



Architecture + Construction Alliance

A+CA semiannual Meeting

Philadelphia, Pa

Thursday, November 6, 2014

Hyatt Bellevue

Meeting Minutes:

9:00 Call to Order & Introductions – Jim West

Jim West MSU

Vallie Miranda – A&M

Steve French – Georgia Tech

Vini Nathan – Auburn

Tom Regan – Emeritis BoD

Gregg Lukative – Penn

Greg Hall – MSU

Michael Berk – MSU

Richard Burt

Brian Kleiner – Vtech

Marjorie Callahan – University of Oklahoma

Margot McDonald – San Louis Obispo

Daniel Castro – Georgia Tech

George Welch – NewSchool

Katherine Schwensen – Clemson

Jason Alread – University of Florida

Barbra Klinkhammer – Philadelphia University

Preston Haskell -- Haskell

8:45 Presidents Report – Jim West

Jim gave an overview of the outline agenda introducing the issues for discussion: GOALI grant proposals and outline for the process of selecting the award; overview of the role of A+CA and award team; discussion of Preston Haskell; questioned how A+CA would be funded and where should we move toward industry; and the introduction of the previous proposals and the MSU symposium – IDP Theater (interactive vignettes between students and practitioners). IDP Theater will be run by MSU Collaborative Studio faculty (Eskew + Dumez + Ripple, Turner, Adams Group will be in participation). A+CA members and

students are invited with no fees for participation. Question: can A+CA allocate some funds for students to travel and participate in the Symposium – for later discussion.

9:00 Treasury Report – Martin Gold

Balance \$25,941 projected to end of the year with expenses and annual dues included.

Tom Reagan pointed out that originally the A+CA BoD had slated \$10,000 as the annual contribution from member schools but the recession of 2008 caused schools to throttle back on support. As the economy and funding returns, dues should be reconsidered.

9:30 ACCE Report – Valerian Miranda

Research report from Vallie Miranda. Passed out a form for comments that will be transmitted as PDF – for survey on research – to department heads and deans.

Richard – discussion of changes in program qualifications and accreditation of construction programs. ABET vs ACCE in terms of accreditation requirements. Richard noted a movement to combine accreditation protocols. This is a concern for programs with graduates qualifying for federal grants.

Suggested that more research and perhaps a position from A+CA should be developed.

9:40 Survey (Tom Regan)

Tom distributed a brief survey “Academic Administrators Questionnaire” to identify critical issues and opportunities facing A+CA administrators (refer to handout page 5 in meeting materials). *“What are the three most significant problems and what are the three most significant potentials to be developed in your administrative role”.*

9:45 Election Nomination Committee – (Jim West)

To work on the slate of officers for election at the Spring Meeting. Current Administrative Schedule with new appointments as of the Spring meeting:

President:	Jim West (ending year 2 of 2)
Vice President:	Valerian Miranda (ending year 1 of 2)
Treasurer/Secretary:	John Murphy (ending year 2 of 2)

Nominating Committee for the next President: Richard Burt, Margot McDonald, Steve French, Martin Gold on committee.

10:00 Preston Haskell

The following notes are paraphrased from Mr. Haskell's talk and may not be accurate in detail or intention:

Intra-academic integration – collaboration between academic units and disciplines.

Assessment of academy:

Silo-ization still an issue even though the discourse of the need for integration has been well accepted. There is high rationale plus physical proximity in the schools yet limited scholarly interaction.

Certain courses that are very similar are taught separately to separate students in separate departments. For example, HVAC is almost the same in mechanical engineering and building construction yet there are separate courses. Architecture and construction could also take similar courses in materials and methods of construction. Construction Equipment and Management courses are taught both in Civil Engineering, Building Construction, and Architecture. Could students be brought together in courses that address the integration of disciplines and perhaps faculty sharing?. This may require new courses.

Could students take courses in business administration schools to be better equipped for practice with a program and to teach more broadly over disciplines to foster multi-disciplinary learning.

Out of classroom opportunities could include meetings, social events, lectures, seminars, and field trips that include students from all disciplines.

Joint or Dual Degree programs and overlap of the disciplinary foundations could be fostered.

ASCE – B+30 initiative (as example). <http://www.asce.org>, See ASCE Policy Statement 45

Engineering students with a 4 year UG curriculum may be trained from an engineering standpoint could be well prepared, but very few students are equipped for real-world issues of communication, public policy, business, ethics, large scale projects. To be prepared it will require more education than the basic 4-year degree. Bachelor + 30 (or Masters Degree) would include credits of additional education in the issues noted above with the idea it could be collective as an alternative to a specified Master. Hours could be in the discipline or in other areas such as business or public policy.

