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**Competition**
In the months of September through November, 2012, the Architecture program at BGSU held its fifth annual Architecture Student Design Competition for teams of students interested exploring the design potential of the CMU. The competition challenged students to submit designs for an experimental construction in the context of an outdoor site on the grounds of the main campus, and to explore a variety of issues related to the use of dry-set CMU in design and construction.

**Judging and Awards**
This year's competition produced unusually strong entries. Judges were asked to consider the following criteria, balanced by their personal preferences: innovative use of material, physical design, and adaptive construction technique. The final jury, which took place on Wednesday, November 7th, 2012, awarded one First Prize, and two Second Prizes, with judges unanimous in their praise of the winning projects for their "significant contribution to design culture," and the potential for the winning designs' innovative stacking patterns to join construction standards.

**Cash Prizes**
Cash prizes of $1000, and $750 went to First and Second place teams. In an unusual decision this year two teams tied for second place. Prize money is supported by a grant from the National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation.

Second place projects by Jasmine Al Momar, Kylie Barnes, Austin Bolyard, Jay Schwartz (Group #45, left) and Yichen Hsieh, Christopher Miggo and MeDonte Dandridge (Group #11, right)
Competition Objectives

- Bridge relationship between architectural representation and physical buildings
- Emphasize the interrelation of design and construction
- Encourage students to work as part of collaborative teams, resolving conflicts, managing communication
- Further the understanding of CMU as one of the world’s most durable, economical and functional building material
- Encourage innovative solutions to the challenge posed by designing with CMU
- Highlight CMU’s as GREEN building materials and can contribute to LEED building points.
- Connect students with individuals from concrete masonry industries
- Promote exemplary designs of future designers by displaying them prominently on campus
- Utilize CMUs as a guideline for building design and performance
- Recognize and award students for creative and innovative use of CMU

Group portrait of participants at the final judging, November 7th, 2012, Bowling Green, Ohio.
Feedback
In written responses to a post-competition questionnaire student strongly agreed that the competition was a rewarding experience in allowing them to develop a critical insights about a unique building material: the CMU. Students also enjoyed the hands-on aspect of the challenge. Out of the studio, into the field where they had to reconcile their drawings with real structures they could build, students reported an enhanced quality of learning that led to fresh perspectives on the nature of sites, structures, materials, and other real-world considerations.
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Frist place team by Doug Furia, Viktor Maier, JeanMarie Greene and Haku Bbela (Group #38)
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction:
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

ARCH 3360: Architectural Materials and Systems will participate in a
design/build competition sponsored by the National Concrete
Masonry Association Foundation. Totally 26 Students working in eight
teams of three (two of four) 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
Lima, Ohio on Tuesday September 11th, 2012.
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

07 Material Description and Application
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Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

Program:
In architecture, an additive composition is one in which units or parts combine to make a unified whole. A subtractive composition, on the other hand, is one in which bits appear to have been removed from a monolithic block, much the sculptor chipping away until the final sculpture is visible. The goal of this year's competition is to excite you, as a designer to explore with the endless possibilities of additive and subtractive composition using the basic building block.

It is up to you to re-design one of the four existing structures that goes beyond the traditional boundaries of (closed) architectural space by re-integrating the surrounding landscape and environment in the new additive and subtractive composition of the piece.
Each re-design folie must specifically address condition(s) and reference(s) as follow:
a) existing project with a ground plot approximately 8’ x 8’
b) at least a two difference in heights between ground and platform
c) a panoramic opening that frames the surroundings like in a painting

sponsored by
National Concrete Masonry Association
Ohio
Bowling Green State University
The four selected designs emphasizing addition and subtraction 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.
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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Addition and Subtraction:
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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 mount-
ed 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):
Precedent Study, Process Sketche(s), 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
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
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Fall 2012

