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December 15, 2011

Our sincere appreciation goes to you for your sponsorship of the this, our fourth annual, Architecture Student Design Competition featuring the CMU. With your support we are able to supply construction materials for construction of 4 full-scale models of designs in an outdoor site on the grounds of the main campus at Bowling Green State University. Your grant also allows us to offer cash prizes to design/build teams whose work is identified as making a significant contribution to design culture, and whose investigation of new stacking patterns adds potential to this standard construction material.

This year the focus of the design challenge was the ‘5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction,’ the theme reflects that the structures are built without mortar over centuries, just like the pyramids of ancient Egypt and ancient Roman aqueduct bridges. Additional objective was to provide students with the opportunity to create light, shade, and texture in a structure. After studying American artist Sol LeWitt’s experiments in concrete block system–specifically the 2001 Concrete Block Structure at the Storm King Art Center, and the 1997 Four-Sided Pyramid at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., the students went to Columbus, Ohio for a guided tour of the Oberfield’s factory, where they discussed the physical properties of CMU, and the logic of construction techniques. Interest concentrated on the manifold processes in the manufacture and
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use of CMU’s particularly the relationship between the block density and it's intended use. We also study about mortarless block methods of constructing CMU walls such as Bolt-A-Blok, Azar Block and among others.

A questionnaire distributed among the students after the design/build competition rendered the following results: two/thirds of the respondents strongly agreed that the competition was very fruitful; over sixty percent thought that the exercise was very helpful in allowing them develop a critical perspective on CMU, and better interaction and understanding of CMU as an construction material.

Free written comments showed that most students appreciated the opportunity to have participated on the Architecture Student Design Competition for enhancing the quality of learning. Representative remarks include:

“Competition as a motivator.”
“The experience working with the blocks.”
“The process of going from design phase to construction.”
“Working with others designing a design in a group with a new material.”
“The fact that we were able to get out of the classroom and build a design.”
“It requires knowledge from this and previous classes to build the structure wall.”
“I enjoyed the challenge of having to design a small space with big meaning with limited materials of choice.”

On behalf of the Department of Architecture and Environmental Design at BGSU, students, staff and faculty, I would like to express our sincere gratitude to NCMA Education and Research Foundation, and OMA for your continued interest and support.

Dr. Andreas Luescher
Professor of Architecture and Environmental Design
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ARCH 3360: Architectural Materials and Systems will participate in a design/build competition sponsored by the National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation. Totally 24 Students working in eight teams of three will design a structure to be built entirely out of concrete masonry units (CMU). Each team will put together a design presentation which will be evaluated by a jury of professional designers. Presentations will include exploratory drawings, a brief essay explaining the conceptual and pragmatic aspects of the design and a digital model. The first jury will select four projects to be built full-scale. Outdoor construction of the chosen designs will be carried out with the support and cooperation of everyone in the class. All construction will be completed within four class periods. A second jury will then select three of the four entries for recognition. Design quality and masonry construction techniques will be the basis of the evaluation.

We will begin with a field trip to Oberfield’s concrete products plant in Columbus, Ohio on Thursday September 1st, 2011.
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

This project is designed to focus attention on the physical properties of materials and the logic of construction techniques. First-hand knowledge of materials - not only what they look like, but their texture, their heft, their pliability and their particular joining requirements expand a designer’s conceptual range and design intelligence. Actual experience handling materials and meeting the demands of construction techniques gives an understand that cannot be duplicated in any other format. Materials and construction are fundamental to design and not merely functional' or 'technical' concerns to be worked out later. Materials and construction techniques can be appreciated as aesthetic contributions, not just their physics.

a. Aesthetic Concept
b. Innovative Use of Concrete Masonry Materials
c. Functional Use of Concrete Masonry Materials
d. Constructability of Design Plans
e. Concrete Masonry Hardscape Design
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Program:
You, as designers, will be asked to explore the historical, architectural, sculptural and environmental aspects of an outdoor space that will be assigned. Architectural history is full examples of interior spaces incorporating outdoor spaces. Windows do this of course, but in Le Corbusier’s roof garden at the Villa Savoye outside Paris (1928-30), the sky is utilized as walls and ceiling. Donald Judd’s minimalistic art spaces in Marfa, Texas do the same.

