



Architecture + Construction Alliance

A+CA Spring Meeting

College Station, Texas

Hosted by Texas A&M

Wednesday, April 22, 2015

Memorial Student Center, Room 2404

Meeting Minutes

8:30 Call to Order & Introductions – Jim West

In attendance:

Jim West - MSU
Vallie Miranda – TAMU
Michelle Herrmann – MSU
Andrew McCoy -- VTech
Craig Capano – MSU
Bruce Bockhorn – PVAMU
John Schaufelberger – UW
Vini Nathan – Auburn
Allan Hauck – CalPoly
Henri de Hahn – VTech
John Murphy – UTSA

Martin Gold – UF

Opening 9:35

Jim West – Overview of A+CA and the past few years and the summary of the issues of focus. Early efforts were focused on the research aspects of the group and more recently focusing on teaching under Jim's leadership over the past four years. *How can we better prepare students for leadership roles in the profession and how should aspects of teaching be emphasized or reinforced to better prepare students?* A+CA has been advancing the six points of the mission statement – (1) collaborative culture and integrated process; (2) curriculum and interdisciplinary courses, training and workshops (IDP Theater), (3) applied research, building information modeling and technology pilots (could we do more here) – financial models to generate funding support (GOALI program); (4) housing and home building; (5) health care design; and (6)

sustainability. The ideas are present and viable yet support has not matched the initiatives to date – how can we be more strategic in getting support to advance the mission?

8:45 Presidents Report – Jim West



April 22, 2015

A+CA Board of Directors:

It has been a distinct pleasure to serve the Architecture + Construction Alliance as President for the past four years. I am more than ever convinced that the A+CA is an important organization for the future of architectural and building construction education. We have dedicated ourselves to be a catalyst to enhance understanding, collaboration, and shared knowledge between design and construction professionals. The ultimate goal is to positively impact the built environment by impacting the students who will be the leaders responsible for building in that environment in the future. Over the past four years the Board has focused on developing collaborative teaching opportunities at our respective universities. I appreciate the effort and resources the A+CA Board has allocated to this critical effort.

The first A+CA Collaborative Practice Symposium entitled *Integrated Project Delivery Theatre* was held this year at Mississippi State University. A report on that program will be given at the April Board meeting, and I am confident we will see that there is value and potential for using this symposium to introduce ideas and methodologies for collaborative learning between undergraduate architecture and building construction students at other universities.

Clemson University and Georgia Tech are moving forward with the A+CA Proposal to NSF for a Grant Opportunities for Academic Liaison with Industry (GOALI) program. The Board will be updated on the status of the proposal at this meeting and as part of the discussion we will have a chance to provide suggestions and comments on the proposal. The opportunity to bring together architecture and construction academic and industry professionals who have a common interest in developing and refining collaborative efforts within practice and at our respective colleges is both exciting and energizing. All of us in A+CA have the opportunity to address this issue in ways not as available to every architecture or building construction program. This is not a minor responsibility we have chosen to undertake. A+CA is helping to set the course for new accreditation standards and we can be useful in discussions concerning modifying the path to architectural licensure. It has been an honor to serve as President during these important times and I look forward to remaining active with A+CA.

Sincerely,

Jim West, AIA
A+CA President
Dean, College of Architecture, Art, and Design
Mississippi State University

9:00 Treasury Report – John Murphy

Budget Summary for A+CA

FY15 7/1/14 - 4/16/15

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Carry Forward Balance as of 9/1/2014 | \$22,318.90 |
| 2014/15 Membership Dues Paid (as of April 15) | \$6,500.00 |
| Total Revenue from dues | \$28,818.90 |
| Expenses | |
| Meeting Costs (Facilities and Meals) | -\$2,918.73 |
| Travel (Executive Director) | -\$1,026.56 |
| Web Hosting (Annual Basis) | -\$500.00 |
| GOALI proposal (in process) | -\$21,000.00 |
| Total Expenses | -\$25,445.29 |
| Current Balance | \$3,373.61 |

9:15 A+CA 2015 SYMPOSIUM - “Integrated Project Delivery Theater”

Michelle Herrmann presented a summary of the results of the *IDP Theater* conducted at MSU in January 29th and 30th, 2015. Michelle’s brochure and media presentation is available on the A+CA website in the meeting information area.