Part One:
Tuesday, September 4, 2012:  Competition Registration Opens
Thursday, September 6, 2012:  Registration Deadline
Tuesday, September 11, 2012:  Field Trip to Oberfield’s
Thursday, September 27, 2012: Submission Deadline.
Entries must be received by 6:00pm to be juried.
Thursday, September 27, 2012: First Rounded of Jury Deliberations and
Public Announcement of the four selected Design/Build Projects

Part Two:
Tuesday October 09, 2012:  1. Session of Design/Build
Thursday, October 11, 2012:  2. Session of Design/Build
Tuesday October 16, 2012:  3. Session of Design/Build
Thursday, October 18, 2012:  4. Session of Design/Build
Tuesday, October 23, 2012:  5. Session of Design/Build
Thursday, October 25, 2012: Alternative Session due Weahter
Tuesday, October 30, 2012: Final of Jury Deliberations and Public
Announcement/Reception of the winning Design/Build Projects
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Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
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Final Jury:
Architecture Department Representative:
Scot MacPherson, AIA, NCARB, Senior Lecturer, BGSU

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

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

OMA State:
Josh Naragon
Ohio Masonry Association, Executive Director

Alternative:
Craig Pickerl, AIA, LEED AP, EDAC, SSOE Group, Toledo

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. ___________________________
4. ___________________________

Team Contact and Address:
____________________________
____________________________
____________________________

sponsored by
National Concrete Masonry Association
Foundation
Ohio
Bowling Green State University
15 Group Registration Form
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction:  
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s  
Fall 2012

When:
Tuesday, September 11, 2012: Oberfield’s Tour @ 1:00PM

Where:
Oberfields Inc.  
980 Shawnee Road, Lima, OH 45805  
(62.1 mi – about 1 hour 10 mins from BGSU, Leaving @ 11:45AM)
Contact: Joe Russ (614) 309 2791

Directions:
- Take I-75 S  
- Take the exit toward OH-81 W/Findlay Rd  
- Turn right onto OH-81 W/Findlay Rd  
- Continue to follow OH-81 W  
- Turn right onto E Mc Kibben St  
- Turn left onto N Main St  
- At the traffic circle, take the 1st exit onto W Market St  
- Turn left onto S Mc Donel St  
- Take the 3rd right onto W Elm St  
- Turn left onto S Collett St  
- Take the 2nd right onto N Shore Dr  
- Continue onto Spencerville Rd  
- Continue onto OH-117 W/Shawnee Rd

Field Trip Info
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Rogier Martens’ Tree Bench: a mobile sitting unit for urban parks.

Rogier Martens’ POP-UP, 2010 is street-furniture that can be pumped out of the pavement by the inhabitants.

17 Precedents

sponsored by Bowling Green State University
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Fall 2012

Team Members:
Medonte Dandridge 1
Yichen Hsieh 2
Christopher Miggo 3
Team Contact (e-mail): yhsieh@falcon.bgsu.edu

Team Members:
Matthew Cothern 1
Dennis Sartor 2
Stefany Risner 3
Team Contact (e-mail): mcother@falcon.bgsu.edu

Team Members:
Spencer Keppen 1
Jasmine Al Momar 2
Sirena Ward 3
Team Contact (e-mail): Sirena.W@falcon.bgsu.edu

Team Members:
Andrew Schroeder 1
Zachary Goeglein 2
Andrew Saleh 3
Malak Orra
Team Contact (e-mail): irozainova@falcon.bgsu.edu

Registration Form/Page 1/2012

National Concrete Masonry Association
sponsored by FOUNDATION
Bowling Green State University
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Addition and Subtraction:
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

Team Members:

Viktor Maier
Hakumbu Bibela
JeanMarie Greene

Team Contact (e-mail):

Team Members:

Megan Gill
Elissa Barnes
Graham Best
Imani Dixon

Team Contact (e-mail):

Team Members:

Kylie Barnes
Jay Schwartz
Austin Bolyard

Team Contact (e-mail):

Team Members:

Jaynee Nienberg
Nicholas Place
Douglas Furia

Team Contact (e-mail):
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Registration Number: 38

Project Title: Rebellion to Order

Team Members:
1. Viktor Maier
2. Hakw Bofla
3. Jean Marie Greene
4. Doug Fucia

Team Contact and Address:
Jean Marie Greene
17594 Saylor Ln
Grand Rapids, OH 43522
jeang@falcon.bgsu.edu

15 Group Registration Form

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association
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Registration
Number: 11

Project Title: obscurative path

Team Members:
1. Yi Chen Hsieh
2. Chris Miggo
3. McDoanlte Donridge
4. 