It is up to you to design a structure that goes beyond the traditional boundaries of (closed) architectural space by integrating the surrounding landscape and environment in the completed piece. Each design folie must specifically address condition(s) and reference(s) as follow:

a) a ground plot approximately 8’ x 8’
b) at least a two steps difference in height between ground and platform
c) a panoramic opening that frames the surroundings like in a painting
d) reference Sol LeWitt’s work (1928-2007)
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Site:
The four selected designs will be build next to the Parking Lot 19 on Poe Street across from the Technology Annex (Aviation). The parking lot and its contents, the trees, the small man-made hill and the airport hanger should all be considered as elements of your design.
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This design competition is open to all registered BGSU junior standing architecture students and including ARCH 3360: Architectural Materials & Systems with the exceptions of any person whose relationship to a juror might affect the juror’s impartiality in carrying out his or her responsibilities.

Students enrolled in ARCH 3360: Architectural Materials & Systems are required to participate in groups of three. Each group will select a member to act as project manager and design representative at the juried presentation. In addition each team must have at least one junior standing architecture student.

Each submission must include a separate entry form, and each entry form must list all group members.
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Part One:
All entries must be submitted without identifying marks, (logos, text, insignia, or images) on any presentation component. Any submission that contains written or graphic material that in any way identifies the student authors will be disqualified.

Teams must submit a copy of the completed registration form along with submission on an CD-ROM in an opaque case.

Part Two:
No visible sign of the submission’s authors (students) in any shape or form on any presentation components.
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Part One:
Item 1: Two (2) 20”w x 20”h boards to be presented together as a single 40”x 20” horizontal presentation (incl. CD-ROM). Each board must be mounted separately on 1/4” white foam board. Each board must include the group’s registration number in the lower right-hand corner of the board using a 48-point font.

Item 2: Required Drawings:
Board One (left board in overall presentation):
Process Sketch(es), Analytic Diagram(s), Proposal Rendering (Digital Modeling)
Board Two (right board in overall presentation):
Technical Documentation (Plan, Section, Elevation, Details, etc.)

Item 3: Required Brief Design Statement

Part Two:
Execution of design at 1:1

Submission Requirement
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Part One:
Thursday, September 1, 2011: Field Trip to Oberfield’s
Tuesday, September 6, 2011: Competition Registration Opens
Tuesday, September 13, 2011: Registration Deadline
Tuesday, September 27, 2011: Submission Deadline.
Entries must be received by 6:00pm to be juried.
Tuesday, September 27, 2011: First Round of Jury Deliberations and Public Announcement of the four selected Design/Build Projects

Part Two:
Tuesday, October 04, 2011: 1. Session of Design/Build
Thursday October 06, 2011: 2. Session of Design/Build
Thursday, October 13, 2011: 3. Session of Design/Build
Tuesday, October 18, 2011: 4. Session of Design/Build
Thursday, October 20, 2011: 5. Session of Design/Build
Either Tuesday, October 25 or Thursday, October 27, 2011:
Final of Jury Deliberations and Public Announcement of the three prize-winning Design/Build Projects incl. Public Reception

Tentative Schedule
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Final Jury:
Architecture Department Professor:
Scot MacPherson, AIA, NCARB, Architect and Lecturer,
Bowling Green State University

Construction Department Professor:
Wilfred Roudebush, Ph.D., NCARB, LEED AP, Associate
Professor of Construction Management Technology

Local Architect:
Craig Pickerl, AIA, LEED AP, EDAC, SSOE Group, Toledo

OMA State:
Josh Naragon
Ohio Masonry Association, Executive Director

Alternative:
Mike Rowe, AIA, Buehrer Group Architecture and
Engineering, Inc., Maumee