The ideas presented and execution of the program was very well received prompting many positive comments and suggestions to expand the initiative to other programs. Multiple comments were encouraging to have a more detailed presentation at ASC and perhaps ACSA. It was suggested that the program be packaged and that perhaps that the team would work with other programs to conduct the IPD Theater at their institutions and others – and perhaps as ‘dissemination sessions’ that could spread the program by others to additional institutions. Members will make contact Michelle to develop this as a possibility. Summary comments and discussion lead to the suggestion that a one-day may be ample rather than two days.

9:45 University of Oklahoma Collaboration – Charles Graham

Not available at time of meeting

10:00 am Certificate Program (Jim West)

Jim is carrying forward an initiative proposed by Tom Regan at the Fall 2014 meeting. As most know, Tom Passed away early in the Spring of 2015. The following excerpt from the Fall 2014 was included in the meeting package as a reference to the proceeding discussion:

Tom Regan: Do you think an organized certificate program would be valuable to industry leaders in evaluating graduates?

Preston Haskell: A+CA education experience, such as through a certificate program, could lead to higher salary upon hire.

Tom Regan – certificate proposal. Can there be an A+CA Certificate of credential based on their academic path and credentials? A+CA would develop criteria to meet and the schools would review and qualify candidates and submit the recipients to A+CA for the award of a certificate. Tom will develop a proposal for review.

From the minutes of the Philadelphia meeting – Fall 2014

Jim – How might this work through multiple institutions? If it is from A+CA, then it does not require schools to measure and vet the candidates?

Could there be a simple form that would be signed by a designated representative(s) (such as unit heads) of the school and sent to A+CA to qualify them for the Certificate from A+CA.

A+CA would develop the criteria and develop the form to register the student's achievement in collaborative and/or interdisciplinary design.

We need to be very careful not to state that this certificate implies any financial advantage upon hire.

Could the certificate be based on outcomes and accomplishments verses just courses students have taken?

Consensus to move forward – steps:

- 1) draft criteria for the certificate.
- 2) develop a process for documenting and conveying the information to the A+CA.

Vini volunteered to contribute to the proposal and work with someone else and will present the progress at the Fall 2015 meeting with a target to complete the proposal in Spring of 2016. Andrew McCoy and Vallie agreed to partner with Vini to develop the proposal.

A+CA Certificate subcommittee: Vini Nathan, Bruce Buckhorn, and Vallie Miranda.

10:30 am NAAB & NCARB changes – A+CA position

Members of the A+CA discussed the current direction of NCARB relative to substantial changes to the qualifications nationally for licensure in architecture that include a position on curricula and the education elements while continuing to reference NAAB accreditation. The following information was provided in advance of the meeting and included in the meeting information.

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ju0yitmibwwn9og/AAAMt2Aua_o3afMULg1NpvRZa?dl=0

NCARB Educational Guidelines | July 2014

This document provides a general overview of the education requirement for NCARB certification, and explains how architects who do not hold a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) can satisfy this requirement.

A current registration in the US or Canada is required

NCARB Education Standard | August 2013

The NCARB Education Standard is the approximation of the requirements of a professional degree from a program accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). It includes general studies, professional studies, and electives, which together comprise a professional liberal education in architecture.