Team Contact
and Address: vhsieh@falcon.bgsu.edu
Miggo@falcon.bgsu.edu
MDAndre@Falcon.BGSU.EDU

15 Group Registration Form

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association

BGSU
Bowling Green State University
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Registration Number: 45 - 2nd

Project Title: Journey Through Transformation

Team Members:
1. Jasmine Al Momar
2. Kyliir Barnes
3. Jang Schwartz
4. Austin Bulyard

Team Contact and Address:
Jasminea@falcon.bgsu.edu
Sjeng@falcon.bgsu.edu
Kbarnes@falcon.bgsu.edu
Abolyane@falcon.bgsu.edu

Group Registration Form

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Associations

FOUNDATION

BGSU.
Bowling Green State University
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Registration Number: 16

Project Title: Nursing Periods

Team Members:
1. Štefany Risher
2. Matt Gothen
3. Dema Sartor
4. 

Team Contact and Address:
Šrisner @ Falcon.bgsu.edu
Mgothen@bgsu.edu
Dsartor@Falcon.bgsu.edu

Group Registration Form

Sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation
Bowling Green State University
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Fall 2012

Registration
Number: 31

Project Title: The Otherside of Difficult: Simple

Team Members:
1. Halak Oma
2. Andrew Saleh
3. Andrew Schroder
4. Zachary J. Goeglein

Team Contact
and Address:
omar@falcon.bgsu.edu
amsaleh@falcon.bgsu.edu
adschro@falcon.bgsu.edu
zgoeglein@falcon.bgsu.edu

15 Group Registration Form

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association
FOUNDATION Ohio
Bowling Green State University
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Registration Number: 42

Project Title: Finding Balance

Team Members:
1. Megan Gill
2. Graham Best
3. Imphi Dixon
4. Aliisa Laderach

Team Contact and Address:
Graham Best
321 apt. b, E. Merry, Bowling Green,
614-434-83
937-4116-0040

15 Group Registration Form

sponsored by
National Concrete Masonry Association
FOUNDATION

BGSU
Bowling Green State University
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Addition and Subtraction:
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

Registration Number: 57

Project Title: Divergence

Team Members:
1. Nick Place
2. Jayme Nienberg
3. Douglas Furia
4. Serena Ward

Team Contact and Address:
Douglas Furia
420 Lehman Ave. Apt 221
Furnier@falcon.bgsu.edu

15 Group Registration Form

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association FOUNDATION Ohio BGSU Bowling Green State University
The Other Side of Difficult: Simple

Life is like a lens, conceive on one side and emerge on the other, this is what drove our design. Life starts out easy, but soon with age, challenges arise that have to be conquered. Some people do not understand the path of least resistance but most face obstacles without a chance to take the easy way out. Our design features an easy entrance, stairs leading down to life's inevitable challenges. A small transition that very few people can make it through to the next stage of "life" is present but must not face a wall (challenge of life) that they must find a way over or through. Whether you have squeezed through the easiest part of the structure another challenge must be faced by each of the two paths. Columns of either that create a choice of one way or another becomes present. One path could be a dead end, while the other leads to the next easy part of life. Which is the correct path? Will you make the correct decision?

Submissions #11 and 31
Finding Balance

This design takes the concept of balance and adds an element of mystery through addition and subtraction. The existing carillon (bells) will be preserved, while a wall will be constructed to hide the source of balance. Visitors passing the site will see nothing but the end wall and an open space in the center. As they approach the site, the balance will not be immediately apparent. The open space on the right is a visual clue that the elements of balance will be revealed. As the visitor enters the space, the wall will fold and rotate, guiding the visitor to the central space. The path leading to the central space will be a surprise where they have just traveled from, allowing the path to follow the contours of the terrain. Reaching the end, balance will be found as they discover the final destination.

