



Architecture + Construction Alliance

A+CA Fall Meeting

San Juan, Puerto Rico

With ACSA Administrators Conference

Thursday, November 12th, 2015

Marriot Conference Center, Miramar Room

Meeting Minutes

8:30 Call to Order & Introductions – John Murphy

In attendance:

John Murphy – UTSA
Vallie Miranda – TAMU
Greg Hall – MSU
Christine Theodoropoulos – Cal Poly
Bruno Giberti – Cal Poly
Vini Nathan – Auburn
George Welch – New School
Michael Berk – MSU
Ikhlas Sabouni – Prairie View
Rodner Wright -- FAMU
Jason Alread – UF
Martin Gold – UF

I. Welcome (8:30 am)

II. Roll

A quorum was reached at Lunch with 9 of 18 schools representing 50% of the members as required according to the Bylaws.

III. Minutes from last meeting in Spring, 2015 –

Approved with amendment. (8+ one abstention)

IV. Treasurer's report

See spreadsheet below. Approved (+9)

Summary for A+CA		FY15 7/1/14 - 6/30/15
Carry Forward Balance as of 9/1/2014		\$22,318.90
2014/15 Membership Dues Paid		\$19,000.00
Expenses		
Clemson Univ		\$20,925.00
Meeting Costs		\$2,918.73
Travel		\$1,976.36
Web Hosting		\$1,000.00
Total Expenses		\$26,820.09
Current Balance		\$14,498.81
		FY16 7/1/14 - 9/3/15
Balance as of 7/1/2015		\$14,498.81
2014/15 Membership Dues Paid		\$1,000.00
Expenses		
Travel for Gold		\$452.10
RCM		\$131.00
		\$583.10
Current Balance		\$14,915.71

V. Old business: (8:45-11:00)**a. 8:45 – 9:15 Clemson report / update on GOALI**

A letter of progress was provided in advance of the meeting (see attached at the end of the Minutes). The members discussed the status of the proposal and confirmed the requirement was for one comprehensive proposal to NSF. If rejected, the NSF comments will be reviewed and feasibility for going further will be evaluated. The GOALI team will present a draft proposal in mid-February. The A+CA will review and help the team focus on the outcomes and goals of the project toward a successful proposal.

b. 9:15-9:30 Certificate program: report and discussion – Vini Nathan.

A hand-out was provided (attached at the end of the minutes). Continuation of an idea introduced by Tom Regan in 2014. The team looked at model programs in medicine and related fields. What is an academic certificate? When looking at 'minimum standards' it seemed, as a concept, to be reproducing existing accreditation requirements. It was proposed that there would be ambivalence to having another accreditation type minimum standards requirement. Many programs are using the 'minor in' at the undergraduate level to show when students achieve special knowledge – certificate/concentration at the graduate level. Within the various schools represented by membership, there are many different methods of recognizing specialized knowledge and it would be difficult to achieve a unified program. One set of criteria is likely not workable for multiple institutions. Could A+CA support programs within schools through some kind of vetting process and letter of support? How elaborate and intensive is the review process? Would the Certificate be in the form of a test such as LEED? What is the role of a certificate within/between construction and architecture curricula and UG/G levels? More definition is likely needed or perhaps a different nomenclature. The discussion will be taken up at the Spring meeting with a larger group and with more research within institutions. Send a call for a one-page survey of the A+CA programs to collect what is currently in-place at the member institutions.

c. 9:30-10:30 Position papers (for NAAB, for ACCE) (Martin, John M, Al Hauck?) – what strategy should we be employing?

Al has sent a draft white paper to John for consideration. Is there a difficulty between ACC and ABET ASAC? It was suggested that one position is preferred and that there is not a preference for the accrediting body but rather advocacy for the integration of modes of design and construction at appropriate places within undergraduate and graduate curricula. The position paper should address A+CA mission and priorities and be presented across accrediting platforms. This will be one of the workgroup concentration areas at the next meeting. Intent is to have a resultant draft coming out of that meeting.

d. 10:30- 11:00 Second volume of research publication (Valie Miranda)

There was very limited response from member institutions. (1) Should be look beyond research projects? (2) Can we get people assigned at each institution to follow-up with Valle to document the work being done? Comments: Yes, the Deans should appoint a person to follow-up with Valle to collect the data. Has the publication and website produced collaboration to date? Based on discussion, the research publication is not seen as valuable and should be discontinued as an idea. What will be pursued is a list of contacts at the member institutions for research to eventually be listed on the website. Included in this action is a general update on the A+CA website, section on research area contacts.

VI. New business/ New discussion 11:00-3:30 (working lunch included)

a. Re-evaluate / confirm the direction of A+CE. What is our raison d'être? (11:00-1:30)

Discussion of our mission and relevancy of the A+CA. Architecture and Construction working together is necessary as the professions develop. How do we break the inertia of separated programs? Discussion of evolution of existing programs – how did we get to where we are?

i. Should we reorg to include engineering? Interior design? Would the name have to change? [eg. Design + Construction Alliance?]

