



Professional Forum Meeting
November 17, 2017

| WORKSHOP I GENERAL CHECKLIST | | WORKSHOP II PRACTICE AND EDUCATION GOALS | | WORKSHOP III ADVOCACY | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1. POSITIVE COMMENTS about documentation | SUMMARY | 1. What are your firm's goals towards net zero/sustainable design? | SUMMARY | 1. How can activities and target goals of BEE now help your firm achieve its sustainability mission? | SUMMARY |
| The framework is very clear and well organized. Separation into categories provides a nice comprehensiveness to the certification document. | Clear, well-organized | We have signed on to the 2030 challenge. We are working on a renovation on a net zero energy building and are looking for additional opportunities to work on high-performance buildings. | 2030 Challenge | We would benefit from adding staff that is monitored to practice sustainable design. | Adding Knowledgeable Students as Staff |
| It seems wise to weigh studio course is more heavily than other academic courses. | Studio weight | We have signed onto the air you 2030 challenge and we are driving towards the net zero 2030. | 2030 Challenge | Young, graduating architects, can facilitate incorporation of sustainability early and projects by early energy modeling and analytics. | Early Incorporation by New Staff |
| Point based system allows for goals with varying resources to focus on - example in a school with a few practicing professors they can focus on scholarship. | Point-based facilitates goal-setting | Mass timber integrated into the practice. | Mass Timber? | Bringing about students who have a strong foundation and level playing field of knowledge across the nation. | Adding Knowledgeable Students as Staff |
| The list encompasses a full breath of sustainable design. | Breadth | To have sustainable design integrated into our office process. Not as an add-on. Signed onto the 2030 commitment. | 2030 Challenge | It can produce a growing next generation of staff. | Adding Knowledgeable Students as Staff |
| It goes beyond the student and coursework by engaging the campus as a model of sustainability best practices and commits the institution as a whole. | Campus engagement | To push every client closer toward sustainability and zero closer than they were before the project. | Push Client Closer to Net 0 | By providing students " a.k.a. new staff" with strong fundamentals and sustainability. | Providing New Staff Foundations |
| It extends towards the community which would help Dr. change in a larger goal then academia. | Community | Signed onto the AIA 2030 challenge. Sustainability discussed considered and implement it on every single project. | 2030 Challenge | 2. Would knowledge of which schools achieves certification be important for you in the hiring process ? | SUMMARY |
| Publishing and lectures are very positive. | Publishing | 2. Do you feel your current projects meet those goals? | SUMMARY | I think this may depend on the studios work sector and region | Region/Studio-Dependent |
| Very clear credit system. Clear categories. | Clear | On projects where sustainability is a client goal yes. Many projects don't have advocates for sustainability more students with passion for sustainability would help this. | If Client Goal | Yes | Yes |
| Thinking about the firm's that want to incorporate more sustainability and don't know how. This could serve as a great guide to help firms advance and be more prepared to make the transition for students to the professional world and community. | Guide for firms | Not all of them. Would be nice if it was 100 percent. | Not All | Yes especially for position specialized in sustainability. | Yes |
| Very thorough. | Thorough | A majority but not all. Depends on the office location. We to have a branch of sustainable champions that facilitate multiple projects within the office. | Majority | Yes it would give a level of background and understanding similar to those being presently licensed. | Yes |
| The pointspread seems cohesive, everything seems to carry a true eight and it reflects the categorical relationships. | Cohesive | Some mean well, others do not. Depends on different conditions and implications. | Depends | Yes | Yes |
| The scholarship category is a nice push for students and faculty to continue their work and doing more than just the minimum. | Scholarship push | Some do, but not all. Especially complex large multi year projects. Average reduction is 55 percent, but we need to be close to 70 to 80 percent. | Not All | Yes it would help. | Yes |
| Great that all topics carry the same weight. | Weights | Most projects are designed to be as efficient as required by code which is a DC standard and a high bar. A few projects go beyond that primarily through opportunities of clients wanting to go beyond. Most projects aspire for more but are constrained by client needs and financial caps. | Few | 3. How might Beenow initiatives better respond to the aims and goals of your architectural practice, those of your clients, and the AEC industry? | SUMMARY |
| Required documentation needed for submission is positive. | Documentation | Only a few. We still do most of our work in a "traditional" manner without integrating sustainable strategies automatically into all projects. In addition we do not yet benchmark our projects. | Few | Prepare students with a methodology in school that can carry over to professional practice. | Sustainability Methodology |
| Service is positive. | Service | 3. Is the way we're attempting to meet the net zero/sustainable design goals of your firm through the categories of education sufficient? | SUMMARY | Having the knowledge to back up the demand and work from the office. | Sustainability Knowledge |
| Professional practice is positive. | Pro practice | It is a very powerful start. | Start | 4. Discuss why you think there is a need for higher standards for low carbon building in architectural education. | SUMMARY |
| I like the spread of categories; curriculum, scholarship, etc. very comprehensive. Service is an especially laudable category and I'm glad it has been included. | Comprehensive | For the most part students are not educated well in topics of sustainability. | Students not educated | If it is a part of a persons academic philosophy and it can translate to more discussion related to the project work. | Translates into project work |
| Requiring documentation is important! Glad to see it! | Documentation | Finance/cost neutral solutions. | Need Finance/cost | Because buildings are huge contributor to the greenhouse gas as well as other environmental impact and as one of the professionals involved in the creation of them it means we have a moral obligation. | Moral Obligation |
| Students work displaying learning of the topic is great for the courses. | Student sample work | Water issues process domestic stormwater. | Need Water | The demand for the future! 230 is closer than we think. | Architecture 2030 |
| Topic list appears comprehensive but not exhaustive for courses. | Comprehensive | Resilience design for impacts of climate change. Do renewables fall under "energy studies"? | Need Resilience | The way we design build and analyze is a bit archaic we need to for fill these practices till their fullest potential. | Evolve archaic methods |
| Required documentation | Documentation | I believe so. Forms and process is very well thought through and quite extensive. | Yes | 5. How might your practice help Beenow broadcast this position ? | SUMMARY |
| Service. | Service | I would push further towards net positive goals. | Advance Net + Goals | We could indicate our interest on our website. | Website |
| Professional Practice. | Pro Practice | Yes, but incorporate as well as leadership qualities... | Need Leadership | As a preference on job postings. | Job posting |
| Excellent service requirement. | Service | these ideas with financial knowledge as well. | Need Finance | 6. How might you echo and advocate for the voice of Beenow across other all aspects of practice ? | SUMMARY |
| 2. NEGATIVE COMMENTS about documentation | SUMMARY | Yes but please do add water and resilience. | Need Water + Resilience | No answers | n/a |
| The list of credits seems to favor technical knowledge. This may not allow for the subjective side of sustainable design, or "design" as a standalone fundamental topic. In other words, there still seems to be a gap between general / fundamental design and design engagement, and this pragmatic list. | Gap between design and pragmatics | The categories appear to be comprehensive. I liked Anica's additional financial analysis and understanding of strategies versus financial impact. This could help to drive conversations even one high-performance or net zero or not priorities. | Need Finance | 7. Have you had occasion to engage architectural schools of architecture in the past with subjects that have been important to you ? If yes, has this been effective ? | SUMMARY |
| It seems the checklist emphasizes the vehicles with which topics are explored, rather than the topics themselves. It isn't certifying a students proficiency in the topics. | Student topic proficiency | 4. Indicate the specific expertise that your firm needs to meet current net zero/sustainable design goals by ranking the Certification Categories numerically (1 = lowest) | SUMMARY* | No Answers | n/a |
| Incorporate occupant health example concepts in the well building standard. | Health | | HIGHEST priority → LOWEST priority | | |
| Would probably require hiring new faculty or retraining of existing faculty to accomplish some of these. | Hard to accomplish | 1. Integrated design process, 2. lifecycle and embodied energy, and 3. energy studies 4. daylighting high priority | Daylighting | Integrative Design Process | |
| Heavy on "accreditation" ; but you have to start somewhere. | Accreditation | 1. Lifecycle analysis and resilience is top. 2. Green rating systems. 5/6. Building performance analytics and daylighting. 7. Material consumption. | Material consumption | LCA + Resilience | |