Journey Through Transformation

After high school, each grade is to random into component stations, situated in a building with a rotatable roof. This allows for a variety of experiences. As the roof rotates, the experience is also rotated. When representing the design, one creates a sequence of experiences that a visitor might undergo. The space is divided into a series of interlocking rooms that contain different experiences. The path leading to the central space is a surprise, allowing the path to follow the contours of the terrain. Reaching the end, balance will be found as they discover the final destination.

Submissions #42 and 45
Merging Periods

The concept of merging periods, an idea from traditional architecture, is transformed and adapted for modern times. The idea of merging past and present, old and new, is explored in this submission. Conceptual and material continuity is achieved by using traditional construction methods and modern materials, creating a seamless transition between old and new designs.

The design proposes a dynamic interplay of open and closed spaces, allowing for a flexible use of the building over time. The use of traditional stone masonry and modern steel frameworks creates a visually appealing contrast, symbolizing the merging of periods.

The plan, section, and elevation drawings illustrate the integration of old and new elements, with careful consideration given to the integration of green spaces and the surrounding landscape. The building's layout is designed to accommodate various functions, catering to both traditional and contemporary needs.

This innovative approach to merging periods not only preserves historical context but also enhances the building's adaptability and sustainability, making it a timeless and relevant architectural solution.
Submission #38
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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>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale 1 low - 5 high

He: Dante D.
Yi: Chen T.
Ch: Chris M.
Ma: Matthew C.
De: Dennis S.
St: Stefany R.
Za: Andrew S.
An: Zachary G.
We: Andrew B.
Ma: Malak O.
VH: Viktor H.
HT: Hakumbu B.
Se: Sean Han G.
He: Hegan Q.
El: Ellis P.
Go: Gotham B.
Kl: Kylie B.
Sy: Say Sch.
Au: Asha M.
Ja: Jasmine A1.
Jy: Jay Mee N.
Ni: Nicholas P.
Co: Conkli T.
Si: Sirena W.

Jury One: Judges' Scores/Summary

**National Concrete Masonry Association**

**FOUNDATION**

sponsored by **BGSU**

Bowling Green State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jury One: Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition and Subtraction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 1 low - 5 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Concrete Masonry Association**

**FOUNDATION**

**BG SU.**
Bowling Green State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</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>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Architecture Student Design Competition

**Addition and Subtraction:**
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
<td>Functional</td>
<td>Constructability of Design Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Use CMU</td>
<td>Use CMU</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cumulative Points:**

Scale 1 low - 5 high

---

**Jury One: Ranking**

Sponsored by **National Concrete Masonry Association**

**BG SU**
Bowling Green State University
## ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction:
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</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>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jury One: Ranking**

[Logo and text: National Concrete Masonry Association, sponsored by BGSU, Bowling Green State University]
Build Phase: *Break ground*
Build Phase: *Learn to level*
Build Phase: Application of liquid nails
## Architecture Student Design Competition

**Addition and Subtraction:**

Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's

**Fall 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge I</th>
<th>Judge II</th>
<th>Judge III</th>
<th>Judge IV</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38, 2nd place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36, honorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43.5, 1st place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38, 2nd place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judges' Score, November 7th, 2012

Sponsored by **Foundation**

Bowling Green State University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aesthetic Concept</th>
<th>Innovative Use</th>
<th>Functional Use</th>
<th>Craft and Construction</th>
<th>Cumulative Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Jury: Ranking, November 7th, 2012
# Architecture Student Design Competition

**Addition and Subtraction:**
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's

<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 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Jury: Ranking, November 7th, 2012**

*Sponsored by* Foundation

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

Addition and Subtraction:
Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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 2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale 1 low - 5 high

Final Jury: Ranking, November 7th, 2012

National Concrete Masonry Association

sponsored by Foundation

BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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 prize that led the motivation

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Site and tools - the site was hard to work with
   The tools were not good enough for the job.