It is important that the programs are unified under one college in terms of overcoming obstacles to collaboration. A+CA is probably not ready to expand to include Engineering. Relative to other disciplines, those within the College as the member unit, those collected disciplines could be included. Allied disciplines can be included through the Type Two membership as outlined in the Bylaws.

ii. Does the current membership option Type 2 suffice with regard to attracting Arch + Construction from two different colleges at same university? (see bylaws)

No discussion on this item

iii. Should we work toward a stand-alone meeting for A+CA once per year?

Logistics and location play a factor in attendance within current structure. Cost is an important issue. Extending the time with the current meetings may require too much of a block of time away. Can we find outside sponsorships to subsidize the meeting. Could this tested one time and then evaluated. It is important for consistency in those who are able to attend.

At each conference we could schedule a ~~panel~~ **informal** session or a gathering scheduled at the existing meetings and go to one annual dedicated A+CA meeting.

Motion: to move to one stand alone annual meeting for the Spring or Summer of 2016 as a pilot study for the 2016 academic year.
Motion approved – 9 yes, 0 no.

Discussion of location that is generally centrally located (hub) and/or at/near at least one member school. A Thursday – Saturday program was recommended. Program was proposed for June (2-5 or 9-12). Optional locations being considered at this time will be San Diego, Atlanta, Seattle.

John and Martin will coordinate on the location options and dates and notify the Group.

1:30 Motion to end the Business Meeting – (8+ with 1 abstention)

Meeting Adjourned.

Discussion Group for Agenda for the Stand Alone Meetings:

The working group (George Welch, Vini Nathan, Vallie Miranda, Greg Hall, Jason Alread, John Murphy, Ikhlas Sabouni) suggested the following four issues for breakout working sessions at the next meeting. Selection of topic moderators.

1. Bylaws revisions issues (Vini Nathan - Moderator):
 - a. Meeting Attendance
 - b. Requirements for appointment of Executive Officers
2. Unified Position Paper Development (Greg Hall - Moderator):
 - a. Achieve one position statement for all external agencies
3. “Scholarship of Engagement” (John Murphy - Moderator) is there a way to document the impact/collaborative output from the A+CA? We should be disseminating the efforts and gains made. Document/workshop/etc. John paraphrased this focus group as: *“creating an historic and data driven archive of progress, success and best practices, and marketing our findings and value as an organization.”*

Included herein, Scholarship of Engagement Competition – call for entries within a framework (to be developed) that can be published as number 3 above and gather the grassroots efforts and initiatives.

4. GOALI proposal review and final draft to NSF (Clemson Team – Moderator).

End of Minutes



November 3, 2015

Marlin Gold
Executive Director, A+CA

Dear A+CA Board of Directors,

This letter provides a brief update on the GOALI proposal and to request for an extension on the grant end date. The basis for the extension is that our team cannot make a second trip to NSF until spring 2016. Therefore we are requesting an extension to May 31, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF
CONSTRUCTION SCIENCE
AND MANAGEMENT

Clemson University
120 Lee Hall
Box 840907
Clemson, SC
29634-2907

P 864-656-0181
F 864-656-7042

The timeline for project completion is as follows:

- From present to early February – work on proposal
- Mid-February – submit proposal draft to A+CA for review and comments
- Mid-February to early-March – receive comments from A+CA
- Early March to mid-March – incorporate comments and prepare the final draft
- Mid to late March – meet with NSF
- Late March to early April – meet with others as necessary
- April – meet with A+CA Board at the ASC Conference to discuss meeting findings
- Early May – submit the final draft to A+CA for review and comments
- Mid May – receive final comments from A+CA
- End of May – submit the final proposal to NSF

The following is a short budget summary:

Grant award for proposal develop = \$20,925.00
 Faculty grant team expenditure = (\$11,425.00)
 Team travel to NSF (2/5/15 to 2/6/15) = (\$3800.00)
 Balance = \$5700.00

We are unable to attend the A+CA meeting on November 11th.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should have questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Shirma N. Clarke, PhD, PE, AIC
shimac@clermson.edu
864-656-4498

A+CA Certificate discussion

Purpose:

- To recognize accomplishment?
- To certify capability?
- To record specific experience?

Awarded by A+CA on recommendation of each A+CA member institution upon graduation:

- To graduate students?
- To undergraduate students?
- Will the requirements be the same for both?

Academic requirements:

- What are the expected core competencies?
- Courses in Architecture?
- Courses in Construction Management?
- Practicum?
- How much of each?

Process:

- Each participating school submits a proposal that meets min. reqs.
- A+CA 'academic sub-committee' reviews and votes to approve
- In April every year each school submits requests (with documentation) for the current academic year
- In May certificates are sent to schools

Examples of programs administered by CRS Center

Graduate certificate:

- 15 credit hours of FM coursework (6 hours of req. courses, 9 hrs of elective courses)
- 6 credit hours of required coursework (COSC 670 3 cr.hr. & capstone course, 3cr.hr.)
- 6 credit hours of electives must be from one of the four major areas; O&M, Finance & Real Estate, Human/Environmental Factors, Planning, Management & Technology
- 3 credit hours must be taken outside student's major area

Undergraduate minor:

- 18 credit hours (6 hours of required courses, 12 hours of elective courses).
- 6 credit hours at 300, 400 level.
- 6 credit hours can be double counted between student's major and the FM minor.
- 6 credit hours must be taken outside student's major area.
- Student must make a "C" or better in all courses.