Award:
Best Design First Place $1,000.--
Best Design Second Place $500.--
Best Design Third Place $250.--
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Registration
Number: ____________________________

Project Title: ________________________

Team Members:
1. _________________________________
2. _________________________________
3. _________________________________

Team Contact
and Address: _________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
_______________________________
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When:
Thursday, September 1, 2010: Oberfield’s Tour @ 1:15 PM

Where:
Oberfields Inc.
1221 Alum Creek Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43209.
Contact: Joe Russ (614) 309 2791

Directions:
We will take Route 23 down to I-270 on the north side of Columbus. Follow I-270 east to I-71 south that goes to downtown Columbus then go east on I-70 to the Alum Creek exit which is about 2 1/2 to 3 miles. As we drive down the ramp stay straight and cross Alum Creek and Oberfield's plant is right in front of us. We can park in the front lot to the right and we go around the corner to a door that faces the drive we came in on.
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Sol LeWitt  Concrete Block Structure, Storm King Art Center, 2001
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Field Trip to Concrete Factory: September 1, 2011
Competition Registration: September 6, 2011
Design Competition (Part I): September 6-22, 2011
Midterm jury will take place: September 27, 2011
Build Competition (Part II): October 4-20, 2011
Final jury will take place: October 25, 2011
Field Trip to Oberfield’s Solid Performance in Concrete Products
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Team Members: 1. Joe Phillips
2. Amy Golden
3. Todd Durval
Team Contact (e-mail): jphilli@bgusu.edu

Team Members: 1. Josh Hostetler
2. Kelly Snyder
3. Kyle Swind
Team Contact (e-mail): snyderm@bgusu.edu

Team Members: 1. Josh Phillips
2. Mitch Kalb
3. Scott Gilbert
Team Contact (e-mail): mitchkalb@bgusu.edu

Team Members: 1. ST. Amil
2. Holly Guinell
3. Ben Aigner
Team Contact (e-mail): hguinell8@bgusu.edu

Registration Form/Page 1
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Team Members: 1. **Ryan Moninger**
2. Mark Marquis
3. Joseph H. Maloney

Team Contact (e-mail): marquis@bgsu.edu

Team Members: 1. Heather Allen
2. Ryan Scanlan
3. Matt Zix

Team Contact (e-mail): r.scanlan@bgsu.edu (Ryan)

Team Members: 1. Tom Zarack
2. Adam Coup
3. Karl Boekli

Team Contact (e-mail): tzarack@bgsu.edu

Team Members: 1. Katie Yinger
2. Lara Jones
3. Devin Adams

Team Contact (e-mail): k.yinger@bgsu.edu

Registration Form/Page 2
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AT BALANCE

Our design is inspired by the works of artist, Shane Hart Paul Gregory and the idea of finding and maintaining a balance in the life of a college student. Just as in our college journey we are faced with the challenge of finding a balance between studies and other responsibilities, the visitor travels up the length of the wall, moving much like a gymnastic rod on a balance beam. As the end of the path the visitor discovers a contoured wood bench branching out from the OMI Blocks. This piece functions due to the perfect balance that has been achieved and offers a unique seat to venture out onto.

FORM INTEGRATING NATURE

The purpose of this design is to represent how one can integrate a structural form within nature. The natural component of the design is a boulder that is representative of the inherent site conditions. The block moves to incorporate into the composition. The main structure of the form departs from the boulder via a transition and the adjacent dimensions. The form gives function to the boulder by use in the structure. The boulder gives function to the form by serving as a place to sit and appreciate the view. The towering heights between the front and back wall is intended to allow the existence of an open view, and call out entry. Another method of calling out entry is the river rock bed at the entrance. This design comments on the relationship between nature, the site, and structure. These themes hold true because it is important for architects to design with an intention that incorporates both the materials used and the natural environment surrounding the site.
The Road Not Taken...