Evaluation

sponsored by BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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?
   ____________________________________________________________

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

Sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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?
   Building/constructing

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   too many weeks dedicated to this project

Evaluation

sponsored by [Logo]
# ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s  
Fall 2012

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</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</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</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</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</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</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</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* I enjoyed being able to work on a project and not just design it.

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

* The cold! Also, not much feedback from jury just scores.

---

**Evaluation**

[Logo and text] sponsored by BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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?
   Working together in groups and designing a project that might/will be constructed.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Money of the winning projects should be split between the people who worked on it. Because the workers had a lot of input into design and deserve credit.

Evaluation

sponsored by BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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
   [tabular data: 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
   [tabular data: 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
   [tabular data: 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
   [tabular data: Excellent...................Poor
   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?
   Being able to physically work with CMU blocks, therefore knowing how they are designed.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Not enough time to design.

---

Evaluation

sponsored by

[Logo]

Bowling Green State University
# ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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

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

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   - Working on a hands-on project with classmates

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   - Working in the cold

---

**Evaluation**

Sponsored by

[Logo: National Concrete Masonry Association (NCMA)]

[Logo: BGSU (Bowling Green State University)]
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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:
   - Excellent
   - Poor
   a. knowledge gained about production
   b. understanding of applications of product
   c. understanding of the masonry techniques
   d. visit as a motivator

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

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

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

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   I liked the hands on part.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Coordinating w/ team.

Evaluation

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association

Boothing Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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

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

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

Evaluation

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

[Blank]

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

THAT THERE WAS NO THE BREAKER FOR SECOND PLACE
**ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION**

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Poor      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

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

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 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
   | Poor      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

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

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 enough selection of blocks  

---

**Evaluation**

sponsored by [National Concrete Masonry Association](https://www.nationalconcrete.org)  
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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

3. 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?


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


Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

BGSU.
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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:
   - knowledge gained about production
   - understanding of applications of product
   - understanding of the masonry techniques
   - visit as a motivator

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

2. Competition brief:
   - organization of information
   - clarity of information
   - adequacy of information
   - relevance/practicality of information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

Evaluation

sponsored by National Concrete Masonry Association

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 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 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 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 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 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 1</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition?
   That we were able to design something, and get it built.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Explanation of first round of judging.

Evaluation

sponsored by [Sponsor Logos]
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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
   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
   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
   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

4. Judging:
   a. jurors as a group .................................................................. Excellent ..................... Poor
   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?
   THE TEAMWORK INVOLVED IN NOT ONLY THE DESIGNING BUT BUILDING

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

Evaluation

sponsored by BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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
      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
      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

4. Judging:
   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

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

- The program is in place.

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

- The site was no good.

Evaluation

sponsored by FOUNDATION

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's Fall 2012

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........................Poorest
   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........................Poorest
   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........................Poorest
   5 4 3 2 1

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

   Excellent........................Poorest
   5 4 3 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?


Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU's
Fall 2012

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?
   Being onsite and learning best building processes.

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   Team members that didn’t win weren’t helping build others’ designs. Fitting the winners against others wasn’t a good idea.

Sponsored by
National Concrete Masonry Association
BGSU
Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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

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

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

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

5. What did you like most about this architecture student design competition? 
   very educational and hands on

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition? 
   Not knowing why the judges chose the 
   projects they chose.

