority of votes -with 1 dissenting vote; 1 dissenting vote, 2 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 4 dissenting votes, 4 dissenting votes, respectively. 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2007, 2011, 2012, 2015, 2016, 2018, and 2022 were moved to the 2nd round.

Notes on the Projects:

2005: The narrative and representations of the project were found strong, but the architectural details were not developed enough.

2006: The concept of the project was found unclear, and the site analyses were thought to be insufficient. It was also highlighted that there is a disconnection between the form and intention of the project.

2008: Although the fragments of the project were found positive, sections and other drawings do not support the main idea of the project.

2009: Spatial quality was found good, but the quality of the representations is not enough to express the whole project approach. It has problems regarding solidity and attitude towards linking with the street as a corner project. This solidity prevents potentials coming from the city. This is the reason why the project does not invite and work very well.

2010: The process of the project was appreciated, but the context was found unclear.

2013: It was thought to be a powerful project in terms of the level of research, but the analyzes are weak to reflect the project. The mass was also found too huge.

2014: Theoretical approach and architectural sensibility are appreciated, but the project was found undeveloped and lacking material to express itself.

2017: This project was found spatially well developed. However, even if it claims to be socially responsive, it has ordinary solutions with ordinary plans and sections.

2019: The project was found isolated from its site and lacking narratives.

2020: The representation techniques (collages and hand drawings) are original but the project is not developed enough in terms of the design approach.

2021: The empty shell design makes no reference to the city. The relationship between the text and the project is weak.

2023: The spatial relationship between the environment and the project was found weak. The program was also found simple and repetitive.

2024: The relationship between inside and outside was found weak. The representation techniques (diagrams, images, etc.) are confusing.

2nd Round:

2003, 2007, and 2012 were unanimously eliminated; 2001, and 2011 were eliminated by the majority of votes -with 2 dissenting votes, 1 dissenting vote, respectively. 2002, 2004, 2015, 2016, 2018, and 2022 were awarded by following rewards:

2004 > Success Award

2015 > Encouragement Award

2002 > Jury Special Award

2016 > Jury Special Award

2018 > Jury Special Award

2022 > Jury Special Award

Notes on the Projects:

2001: The jury acknowledged the potentials of the contextual framework and site analyses. However, the relation of the proposal with the existing built environment and the articulation of architectural spaces were considered underdeveloped and problematic.

2002 (Jury Special Award): Hand drawing representations of the project were considered highly impressive; however the overall proposal was found underdeveloped regarding the plans and three dimensional expressions. The project was praised for its analyses and the research on vernacular use of the space. The interchangeable and adaptive use of the created environment was found strong and the student's awareness appreciated by the jury.

2003: The level of research and analyses and the scope of contextual approach were found insufficient to inform the spatial development. Even if the space articulations have some potential, the relation of the structure with the existing buildings was found problematic.

2004 (Success Award): The project topic, the context and the articulation of spaces are found powerful and successful by the jury. The use of transformable structures and natural materials is found promising and considered that they create interesting effects. The project addresses important programs that are not common in which the project is located. It also mentions the history of the city. The fact that the project faces real-life problems is found positive by the jury. For example, the relation between the city and the park is impressive. The sensitive approach of design is easily understandable. Research, representation is strong. The program contains a wealth of fiction. Its function is interesting. Humour and a sensitive approach to design are found good. The relation with sub-units in the section is not well-defined. The process is found clear. The Tschumi effect and its references were a bit too much.

2007: The contextual approach and spatial response of the project were appreciated by several jury members. However, spatial qualities of underground spaces were criticized, and the spatial articulations were found underdeveloped.

2011: The idea of extending the park towards its periphery, appropriating it, was appreciated. However, broader questions regarding the motivations behind such an approach towards the city as well as the appreciation regarding the benefits/downsides of colonizing the rooftops were missing. The project seems to have been enthusiastically driven by the belief in the potential of rooftops to become a repository for vegetation, but the exercise remains aesthetic to a large extent, missing the opportunity of a critical inquiry into such interventions in urban environments.