The concept of our structure was to create an interactive sculpture piece that is modeled after Robert Frost's poem, "The Road Not Taken". The poem speaks of the author coming to a fork in the road while traveling through the woods, and his thought process as he decides which path to take. One path is clearly cut, and easy to navigate while the other is unkown, and for more mysterious than it's predecessor. The message that this poem is conveying is that while some choices may be clear, they may not reap the same benefit as others. The same concept can be applied to the design of this sculpture which encourages members of the community. This concept is furthered in our design through the two paths created by the Criblocks, one is cut and clear and fragmented in order to indicate a stronger assembly, while the other path is complex and much easier to navigate.

Suspended Moment

Students are often faced with multiple paths of which to choose. Many of these paths lead to nothing more than a dead end. However, with the right amount of guidance and good decision of the student's behalf, some of these paths end up leading to windows of opportunity and leaps of faith in the next of these paths of their future. Some paths concern short-term future and others long term future, to ones education, career, lifestyle, family and in a whole, the rest of their life. The most interesting of these events is when these paths cross in a suspended decision of fate. Then one must decide to take the path of opportunity or take a leap of faith.
Diverging Paths of Society

The paths that individuals travel along through life are often represented by the choices they make along their journey. Our design simulates these decisions through a physical representation of the obstacles and choices encountered throughout the journey and the varying effects it has on individuals.

As one begins the path, they are faced with an obstacle in the center of the path. This encounter is symbolic of the many trials in life. The obstacle provides two possibilities of direction. Veering left under the shelter is symbolic to reacting to the obstacle with the help of others, avoiding the path to the right of the obstacle signifies responding on your own, without assistance.

The intention of the design is to present four unique scenarios that result in either success or failure. The path of success widens and rises up out of the ground. This path of failure concludes in a usable, utilized field.

The river that forces you to retrace around implies trials of life that affect your direction. The vegetation throughout the success path signifies growth and experience and becomes more dense toward the end of the journey. The essence of life, ending in failure, is suggested by the collision of the separating wall and erosion of dirt into the path of failure.

INTERACTION OF ELEMENTS

The idea behind our design comes from the interaction of tectonic plates and their relationship to the Earth. As tectonic plates move, they often collide and create fractures causing the Earth to shift. These movements have a high impact on the world however, abruptly changing its identity as a whole. In order to best represent this idea, our group combined the elements of wood and concrete to create a clear visualization of the fractures. The concrete element was used first in order to create a solid mass which symbolized the Earth and its solid inner core. Wood was then combined with the concrete to represent the tectonic plates and how they relate to the Earth. To create the feeling of collision and movement among the tectonic plates and the Earth, the wood was built into the concrete and also separated from it. The Earth's reaction or shift to the collision of the tectonic plates was then represented by subtracting a simple form on top. We chose to subtract a single form so that the essence of the Earth would not be lost. In order to create a design which was not only symbolic but also functional, the tectonic plates were placed strategically to create seating and also a staircase to the top of the model. Also, the top portion of the model creates more seating. The model was placed to ensure that the tectonic plate that also functions as a seat is facing the most aesthetic view of the site.
When approaching this structure, one may believe it to be an impregnable fortress. However, the closer a person gets, there is a course that goes through. Entering Royal View leaves one with a feeling of cozy quarters and being surrounded, but trying to find a way out. One quickly finds a narrow opening; only large enough to catch a glimpse of the outside world and travel up and out with a feeling of relief and freedom.

Two Different Views

Hidden View

Isometric Sketch

Opening up Through

MONOLITHIC STRENGTH

Strong simple lines and clean geometries define a unified mass that exhibits an unchanging strength. This strong presence is born from the density solidity of CM blocks. These blocks are arranged into an imposing form that is cut by and connected to a wooden cantilever. The relationship formed between the concrete cube and the structural wood is one of dominance. Together, they instill in us a greater depth of strength through the context of the organic, smooth wood with the hard, gritty CM: the thin cantilever against the massive cube, and the warm color of wood versus the cool, industrial color of concrete. The interrelated cube site as a site mass composed of power that ideally eliminates the 8 X 8 ft. space gaves to build within. When the guard box is compared to the substantial scale of the structure its presence is reinforced.