| WORKSHOP I GENERAL CHECKLIST | | WORKSHOP II PRACTICE AND EDUCATION GOALS | | | WORKSHOP III ADVOCACY | |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| What recognitions exist for faculty regarding sustainability? Should resilience be a topic add it as a category? | Specific faculty awards | 1. History and theory 2. Performance analytics 3. Mechanical systems 4. Environmental controls 5. Materials and waste 6. Green rating systems 7. Sustainability metrics 8. Daylighting and lighting 9. Energy studies 10. Low-energy design 11. Integrated design 12. Lifecycle and carbon footprint | LCA and carbon footprint | History + Theory | | |
| Integrated design and sustainability metrics - somehow reformat this into a matrix that makes it more efficient use of space and then it becomes easier to see the types of credits required for each category title. Description and required documentation. | Reformat category | 1. Ldp 2. Low energy design 3. Energy studies 4. Bpa 5. Mechanical 6. Daylighting 7. Environmental history and theory, sustainability metrics, resilience, water. 8. Lca 9. Materials 10. Enviro controls 11. Rating systems Use the tools, ask the right questions, output make sense in order to direct design. | Rating systems | Integrative Design Process | | |
| It's complicated. Don't understand the numbering system. Is it possible to get through the system without addressing all issues? How would the monitoring of this be funded? | Numbering system | 1. Environmental history and theory 2. Green Rating systems 3. Sustainability metrics, benchmarking, and marketing 4. Building performance analytics 5. Integrated design process | Integrative Design Process | History + Theory | | |
| The topic seem to be thorough however I wonder if there is a method of implementation of these topics that allows students to graduate at a more consistent level across the country? | Method to implement consistency | 1. Green rating systems 2. Sustainability metrics 3. Building performance analytics | Building Performance Analytics | Rating Systems | | |
| Privacy laws regarding student names and contacts may be an issue for the survey. | Privacy laws | 1. Material consumption 2. Green rating systems 3. Daylighting 4. Building performance analytics 5. Low-energy design 6. Integrative design | Integrative Design Process | Material Consumption | | |
| Prerequisite courses needed. | Prerequisites | * Some people may have confused the two 1-8 ratings and put 8 as lowest? | | | | |
| There seems to be a bias towards energy. There are multiple phases in the description and Richard documentation which specify "low-energy design" I feel like water is equally important. | Energy bias | | | | | |
| Only 78 out of the 408 relate to the curriculum. Does this seem balanced if the goal of the certification is for practitioners to be certain of the skill sets and knowledge of a certified program? I would require multiple student sample work for documentation. | More curriculum focus | | | | | |
| Published work weight higher than funded research work and practice integrated work? | Funded research weight | | | | | |
| Credit given to faculty with accreditations, but not for building certified? | Building Certifications | | | | | |
| Incentive for platinum - faculty and school. | Incentivize platinum | | | | | |
| Prerequisite courses needed. | Prerequisites | | | | | |
| Post-survey? | Post-survey | | | | | |
| Year-end review? | Review | | | | | |
| It would be terrific if the system could incentivize additional research on sustainability. | Incentivize sustainability research | | | | | |
| What is NCARB doing to the ARE to include sustainability? | ARE impact | | | | | |