2012: While the idea of creating a building design that facilitates the engagement of the audience is powerful, we found that the most visible feature of the building, the adaptive chromatic of the elevations and rooftop, was not part of the same conceptual register. The variable width and height of the spaces accommodating the different functions associated with the program as well as the structural intentions visible in the drawings have been largely appreciated.

2015 (Encouragement Award): Representation techniques and the awareness of the student are found successful by the jury. The project tackles the problems that a corner can create and it provides various vistas. It has a powerful diffusion on the existing built environment and also has a promising futuristic approach. While the provided daily life connection is significant, the project does not give adequate information about geometry. Fine-tuning details are impressive. The project focuses on problems in itself and is less concerned with urban problems and relations. There is not enough connection with the urban scale.

2016 (Jury Special Award): Different from the rest of the other projects it tries to be in a relationship with locals. It was found positive that the project was thought together with local material. It adapts to the topography using the slope in a good way. The relationship between the fiction of the model and topography was found to be positive. The character of space is interesting. The floor material's shaping of the roof was found to be creative, but there is weak relation in the section in the renders and perspectives. The project would have been expected to be associated with more issues

(such as materials and environment). The circulation is not understandable. It is not clear how the common areas are separated from each other.

2018 (Jury Special Award): The project site is iconic and historical, it handles the site's challenges. The transition between macro and micro scales was found to be successful. It's well solved, although difficult to create flexibility with functions. The flexibility approach is great. Analysis and diagrams are found well-developed. Structural relation is powerful and it creates potential. Modular system assembling was found open to development.

2022 (Jury Special Award): The simplicity of space is impressive. The second board was found meaningful in terms of containing details about daily life. Dream of space is convincing and the spatial quality is powerful. The project is a response to the phenomenological approach of architecture.

THIRD YEAR CATEGORY

16 of the 31 projects from the 3rd year category were eliminated in the first round. 15 projects passed to the second round of the evaluation.

1th Round:

3002, 3007, 3010, 3016, 3019, 3020, 3021, 3029, and 3030 were unanimously eliminated; 3005, 3028, 3003, 3027, 3031, 3011, and 3013 eliminated by the majority of votes -with 1 dissenting vote, 1 dissenting vote, 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, respectively. 3001, 3004, 3005, 3006, 3008, 3009, 3012, 3014, 3015, 3017, 3018, 3022, 3023, 3024, and 3026 were moved to the 2nd round.

Notes on the Projects:

3002: Plan solutions were not satisfying and the sense of scale was not proper. The diagrams of form and process explanation were not found sufficient. Facade descriptions were misleading.

3003: It was hard to relate to the two boards in terms of intention and the proposal. The character of the space was not understandable.

3007: There was no relation between the idea and the building. The idea was not defined very well and the context was found a bit generic.

3010: The program was undefined and there was a lack of architectural statements and research.

3011: The project had a scale problem. Considering being multi-layered (social and ethnic) was found positive. The relationship with the city was weak in terms of the section but it was better in plans.

3013: Pedestrian view and meeting to the sea attempt were good but there were meaningless spaces for just passing. Also, mass was found huge according to its context.

3016: The project was found problematic in terms of managing the scale and using conventional solutions.

3019: Even if the section of the building was found good, it did not reflect the properties of the project. Its attachment to the mountain was found imaginary.

3020: It was thought that the scale of the project did not fit the neighbourhood. The project did not relate to any historical/typological references.

3021: Even if the idea of the project was interesting, it was not well defined.

3025: The accessibility and circulation approaches were problematic. Even if differentiation of the units was good, this differentiation did not direct to the project as plans were too conventional.

3027: This project was found weak in terms of the unclarity of the concept and the unoriginality of the diagrams.

3028: The relationship with the environment was difficult to understand. It had strong potential but it was not well developed. The section did not express the project correctly.