Monolithic structures are created by society to remember, commemorate, or celebrate. From these three purposes, intentions are melded into monumental structures. Intentions can range from solemn to proud, from meditation to enthusiastic, and are meant to reinforce the strong purpose and emotion. Our structure is a monumental and solemn box, not a joyful celebration. That feeling binds itself to the purpose of representing the strong simplicity of orthogonal geometries and distinction of linear lines in the form of a monolithic structure.
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Registration
Number: 18

Project Title: FORM INTEGRATING NATURE

Team Members:
1. T. O'NEILL
2. A. SOLORZANO
3. J. PHILLIPS

Team Contact
and Address:
ANNA S: 419 333 0203
TODD D: 419 320 1017
4232 Rivertown Rd Toledo OH 43614
SHEPARD: 419 944 8848
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Registration Number: 21

Project Title: AT BALANCE

Team Members:
1. Kyle Schroeder
2. Molly Snyder
3. Josh Hostetler

Team Contact and Address:
Kyle Schroeder
9410 Five Point Rd.
Perrysburg, OH 43551
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Registration
Number: 25

Project Title: THE ROAD NOT TAKEN

Team Members:
1. MITCH BLAKKOLB
2. SHAUN GILBERT
3. JOSH PHILLIPS

Team Contact and Address:
MITCH BLAKKOLB
MITCHBL@BGSU.EDU
2055 NAPLESON RD, APT 9E
BOWLING GREEN, OH
43402
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Registration Number: 32

Project Title: Suspended Moment

Team Members:
1. CJ Ansin
2. Holly Grunwell
3. Ben Algire

Team Contact and Address:
Holly Grunwell
184 E Court St
Bowling Green OH 43402
419-344-8925
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Registration Number: 39

Project Title: DIVERGING PATHS OF SOCIETY

Team Members:
1. Ryan Moninger
2. Mark Marquis
3. Joe Maloney

Team Contact and Address:
Ryan Moninger
419-769-4426
433 Thurston Ave, Apt 10
Bowling Green, OH 43402
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Registration Number: 49

Project Title: Interaction of Elements

Team Members:
1. Heather Allen
2. Ryan Scanlan
3. Matt Zix

Team Contact and Address:
Heather Allen
652 N. Enterprise St.
Apt. 127
Bowling Green, OH 43402
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Registration Number: 55

Project Title: Royal View

Team Members:
1. Karl Boegli
2. Tom Zarack
3. Adam Coop

Team Contact and Address:
(419) 559-7436
Karl Boegli
706 Napoleon Rd, Apt. 713
Bowling Green, OH 43402
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Registration Number: 60

Project Title: Monolithic Strength

Team Members:
1. Katie Yinger
2. Devin Adams
3. Lana Jones

Team Contact and Address:
Katie Yinger
107 W. Wooster
Bowling Green, OH 43402
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale 1 low - 5 high**
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[Logo of the Foundation]

Sponsored by [Bowling Green State University]
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<td>Innovative Use CMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Use CMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructability of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION**

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction

Fall 2011
### Architecture Student Design Competition

**Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction**

**Fall 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Innovative Use of CMU</th>
<th>Functional Use of CMU</th>
<th>Constructability of Design Plans</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jury One: Ranking**

---

**Sponsored by**

[National Concrete Masonry Association](#)  
[Foundation](#)  
[BGSU](#)  
[ Bowling Green State University ]
### ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction  
Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Aesthetic Concept</th>
<th>Innovative Use CMU</th>
<th>Functional Use CMU</th>
<th>Constructability of Design Plans</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jury One: Ranking**

[Logo of National Concrete Masonry Association]

[Logo of BGSU - Bowling Green State University]

**Scale: 1 low - 5 high**
Winners
November 1st, 2011

Heather Allen
Ryan Scahan
Matt Zix

First Place

Kyle Schwind
Josh Hostetler
Molly Snyder

Second Place

Third Place

Mark Marquis
Joe Maloney
Ryan Moninger

Fourth Place

Shawn Gilbert
Mitch Blakkolb
Josh Phillips
# Architecture Student Design Competition

**Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction**

**Fall 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge I</th>
<th>Judge II</th>
<th>Judge III</th>
<th>Judge IV</th>
<th>Judge V</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judges’ Score**

Sponsored by [National Concrete Masonry Association](#) and [BGSU](#) - Bowling Green State University

- Rev. 1st 2011
# Architecture Student Design Competition

## Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic Concept</th>
<th>Innovative Use CMU</th>
<th>Functional Use CMU</th>
<th>Craft and Construction</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale 1 low - 5 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Final Jury: Ranking

Sponsored by [National Concrete Masonry Association](#) Foundation [BGSU](#)

Bowling Green State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetic Concept</th>
<th>Innovative Use CMU</th>
<th>Functional Use CMU</th>
<th>Craft and Construction</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Jury: Ranking**

**Sponsored by**

[Foundation Logo]

[ Bowling Green State University ]
### ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

**Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Concept</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Use CMU</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Use CMU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft and Construction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1 low - 5 high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Jury: Ranking**

[Logo: National Concrete Masonry Association]

[Logo: BGSU - Bowling Green State University]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Aesthetic Concept</th>
<th>Innovative Use CMU</th>
<th>Functional Use CMU</th>
<th>Craft and Construction</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Jury: Ranking**

Sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association

BGSU, Bowling Green State University
**ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION**

*Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction*  
*Fall 2011*

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Field trip as introduction:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a. knowledge gained about production</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. understanding of applications of product</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. understanding of the masonry techniques</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. visit as a motivator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Competition brief:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>a. organization of information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. clarity of information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. adequacy of information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. relevance/practicality of information</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Design program:</th>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>a. pace of the process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. aims and goals of the design challenge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. suitability of site</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. input/support from faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Judging:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a. jurors as a group</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. jury feedback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. evaluation criteria</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. effectiveness of anonymous judging</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?  
   _Allowability of creative designs_

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?  
   _The crummy weather_

---

**Evaluation**

[Logo]  
National Concrete Masonry Association  
**FOUNDATION**  
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
      Excellent...............................Poor
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
      Excellent...............................Poor
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
      Excellent...............................Poor
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
      Excellent...............................Poor
      5  4  3  2  1
      5  4  3  2  1
      4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   The process of going from design phase to construction

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?

Evaluation

sponsored by

BGSU,
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as Introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
      Excellent ..................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. understanding of applications of product
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. visit as a motivator
      5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   Excellent ..................... Poor
   a. organization of information
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. clarity of information
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. adequacy of information
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. relevance/practicality of information
      5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   Excellent ..................... Poor
   a. pace of the process
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. suitability of site
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. input/support from faculty
      5 4 3 2 1

Judging:
   Excellent ..................... Poor
   a. jurors as a group
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. jury feedback
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. evaluation criteria
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
      5 4 3 2 1

4. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   Team on excellence

5. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?

Evaluation

National Concrete Masonry Association

sponsored by FOUNDATION

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   Competition as a motivator

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Group effort

Evaluation

sponsored by
National Concrete Masonry Association
FOUNDATION
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent.........................Poor
   Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent.........................Poor
   Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent.........................Poor
   Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent.........................Poor
   Rating: 5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
The field trip was nice but it would have been better if it was at a closer location.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   My group was one that had a project selected.

Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   HANDS ON

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   NON

---

Evaluation

National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation
Bowling Green State University

Page 55 of 74
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as Introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td>5 4 ☐ 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?  

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?  

_during_our_work

---

Evaluation

sponsored by

Bowling Green State University
**ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION**

*Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction*
*Fall 2011*

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. **Field trip as introduction:**  
   a. knowledge gained about production  
   b. understanding of applications of product  
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques  
   d. visit as a motivator  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Competition brief:**  
   a. organization of information  
   b. clarity of information  
   c. adequacy of information  
   d. relevance/practicality of information  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Design program:**  
   a. pace of the process  
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge  
   c. suitability of site  
   d. input/support from faculty  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Judging:**  
   a. jurors as a group  
   b. jury feedback  
   c. evaluation criteria  
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 4 3 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?**  

I enjoyed the challenge of having to design a small space with big meaning with limited materials of choice.