Evaluation

sponsored by

National Concrete Masonry Association

Bowling Green State University
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION

Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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?
   Being able to have a hands on project and seeing our designs actually built

6. What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?
   We should be able to pick groups

Evaluation

sponsored by BGSU. Bowling Green State University

National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation
ARCHITECTURE STUDENT DESIGN COMPETITION
Addition and Subtraction: Varieties of Form and Structure Using CMU’s
Fall 2012

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  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

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

   / / /

Evaluation

sponsored by BGSU.
Bowling Green State University
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:**
   - knowledge gained about production: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - understanding of applications of product: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - understanding of the masonry techniques: 5 [4] 3 2 1

2. **Competition brief:**
   - organization of information: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - clarity of information: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - adequacy of information: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - relevance/practicality of information: 5 [4] 3 2 1

3. **Design program:**
   - pace of the process: 6 [4] 3 2 1
   - aims and goals of the design challenge: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - suitability of site: 5 [4] [3] 2 1
   - input/support from faculty: 5 [4] 3 2 1

4. **Judging:**
   - jurors as a group: 5 [4] 3 2 1
   - jury feedback: 5 [4] [3] 2 1
   - evaluation criteria: 5 [4] [3] 2 1
   - effectiveness of anonymous judging: 5 [4] 3 2 1

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

6. **What did you dislike most about this architecture student design competition?**
   - **the feedback during design process**

**Evaluation**

[Logo: National Concrete Masonry Association Foundation]

sponsored by

[Logo: BGSU]

Bowling Green State University
Survey Analysis

Field trip as introduction

- visit as a motivator
- understanding of the masonry techniques
- understanding of applications of product
- knowledge gained about production

Competition brief

- relevance/practicality of information
- adequacy of information
- clarity of information
- organization of information

Legend:
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent
Survey Analysis

Design program

- input/support from faculty
- suitability of site
- aims and goals of the design challenge
- pace of the process

Judging

- effectiveness of anonymous judging
- evaluation criteria
- jury feedback
- jurors as a group

Legend:
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Excellent
Scot MacPherson (right), a professor of architecture and environmental design at BGSU, judges architecture projects by students as BGSU student Dennis Sartor (left) chats with attendee Alex Naragon, 11, of Bellefontaine. (Photo: Enoch Wu/Sentinel-Tribune)

Jasmine Al Momar, an architecture student at BGSU, walks through a structural project titled "Journey Through Transformation" built by her and team members before it is judged during a design competition.

BGSU architecture class builds skills

Written by JORDAN CRAVENS Sentinel Staff Writer

Thursday, 08 November 2012 10:44

Bowling Green State University students got a chance to put their classroom skills to the test in the real world during the 6th annual Architecture Student Design Competition on Wednesday.

Students in Andreas Luescher’s architectural materials and systems class have been constructing concrete masonry units for the last several weeks near Lot 19 on BGSU’s campus.

Eight teams of students created designs for these cement structures. Only four of the designs were picked by a judging panel to actually be built. On Wednesday, the four designs were judged again. The judges were BGSU alumni now working in the architecture field.

Each team was given a variety of mason blocks, donated by a Lima company, in different colors and textures. From there, they had to build the structures and make their ideas transform from paper to the outdoors.

"This is unique because not only do the students get to draw and design their idea, but they get to come out here and lift the concrete blocks," Luescher said.

"It's all part of the learning process and understanding how things work," he said.

Kylie Barnes, a senior architecture student, and her team took second place in the competition for their "Journey through Transformation" design.

"Our big focus was transformation and the journey from high school to college and the obstructions you hit and the paths you choose to go down," Barnes said.

Students constructed their designs for four weeks prior to Wednesday’s judging.

The students were judged on aesthetics, innovative use, functionality, construction and design.

The competition, sponsored by the National Masonry Association Foundation, awarded $1,000 to the first place team; $500 to the second place team; and $250 to the third place team. This year, due to a tie for second, the second and third place prize monies were added together and split between the two teams.

1st place - Viktor Maier, Haku Bbela, Jean Marie Greene and Doug Furia.
2nd place - Yichen Hsieh, Chris Miggo and Medonte Dandridge
2nd place - Jasmine Al Momar, Kylie Barnes, Jay Schwartz and Austin Bolyard.

Josh Naragon, executive director of the Ohio Masonry Association was on hand for the final stage of the competition. He underscored the importance of hands-on experience for students.

"A lot of architecture students, when they graduate, have never worked with these materials," Naragon said. "All they know are drawings and designs."

"This is just another step for them to understand how these products can be used," he said.