| Subject Area and Category | Semester Credit Hour Requirement ^{1,2} |
|---|---|
| 1. General Education | 45 hours |
| A. Communication Skills | 3 hrs. min. |
| B. Humanities and Arts | N/A |
| C. Quantitative Reasoning | N/A |
| D. Natural Sciences | N/A |
| E. Social Sciences | N/A |
| 2. History and Theory, Human Behavior, and Environment | 16 hours |
| A. History and Theory | 6 hrs. min. |
| B. Human Behavior | 3 hrs. min. |
| C. Environment | 3 hrs. min. |
| 3. Technical Systems | 24 hours |
| A. Structural Systems | 6 hrs. min. |
| B. Environmental Control Systems | 6 hrs. min. |
| C. Construction Materials and Assemblies | 6 hrs. min. |
| D. Building Service Systems and Building Envelope / Enclosure Systems | 3 hrs. min. |
| 4. Practice | 9 hours |
| A. Project Process | 3 hrs. max. |
| B. Project Economics | 3 hrs. max. |
| C. Business Management | 3 hrs. max. |
| D. Laws and Regulations | 3 hrs. min. |
| E. Technical Documentation | 3 hrs. max. |
| F. Ethics and Social Responsibility | 3 hrs. max. |
| 5. Design | 50 hours |
| Level I | 8 hrs. min. / 12 hrs. max. |
| Level II | 8 hrs. min. / 12 hrs. max. |
| Level III | 8 hrs. min. / 12 hrs. max. |
| Level IV | 8 hrs. min. / 12 hrs. max. |
| Level V | 8 hrs. min. / 12 hrs. max. |
| 6. Electives | 16 hours³ |
| TOTAL | 160 HOURS |

NCARB's Contribution to the NAAB 2013 Accreditation Review Conference | February 2013

...the NCARB Education Committee identified several themes early in the analysis, which are now formally presented in NCARB's Contribution to the NAAB 2013 Accreditation Review Conference. These four categories—common threads, recurring themes, proposed enhancements to the current Conditions for Accreditation, and blue-sky topics...

Common Threads. *“Common threads” are topics more general in nature, not necessarily specific to architecture, which could easily be interwoven throughout the curriculum. Survey respondents identified three topics—communication, collaboration, and leadership—as needing reinforcement in the overall curriculum.*

1. *... graphic means is clearly covered in accredited education however, students do not possess an equal command of basic written and oral presentation skills.*
2. *Exposure to team building strategies and completion of student projects that promote collaboration within the program and across the university—are critical.*
3. *A broad range of leadership skills should be developed early in education and refined through extracurricular activities.*

Recurring Themes. *...six “recurring themes” emerged that require a greater focus in education: professional conduct, practice management and project management, site design, constructability, sustainability, and technology.*

1. *... professional conduct and compliance with regulations is critically important, is performed daily, and should be further incorporated in the foundations of an accredited program.*
2. *According to survey respondents, knowledge and skills for many practice management and project management issues are acquired after licensure. The professional practice curriculum should be enhanced and further expanded to integrate important topics such as business development, office management, project management, and risk management.*
3. *Site design knowledge and skills are clearly covered in education; however, practitioners reported the level of performance is below that indicated by educators and suggested that students should have a greater ability to perform these tasks prior to graduation.*
4. *The integration and coordination of building systems, combined with the interpretation and application of building codes, are interdependent components of constructability. The Practice Analysis provides evidence that these important knowledge and skills are being acquired during internship; however, a majority of*

educators and practitioners indicated they should be acquired prior to completion of accredited education.

5. *As the emphasis on sustainability continues to increase, the knowledge of design strategies and energy codes as well as the ability to assess, develop, and implement sustainable criteria must also increase. Survey respondents indicated they believe that accredited education could better support students in developing this area of expertise.*
6. *The profession's dependence on technology continues at a rapid pace. Accredited education must play a significant role in exposing students to a wide variety of graphic and project management applications and developing knowledge and skills to carry them through internship and practice.*

Proposed Enhancements. *NCARB believes that combining, expanding, extracting, and raising the performance level of various existing SPC will respond to the shortcomings identified above as common threads and recurring themes. NCARB also suggests that: Comprehensive Design should receive greater emphasis; revisiting the Education Core Requirement concept could better ensure that students acquire essential knowledge and skills; licensed practitioners and actively engaged IDP Educator Coordinators benefit every academic program and campus; and the studio instructional model should be reviewed to ensure relevance.*

Blue-Sky Topics. *These ideas to integrate the path to licensure range from new education models, to mandatory internships, to new expanded/integrated programs that allow licensure upon graduation.*

A+CA Discussion:

We should develop some position from A+CA with regard to changes to NCARB.

We should not limit our points to collaboration.

A+CA needs to have ongoing discussions of this issue and keep abreast of the developments on an ongoing basis.