Industry-academic integration/interaction:

Internships programs at Haskell for example – summer between jr. & sr. year rotating students through different areas of the program – a “3-month interview” process. 75% are offered jobs and 75% of those will come to work with Haskell

Work-study program – a semester or longer time with the employer, but this is not as tailored to students as the internships. Duration can interrupt the progress in school in some cases.

Career counseling and recruitment – recruitment as a continuous process of employer counseling and liaison and contact with industry through advisory committees, visiting campuses, and learning to learn about the colleges from which they recruit. Seeking the most appropriately qualified students through continuous counseling and contacts and gives visibility to the company to attract students.

Advisory councils and committees – too often they are administratively focused and pro-forma with limited understanding or communication of the ‘neat’ things going on in the programs. Tour advisory groups around the classroom and get them in touch with the students and program activities.

Mentorships from industry – partnering mentors from industry with students to provide guidance (once a semester meeting) and counseling for two-way communication of academic and practice issues.

Industry Days – opportunity for students and faculty to interact and transfer information and make career connections. This is highly scalable and could start small and grow.

Exhibitions – Virginia Tech is doing exhibitions of industry work and projects to expose students to issues and related company profiles.

Information Sessions – representatives from one or more companies to meet with students. Invited lecturer, or guest speaker.

Courses in Continuing Education – can the academy bring professionals back to campus for continuing education programs, and to interact with students and/or connect with the academy. Meaningful experiences that differ from practice would be well received.

Fellowship Models – Harold Adams from RTKL as example of senior professional back at the academy as a Fellow in support of knowledge translation through meetings, lectures, discussions, and other.

Observations:

Consider bringing Engineering into the A+CA as part of the policy thinking.

Use of the term IPD – as the well-defined industry standard for delivering projects – or the more general sense should be clarified in the literature. (“Little” ipd versus “big” IPD.)

Consider adding business administration as a future expansion.

How does the integration of disciplines expand over the next few years including perhaps engineering and business?

Q&A

P: Vtech is advancing rapidly in this area and is setting a great example. Can Civil Engineering be more present? Are we not missing the "E" in AEC?

Brian: At VT we have done this by creating a School that sits in Architecture and Engineering. I agree with you, but it isn't easy. In our case, it took industry donors and a paradigm shift in infrastructure.

P: Vtech is advancing rapidly in this area and is setting a great example. I sat with the department head of Civil Eng recently regarding the role of project director leading the design and construction team and typically needs expertise and interest in a variety of areas. Architects with more exposure to construction and engineering are better architects and project directors having had that experience.

Q: How do you deal with multiple professionals coming into the firm?

P: Historically, the firm was construction managers working with architects in support or in sometimes leading discussions of construction delivery and management. As Haskell evolved into DB companies with the design team in-house (90%), many barriers had to be overcome including the market (as a new area), AIA (unwilling to recognize DB architects within Haskell), now Haskell employees have leadership administrative roles in AIA, and continue internal culture of integration. Trying to avoid (d-B) and maintain parity, quality, and a sense of common value among the teams. Working to do a better job of bringing architects top management positions. Sometimes, architects education is seen as limiting in this aspect as they don't have strong enough backgrounds in the construction and business elements of the company.

DB delivery. Haskell adopts the client goals as their goals – how does one create value? Integrating the design and construction process. The intellectual phase is in the design portion and once the drawings are complete, the constructor has little opportunity to affect the efficacy of the process. Merging the knowledge as an end-to-end structure adds value throughout the process.

Q: Barbara Klinkhammer – students take a set of cross-disciplinary courses such as one BIM course with different major students taking the same course. Bringing constructors to work alongside designers (Interior Design). Nurturing the ‘common goal’ within the classroom.

Q: George Welch, Proscriptive Accreditation – has limited the ability of programs to integrate courses.

P: Accrediting bodies need to get on board the train – that has left the station – and this appears to be happening slowly.

Q: Tom Regan – how can we avoid reinforcing the silos. Can Deans recommend construction and architecture meet together with provosts rather than separately.

P: Continue to influence and impact curricula to the extent possible. Could A+CA and DBIA develop a relationship in terms of improving cross-disciplinary learning and finding common goals and common actions? Bring the accrediting agencies into the room. Learn more about ASCEB+30. Issues must be sustained, broad, and multi-disciplinary.

P: Research efforts should work to broaden research collaborations and dissemination of results.

Q: who is responsible for safety?

P: Safety is everyone’s responsibility. In DB safety is integrated in the design and the design of the construction process. Developed a language of safety icons on the actual construction drawings. Director of safety who has authority to implement safety practices throughout the company with an executive director of safety within the top leadership of the organization.

Bring national institutes and academies into discussion of advancing the state of the art.

Q: How is ‘leadership’ promoted within the firm. ‘Project Director’ (PD) is the leader of the team with administrative and functional responsibility. PD is the principle as represented to the client in terms of authority and communication.

Q: how are PD’s developed?