3029: The project was too abstract and undeveloped. It was thought that there was a weak relation between the plan and the program, as well as the plan and the city.

3030: There was no relation between plans, 3D images, and sections. The general approach to the tunnel design and underground city was found problematic.

3031: Representation was very clear. Additional buildings were too narrow in terms of functionality. The project could not be detailed on more than a 1/500 scale.

2nd Round:

3004, 3014, 3022, 3023, and 3024 were unanimously eliminated; 3005, 3006, 3009, 3012, 3018, and 3026 were eliminated by the majority of votes -with 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, respectively. 3001, 3008, 3015, and 3017 were awarded by following rewards:

3001 > Success Award

3008 > Encouragement Award

3015 > Jury Special Award

3017 > Jury Special Award

Notes on the Projects:

3001 (Success Award): The project was located in a complicated urban area and had a struggle with continuities on the urban ground. The analysis part was strong and the project proposed a permeable ground floor usage which contributes to the ground level pedestrian network. While doing these, water was neglected; more definition was required for the relationship with the waterfront and water, and the relationship between the open spaces of the project and the square could be developed further. The project proposed interesting spaces in the section; however, the information about the structural system was lacking. Overall, the project contained a lot of data and information, although it was hard work, the student was able to cope with it.

3004: The effort to create a typological and morphological bond with the existing site in reference to industrial identity was welcomed. The proposed program diversity and its responses to new spatial relations were found quite positive. However, how the industrial character will be shaped or reinterpreted according to the new program was not so clear. In addition, the relationship with the topography

and the merging quality with the backside hill ridge was also found not well developed.

3005: The intention to create a pure relationship with the sea cliffs, the architectural tectonic quality of the horizontal linear element, and its variation capacity in the section were found as the positive sides of the project. Whereas, the weak relation of the other complex with the rest and the less detailed formal quality of the vertical tower were criticized. Even though the tectonic research was found promising, the overall design seems to be out of scale for several jury members. Meanwhile, the harsh interference with the natural landscape was found questionable. The representation of the project was not mature enough to express the real potential of the design.

3006: The morphology of the site was well analyzed. In terms of scale, the project was able to read the site well and develop a project accordingly. However, the idea of making the courtyards accessible was found problematic, which may lead to the destruction of the neighbourhood's tissue in the future. In addition, more definition was required for the spaces proposed, they remained schematic.

3008 (Encouragement Award): The idea and the intention to create a temporary situation were found interesting and relevant for contemporary cities. The machine language and its reflection on the presentation through powerful diagrams were very positive; yet, the relation between this machine aesthetic and its context was questioned. Even though the project proposed interesting open spaces, the response to the neighbourhood could be developed further.

3009: The definition of "public infesters" as the transformation tool for the historical buildings to the new defined functional necessities was found exciting. However, the transformation capacity of the new proposed structural system was not clearly understood, and the necessity of the feeling of invasion on the exterior facade of the historical buildings was also questioned.

3012: The search for an experimental architectural language was admired but on the other hand the symbiosis between two functions which was mentioned in the report

couldn't be succeeded in the overall design. The connection between the two facilities wasn't found to be mature enough. The final design couldn't become a "water building" and the intentions to make it that way stayed at a figurative level.

3014: The proposed fragmented structure that aims to establish a relationship with the coherent neighbourhood morphology was found promising. However, the fluency of the pedestrian movements planned to merge with the urban external circulation axis could not be seen clearly on the ground floor plan solutions. Moreover, the structural problems observed in the sections and the unidentifiable expression of the newly designed area in the presentation were criticized.

3015 (Jury Special Award): Through in-depth research on various buildings, the project proposed a generative model. The representation technique for the analysis of the buildings was found powerful and inspiring. However, the research was not transformed into an architectural project sufficiently. The relationship between the shell and the interior spaces were problematic. The structural definition was insufficient in the proposal and the project was not able to create a response to the context and its requirements.