6. **What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?**  

My third partner CJ, he did not perform any of the tasks asked by myself and Holly and the ones he did do were so bad we had to re-do them anyways.

---

**Evaluation**

Sponsored by  
**National Concours Maturity Association**  
**FOUNDATION**  
**Bowling Green State University**
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent................. Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent................. Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent................. Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent................. Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   The experience working with the blocks

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Not being able to talk to the final

Evaluation

sponsored by
BGSU.
Bowling Green State University

Page 58 of 74
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   - a. knowledge gained about production
   - b. understanding of applications of product
   - c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   - d. visit as a motivator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Competition brief:
   - a. organization of information
   - b. clarity of information
   - c. adequacy of information
   - d. relevance/practicality of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Design program:
   - a. pace of the process
   - b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   - c. suitability of site
   - d. input/support from faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Judging:
   - a. jurors as a group
   - b. jury feedback
   - c. evaluation criteria
   - d. effectiveness of anonymous judging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   - [Blank]

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   - [Blank]
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   WE GOT TO BE HANDS ON AND PUT THE PRODUCT IN USE RATHER THAN JUST SITTING IN GLASS

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   RAIN MADE IT HARD TO BUILD. TURF AT FAIR JUDGING WERE NOT THE SAME AS FIRST TIME SO THEY WERE NOT FAMILIAR WITH OUR CONCEPT.

Evaluation

sponsored by FOUNDATION
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent...........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent...........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent...........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent...........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   (Required knowledge from this and previous classes to build the)
   Structure well

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   (Not knowing how to build someone else's project)

---

Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

Bowling Green State University

Page 61 of 74
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator

   Excellent ......................... Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information

   Excellent ......................... Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty

   Excellent ......................... Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging

   Excellent ......................... Poor
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1
   5  4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   Hands on experience, field trip most useful

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Not being able to build actual design

Evaluation

National Concrete Masonry Association

sponsored by BG SU.
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent..............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent..............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent..............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent..............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   DOING FIELD WORK + WORKING WITH MATERIAL

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   COULD NOT PRESENT TO FINAL JURY MEMBERS

Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. **Field trip as introduction:**
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Competition brief:**
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Design program:**
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Judging:**
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   __________________________________________________________________________

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   __________________________________________________________________________

   Evaluation

   National Concrete Masonry Association

   sponsored by FOUNDATION

   Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator

   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information

   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty

   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging

   Excellent............................Poor
   5  4  3  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   The fact that we were able to get out of the classroom and build a design

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   N/A

Evaluation

sponsored by

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production  
     Excellent..........................Poor
     5 4 3 2 1
   b. understanding of applications of product  
     5 4 3 2 1
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques  
     5 4 3 2 1
   d. visit as a motivator  
     5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information  
     Excellent..........................Poor
     5 4 3 2 1
   b. clarity of information  
     5 4 3 2 1
   c. adequacy of information  
     5 4 3 2 1
   d. relevance/practicality of information  
     5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process  
     Excellent..........................Poor
     5 4 3 2 1
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge  
     5 4 3 2 1
   c. suitability of site  
     5 4 3 2 1
   d. input/support from faculty  
     5 4 3 2 1

Judging:
   a. jurors as a group  
     Excellent..........................Poor
     5 4 3 2 1
   b. jury feedback  
     5 4 3 2 1
   c. evaluation criteria  
     5 4 3 2 1
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging  
     5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   Working with others designing a design in a group with a new material.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Maybe more different materials to use, but I understand costs.