It would be helpful to have a position for programs to reference with regard to other requirements.

Action: Martin with work with the new A+CA President to adapt and evolve the current position sent to NAAB to address some of the issues raised by NCARB. (*John Murphy was later elected as the new President*)

Could we have a position for the construction accreditation bodies? Members supported adapting the position language for construction accreditation as well.

Recommendation for two parallel position papers for Architecture side (1) and Construction side (2) to bring those entities in alignment with regard to interdisciplinary and collaboration issues.

CMAA is making changes in accreditation requirements that should also be influenced by the A+CA. Can CMAA be covered by a single accrediting body? AI will draft a position for the construction side.

Jim – can Craig, John and AI work on drafting the position paper(s) for coordination of A+CA's position – agreed. Perhaps this should identify the role of construction management within the Universities.

11:30 am Officer Elections Election Committee (Burt, McDonald, French, Gold)

The nominees were:

President: Chris Silver (UF) and John Murphy (UTSA)
Secretary/Treasurer: Charles Graham (UO)

A quorum was present with 9 universities represented.

John Murphy was elected President.
Charles Graham was elected Secretary/Treasurer.

11:40 – Fall Meeting Discussion

John Murphy – Puerto Rico is the location of the ACSA meeting. Meet the day before the scheduled events. Our meeting set for Wednesday, November – 11th. Check schedule to determine one or two day schedule.

1:00 pm – GOALI Team Introduction and Presentation

Javier Irizarry and James Packer Smith – Media presentation from GOALI team – progress and next steps (available on A+CA website)

Discussion:

(regarding the details uncovered in the team investigation and visit with NSF Directors)

Why do we need to work with NSF if the value is only \$50,000 and we could probably raise that from industry.

Javier – There is benefit to be funded by NSF in terms of an achievement for the faculty member but also as an effort supported by NSF.

We have to be careful who is getting “value” from the association.

The benefit is credibility with industry partners for attracting additional support. On the academic side, construction and architecture collaboration is an important idea and with NSF support, it strengthens the mission of the A+CA.

Could the workshop and the conference be split to have one funded by NSF and industry fund the other so the discussions could be consecutive or overlapping.

Javier – to refine the focus of the proposal based on further communications with the A+CA with ongoing development of the proposal. To keep communication open the team will send questions along to the board for feedback and development of the fundamental idea. This is recommended to occur in the form of conference calling with open discussions among the interested partners.

1:45 pm – GOALI & A+CA Coordination Discussion

Can we discuss the role of industry partners?

There is NSF funding on collaboration directly – could this be part of the proposal for Arch-Construction. Could we find a person who has done integrated business in Salt Lake City in the Spring of 2016 to come in?

Health care seems to have the most advanced form of integrated project delivery.

The process depends on the delivery method is it IPD or Design Build.

Social Behavior and Economic (SBE) as a basis for collaborative process between Architects and Constructors. IPD Theater as the seed to be further developed. We need to build on what we have done so far.

We need the project Owners as part of the process – could we have Owners come talk to us?

We are already convinced that collaboration is good. What are we trying to accomplish with visitors or as the mission of A+CA?

There is a broad range of what the schools are doing and we don't really have a good sense on what is being done and how to advance what is working well and what is developing.

How can we move the IPD Theater forward through dissemination perhaps as a menu of things that would promote/educate on collaborative processes?

Faculty have to be very creative to put the projects together to include all the disciplines in a studio.

Could the IPD or TED talk programs be prepared to transmit processes/lessons that work well.

2:30 pm – Open Discussion

Research Initiatives Publication - Vallie. He will send reminder calls for updates for a comprehensive list of research initiatives for the A+CA publication. Will send out another reminder to members to have their information included.

Funded Research Projects - Vallie. Do we want to restrict the research initiatives strictly to funded projects? There are projects listed but were not initiated or completed.

Consensus: Project Timeline – within the last 3 years.
Funded or unfunded is acceptable (to add check box)
indicating funded or unfunded was suggested.

Vallie – Do we keep the 6 categories? Consensus was yes we should.

3:00 pm Closing comments and adjourn