3017 (Jury Special Award): The questions the project raises on shelter were transformed into an interesting research project. However, the architectural space developed based on this research remains experimental and was not developed much as architectural space. Despite some problems with technical drawings, representation was found strong.

3018: Project was huge and there was too much structure according to the settlement on a beach. It could not contact nature and water. The representation of the project led to a misunderstanding of the scale of the project and the relationship of solid-void. Pedestrian movements were found inspiring though.

3022: Even though the representation of the idea and the research about the architectural form were found impressive, the functional scenario was found underdeveloped. The user experience in the dramatic spatial void was not expressed at a mature level.

3023: The relationship established with the densely woven urban fabric was found quite successful, but this idea was expected to be supported by plan presentations in addition to the well-prepared axonometric. The scale of the proposed inclined urban deck and its lacking interaction capacity with the project area were also criticized.

3024: The project was well driven and conveys lightness despite the large number of square meters it houses. It was explained in the diagrams that the project attempts to integrate itself into a problematic and complex heritage area. However, there was too little information on the thought process regarding the conservation conditions of the site and how these form the massing. A section including the vicinity or detailed plans thereof was largely missed in this otherwise interesting project.

3026: The attempt to create a device to exhibit memory within this project was indeed successful. The concept generating the form, however, was antagonistic to something that was not clearly expressed in the project. Questions concerning the existing archive structure being criticized as well as the relationship symmetry/asymmetry to power were not posed. Furthermore, there was no clarity in respect to the reasons why the analogy symmetry-authority was made in the first place. While the jury appreciates the plasticity of the proposal and sees the curatorial effort behind the project, it was confused by the conceptual basis that appears not to be the product of in-depth source-based analysis.

FOURTH YEAR CATEGORY

18 of the 28 projects from the 4th year category were eliminated in the first round. 10 projects proceed to the second round of the evaluation.

1th Round:

4002, 4003, 4007, 4009, 4016, 4017, 4018, 4021, 4022, 4025 and 4028 are unanimously eliminated; 4005, 4008, 4014, 4027, 4015, 4011, and 4001 eliminated by the majority of votes -with 1 dissenting vote, 2 dissenting votes, 2 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes, 3 dissenting votes. 4004, 4010, 4012, 4013, 4019, 4020, 4023, and 4026 were moved to the 2nd round.

Notes on the Projects:

4002: Even though the plans are well presented, the spatial potential was not explored sufficiently. The contextual challenge is not visible and the interaction with its surrounding is lacking. The circulation strategy is not very clear and representation techniques are not found strong.

4003: The project focuses on an interesting research area and starts from an interesting concept. However, the contextual background remains unclear and therefore the relationship between inside and outside is not well developed. Morphology proposed is not convincing and the circulation should improve more in relation with common spaces.

4007: The presentation technique is interesting but makes it difficult to read the project. The spatial organization and the quality remains unclear. Besides, the main design decision which takes the highway to underground is questionable.

4009: The positive side of the project is the attemptation of giving an answer to the topological situation. However, there is no contextual explanation and it does not discuss anything. Representation techniques are not found strong. There is no clarity of the circulation.

4016: The idea is interesting but it is not resolved in detail. It is hard to relate to the context. There is no relation with public space. The program is found good but not convincing.

4017: The project has not been adequately related to the layers and historical context of the area. Creating new grammar is found positive.

4018: The scale of the building is problematic. It does not give any information about the current state, existing situation, and historical layer. The language is not found enough.

4021: It does not make any relation with the site. The project started with a good question but was not detailed enough for the answer.

4022: Plans and sections are good but the design approach is found very generic.

4025: It is a very simple approach, the addressed problem is not resolved about the historical site. The square is notably disturbed.

4028: The ratio of the open spaces, sense of the open space are lost. The landscape intervention is found insufficient.

4005: The project was articulated around the borderline between public and private. It is not clear to usage intention of green areas. The project is not well defined.