Evaluation

sponsored by
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production  
   b. understanding of applications of product  
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques  
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information  
   b. clarity of information  
   c. adequacy of information  
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process  
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge  
   c. suitability of site  
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group  
   b. jury feedback  
   c. evaluation criteria  
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1
   5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   interaction w/other students

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   interaction w/other students

Evaluation

[Signature]

[Logo]
sponsored by BGSU.
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   It allowed us students to learn hands on how to build with concrete blocks

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   The limits on the number of blocks available hindered the design process.

---

Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   Excellent.......................... Poor
   5  4  2  1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   Excellent.......................... Poor
   5  4  2  1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   Excellent.......................... Poor
   5  4  2  1

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   Excellent.......................... Poor
   5  4  2  1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?

not a lot of feedback

Evaluation

sponsored by

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator
   | Excellent | Poor |
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information
   b. clarity of information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information
   | Excellent | Poor |
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty
   | Excellent | Poor |
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging
   | Excellent | Poor |
   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   | Being able to work outside |

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   | The lack of details about what other materials could be used |

Evaluation

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in the future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production ............................................ Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. understanding of applications of product .................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques .................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. visit as a motivator .................................................................. Poor
      5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of information ....................................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. clarity of information .................................................................. Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. adequacy of information ............................................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. relevance/practicality of information ........................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process ..................................................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge ........................................ Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. suitability of site .......................................................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. input/support from faculty ............................................................ Poor
      5 4 3 2 1

\[\text{Judging:}\]

   a. jurors as a group ......................................................................... Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   b. jury feedback .............................................................................. Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   c. evaluation criteria ........................................................................ Poor
      5 4 3 2 1
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging ............................................. Poor
      5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition? 
   We were left to design and build ourselves without a lot of restrictions.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   
   

**Evaluation**

Sponsored by **BGSU.**
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Design/Build: 5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction
Fall 2011

We would appreciate a few minutes of your time in completing the following evaluation. Your comments and suggestions will provide useful information to assist us in future planning. Please circle the number that best reflects your rating.

1. Field trip as introduction:
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

2. Competition brief:
   a. organization of Information
   b. clarity of Information
   c. adequacy of information
   d. relevance/practicality of information

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

3. Design program:
   a. pace of the process
   b. aims and goals of the design challenge
   c. suitability of site
   d. input/support from faculty

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

Judging:
   a. jurors as a group
   b. jury feedback
   c. evaluation criteria
   d. effectiveness of anonymous judging

   Excellent..........................Poor
   5 4 3 2 1

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   The construction & design

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   We had to scale down our project

Evaluation

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association
Bowling Green State University
Thursday, November 3, 2011

The winning design from the Architecture Student Design Competition

Designing concrete

In Lot 19, across from the Tech Annex off Poe Road, students in Architecture 3360: Architecture Materials and Systems carefully stacked concrete blocks like Lego pieces. They were the finalists for this year's Architecture Student Design Competition sponsored by the National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation.

Now in its fifth year, the annual competition started last month with 24 students working in eight teams of three. After presenting their designs, a jury made up of local architects and BGSU alumni chose four projects to be built full-scale.

On Nov. 1, the jury selected the team of Heather Allen of Huntsville, Ryan Scanlan of Northwood and Matt Zix of Cincinnati as the winner of the $1,000 first prize. The second place team received $500 and third place $250.

The theme this year was "5,000 Years of Dry-Stack Construction." According to competition creator Dr. Andreas Luescher, architecture and environmental design, the theme reflects that the structures are built without mortar, just like the pyramids of ancient Egypt.

The students were asked to explore the historical, architectural, sculptural and environmental aspects of an assigned outdoor space. Each design was expected to utilize a ground plot of approximately eight feet by eight feet and incorporate the parking lot and its contents, the trees, the small man-made hill and the airport hangar.

"This is the most popular project in our program," Luescher said. "Instead of me lecturing, students can go out and touch the materials. What's great is the simplicity of the concrete block. It doesn't have to be fancy, just lifting a block and stacking it. It's a very intuitive and tangible experience."

Zoom News is provided as a service to BGSU faculty and staff.