P: Experience and training is critical. Engaging young talent in all aspects of the DB even though they may not be educated for those roles. It is necessary to develop their level of experience and knowledge of the multiple elements of the business. PD's are the most important people in the company and ultimately will rise to senior leadership. Define responsibilities of leadership, give them cross-disciplinary experience, and provide CEU education.

Q: what is your gift as a leader?

P: Always had an interest in architecture and construction and expressed an interest at early age to become an architect and contractor. Civil Engineering in a liberal arts culture, MBA at Harvard, and MIT education in leading aspects of management with multi-disciplinary experience and a commitment to the integration of design and project delivery to add value.

Q: How do we define better results and value? Particularly in measuring the value between disciplines.

P: Timeline, performance of project, sustainability, cost of completed project. Measuring success based on the client success and determining if we have created value for the client. Design process is the critical phase for intellectual development and finding value. In Haskell our PD divisions are based on architectural typologies – office, schools, etc. and teams remain committed to the project delivery division for that building typology throughout the design delivery process. Divisions include architects, engineers, and constructors while minding that people need to communicate between divisions to avoid making new silos.

Can we consistently promote and advocate for the benefits of project delivery and design integration within and outside the discipline?

Jim West: projects have to be carefully crafted to get both architects and constructors engaged early on in the project so both have 'work' to do to contribute to the team continuously through the process. MSU uses a two-year approach to catch students early and then reiterate the experience later at a more advanced level.

P: Emphasized designing to a budget from the earliest phases of the project to evaluate scope and quality effectively early while making iterative evaluations and cost estimates throughout the process.

Michael Berk: Need to ensure that collaborators are bringing information to the discussion – avoid blind leading blind situations.

Daniel Castro: can graduate programs be the focal point for interdisciplinary integration?

Jim: It should be 'both and' rather than 'either or'.

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

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

noon Lunch

12:45 GOALI proposals (Jim West)

Opening comments suggested the Clemson/GTech proposal met the 6 original principles set forward by A+CA. The proposal was the beginning of the expansion of A+CA beyond the group.

Proposal needs – NSF deliverable requires a clearly stated research agenda that would go into the proposals.

Q: should it be an A+CA proposal or supported by A+CA?

Q: can we get in contact with NSF program directors in advanced of the application? Or invite NSF to A+CA? Could this be done through ASC and/or fund PI's to travel to Washington?

Marjorie Callahan – Oklahoma has a talented group of young faculty in their proposal.

Richard – Atlanta makes a great national hub location for an event.

Vini – regional distribution of NSF funds are a concern as saturated regions become perhaps less likely to receive funds.

Daniel – how do we develop linkages with the industry partners?

Steve – we need to have design/industry in participation.

Brian – should we combine the proposals into a single team including all the proposers with additional funds?

A lengthy discussion of the advantages and disadvantages, logistics and viability of combining the three proposal with a team of 14 people would be too unwieldy, would perhaps be beyond the scope of funding available to support working meetings, and it might be presumptive to conclude all the teams would agree to work together.

Michael Berk – motion to select the Clemson/Gtech as the grant award recipient. Richard Burt seconded the motion and it passed with unanimous support.

Some gaps in the proposal were identified and it was suggested that this be transmitted to the winning team and to ask them for a budget request as required to address the gaps.

Proposal gaps:

- 1 – need to more directly address linkages to industry
- 2 – engage more A+CA schools
- 3 – meet with NSF program managers

Discussion of providing additional funds to support collaborations with the other teams but not restricted to that. This could be funded up to \$10k with funds from:

Vtech – 2500
Auburn – 2500
GaTech – 5000

Total additional funds \$10,000

The winning team (Clemson/Gtech) will be offered at their discretion to contact the other institutions to collaborate and if that is successful, additional funds could be provided to support that effort.

Numbers of faculty
Clemson 7
MSU 3
Oklahoma 4

2:00 NAAB & NCARB changes – A+CA Position

Does A+CA want to weigh in on the new NCARB proposals for licensure? Hold until more information comes out on the changes and there is time to consider implications on A+CA mission.

2:05 A+CA Symposium – IPD Theater

Supplementary discussion from the morning discussion – symposium is open to any participants with no registration fee.

Discussion was introduced on the idea of repeated symposia at other programs in future years.

Richard – could this be done around another regular event, such as the ACC spring meeting (February)(to connect with industry)?

Michael – the current program needs to be linked with an institution for student participation.

It was suggested to table the discussion until the Spring meeting after the first symposium has been run and there is feedback from organizers and students.

How to get funding to support the effort?

AIA call for industry proposals Atlanta in May 2015.

Barbara – Could the symposium be combined with ARCC, ACSA, ASC or other related group to support peer review and faculty career promotion opportunities.

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.

GOALI Awardees will be posted on the A+CA website.

3:00 Open Discussion

NA

3:30 Closing Comments