4008: The idea and text are impressive but not developed well. The weak part of the project is that it is not clear how nature shapes this infrastructure.

4014: The project is not well developed, it needs more detail. Conceptual backgrounds are developed well but the solution is not enough. The flexibility of the project is not understandable.

4027: The building is a little primitive, spaces are undeveloped. The graphics are good.

4011: The idea is strong but the design is weak. The potential of the walls is not used very well.

4015: It is not mature enough, it is primitive for the 4th-year project. Choice of material and lightness is found good according to the project site.

4001: Researching, expressing and representing the current situation was found to be strong. The project was able to create its own language strongly. Touching the rural area is a critical problem but how the project deals with this problem is insufficient. There is a lack of definition of how the road was designed and also the program is not clear.

2nd Round:

4004, 4019, 4020, and 4023 are unanimously eliminated. 4010, 4012, 4013, and 4026 were awarded by following rewards:

4026 > Success Award

4013 > Encouragement Award

4010 > Jury Special Award

4012 > Jury Special Award

Notes on the Projects:

4004: The starting statement and the approach to the contextual problem is strong. Design process is very promising however the proposal remains under-developed.

4010 (Jury Special Award): The project site is a difficult location and requires a sensitive approach. The project shows that sensitivity through an infill strategy. At an urban scale, the spaces proposed are inspiring, however for the new structures, the project remains underdeveloped.

4012 (Jury Special Award): The project explores an interesting question. Although the questions the project raises are strong, the research part still remains mostly as a historical account, and does not sufficiently explore the complexities of the issue of censorship, which appeared to result in a somewhat simplistic problem formulation. Nevertheless, the provocative approach of the project was still found valuable, together with how the architectural strategy and language were experimentally developed. This very strategy was also criticized as requiring more definition for the programs and the spaces it creates.

4013 (Encouragement Award): The project tries to understand and intervene into the rural situation in a highly sensitive way, resisting the urge to reduce its irreparably disparate layers, actors, and activities. This embracing of complexity, which contains spatial, cultural, and economic elements was found to be an important aspect of the project, and the complexity of the presented diagrams, collages and images were regarded as relevant architectural strategies, which eventually guide the formation of the equally complicated and fluid architectural interventions. Yet, the spaces remained mostly diagrammatical, and the tectonic and atmospheric detailing of the project appears less convincing than the problem formulation.

4019: This masterplan asks all the right questions in order to hijack conventional production cycles and propose an approach that rethinks material ecologies. The diagrams are clear and lucid and seem to be the result of thorough complex and multi-focused research.

What was missed in this proposal is the transition to an architectural level, where these concepts materialize using constructive means. Further development of these intentions as well as an inquiry into the role of architecture (or the architect) in this transformative process is missed and encouraged.

4020: The approach here seems to dilute into two questions, rather than one: on the one hand the question of the obsolescence of the radio and TV tower, and on the other one the question of a fictitious city. It is feared that the panels do not clarify the ways in which the two inquiries complement each other.

4023: The approach here is clearly communicated in the diagrams within the panels. However, the chosen graphic means for the renderings are questionable in relation to the chosen topic. The highly defined architecture contradicts to a large extent the conditions of the proposed communities, characterized by themes such as subsistence, emergency, disaster, survival, re-use, adaptation among many others.

4026 (Success Award): The project presents very good research and planning, and expresses a special awareness at all levels. The proposals are well-detailed, meaningful, and consistent, and are accompanied by a well developed spatial imagination, in the form of diagrams and collages. Although the overall planning decisions, architectural programs, and some technical specifications are explained extraordinarily well in diagrams, this diagrammatic architectural approach has been both questioned, as somewhat lacking as an architectural project, and praised as a relevant strategy for such development of regional visions. In addition, the project's sensitivity to less anthropocentric issues was found positive, as energy, water, ecology, recycling, etc. gained special focus in the project.

AWARDS

FIRST YEAR CATEGORY

Success Award

Gizem Helvaciođlu,
MEF Üniversitesi

Encouragement Award

Karsu İlhan,
MEF Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Ece Akıl,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Pınar Zeyrek,
MEF Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Sinem Göl,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Sude Turan,
MEF Üniversitesi

SECOND YEAR CATEGORY

Success Award

Mehmet Sait AKTAY,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Encouragement Award

Emircan Öztürk,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Ahmet Can Oflozer,
İzmir Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü

Jury Special Award

Mert Kaan Alptekin,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Emircan Öztürk,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Mert Kaan Alptekin, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

THIRD YEAR CATEGORY

Success Award

İrem Metin,
MEF Üniversitesi

Encouragement Award

Yasir Mahdi,
Altınbaş Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Ayşe Selcan Şimşek,
Tobb Ekonomi Ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi
Gölnur Aktaş,
Tobb Ekonomi Ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Nursena Çolak,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

FOURTH YEAR CATEGORY

Success Award

Mehmet Bulut,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Encouragement Award

Ceyda Yücesoy,
İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

Ezgi Su Tekin,
Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi

Jury Special Award

İlayda Nehir,
MEF Üniversitesi
Sümeyye Nur Öztürk,
MEF Üniversitesi
Karya Deniz Gülerer,
MEF Üniversitesi

MATCHING OF PROJECT NICKNAMES AND CODES

The students' project nicknames (M21-xxxxx) were matched with a coding (10xx, 20xx, etc.) by the coordination team. Only these codes were shared with the jury and rapporteurs.

FIRST YEAR CATEGORY

1001	M21-11862
1002	M21-11981
1003	M21-13006
1004	M21-13121
1005	M21-13915
1006	M21-14146
1007	M21-14422
1008	M21-14772
1009	M21-16024
1010	M21-16115
1011	M21-17091
1012	M21-17160
1013	M21-17667
1014	M21-18234
1015	M21-18613
1016	M21-19631
1017	M21-19840
1018	M21-19985

SECOND YEAR CATEGORY

2001	M21-20218
2002	M21-20356
2003	M21-21269
2004	M21-21339
2005	M21-21444
2006	M21-21606
2007	M21-22278
2008	M21-23274
2009	M21-23739
2010	M21-23849
2011	M21-24302
2012	M21-24458

2013	M21-25229
2014	M21-25409
2015	M21-25898
2016	M21-26398
2017	M21-26778
2018	M21-27229
2019	M21-27446
2020	M21-27671
2021	M21-28021
2022	M21-29028
2023	M21-29244
2024	M21-29562

THIRD YEAR CATEGORY

3001	M21-30090
3002	M21-30138
3003	M21-30197
3004	M21-30373
3005	M21-31468
3006	M21-31556
3007	M21-32273
3008	M21-33096
3009	M21-33819
3010	M21-34169
3011	M21-34184
3012	M21-34287
3013	M21-34644
3014	M21-34800
3015	M21-34936
3016	M21-35208
3017	M21-35257
3018	M21-35288
3019	M21-35890
3020	M21-35892
3021	M21-36886
3022	M21-37099
3023	M21-37349
3024	M21-37479
3025	M21-38188
3026	M21-38366
3027	M21-38561

3028	M21-39131
3029	M21-39172
3030	M21-39481
3031	M21-39990

FOURTH YEAR CATEGORY

4001	M21-40259
4002	M21-40350
4003	M21-40900
4004	M21-41128
4005	M21-41205
4006	M21-41252
4007	M21-42326
4008	M21-42945
4009	M21-43132
4010	M21-43265
4011	M21-43791
4012	M21-44113
4013	M21-44127
4014	M21-44207
4015	M21-44726
4016	M21-45077
4017	M21-45448
4018	M21-46119
4019	M21-46536
4020	M21-46563
4021	M21-46850
4022	M21-46866
4023	M21-47247
4024	M21-47413
4025	M21-47440
4026	M21-47902
4027	M21-48177
4028	M21-48850

www.mimed.org.tr

