Assignment- 01  
Due: 12 Sep 2011

“Just the Facts…”

For the remainder of the semester, a significant emphasis will be placed on the clarity and efficiency of your communications and on your ability to distinguish the relevant from the extraneous in the preparation of case studies.

Reading:

A Simple Introduction to Case Studies  
http://www.students.net/studying/case-study/

Task:

From your past professional coop experience, identify a specific instance, in which poor coordination between or among an architect and a larger project team resulted in an regrettable and theoretically avoidable situation involving unanticipated consequences

To accompany a concise three minute presentation during class, prepare a Storyboard of the facts of the case using only graphic information

Include, as required, illustration, imagery, diagrams, symbols, etc.

For the benefit of your peers, your presentation should convey:

Setting: Relevant project facts, including project type, schedule, cost,
Characters Protagonists and affected stakeholders, etc.
Plot Roles and relationships of key players and what happened
Timeline Relevant milestones

In order to safeguard their privacy and encourage an authentic account of events, the identity of the firm and individuals is to remain confidential.

Resources:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Storyboard
http://www.everythingsl.net/downloads/storyboard.pdf
http://accad.osu.edu/womenandtech/Storyboard%20Resource/
http://pingmag.jp/2006/10/27/storyboard-design/
Professional Practice: Project Case Studies I
Analysis of Practice in the Design Process

Instructor: Daniel Hewett AIA LEED d.hewett@neu.edu 617-291-2102 (cell)

Assignment - 01
Due: 14 Sep 2011

“Conventional Wisdom…”

Be prepared to discuss and offer your insight on following readings and questions.

Readings

“Making the Case”, David Garvin, Harvard Magazine, October, 2003 (pp. 56-65,107)

“Case Studies as Research” by Kwok, Alison; University of Oregon and Grondzik, Walter; Florida A&M University. ARCC Spring Research Conference, April 2003.

Questions

What are these scholars identifying as the primary potential sources of learning in a professional setting?

As an established means of conveying lessons from practice, how does the case study method succeed and fail to: 1) capture the underlying truth of the case, and 2) present the most facts most relevant to learning, and 2) convey these in a format from which encourages their use?

How might architecture, as practiced, be different from the other professions that use case studies as primary platform for learning?
Assignment-03 “Conventional Wisdom II” Due: 19 Sep 2011

Reading

AIA Case Study Guidelines (Blackboard\Course Materials\Course Documents)

Working in teams of two:

I Assessment of AIA format

Read entire document to familiarize yourself with the form and content objectives of the AIA model. Referencing specific sections, write a one page, bulleted, list of positive qualities and shortcomings in this model. Please consider the points raised in class and in our previous readings.

II Critique of an AIA endorsed Case Study.

From the list of fifteen, provided by the American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) Case Studies Initiative (http://www.aia.org/education/AIAS075234), and select one case study for careful review and critique.

In teams of two prepare a written summary (not to exceed two pages) and a five-minute verbal presentation analyzing and critiquing the selected case study’s success. Did it achieve not only the content objectives of the AIA Case Study Development Guideline, but, more importantly, your own high standard for potential learning benefit? How could it have done better?

Consider all aspects of the case, including, among others, the perspectives and motivations of the authors, those interviewed, format, content, etc.

Note: No two teams in a section are to review the same project case study.
Assignment-04 “Perspectives: Stakes and Holders”  Due: 21 Sep 2011

1. Divided into the following stakeholder groups:

   Designer  
   Maker  
   Client  
   History (Ombudsmen)

Meet with you group to discuss how you (in the mindset of your assigned role) see the world, in general, and the following project, in particular:

A new mixed use Transportation Center/Museum of Motion on the Rose Kennedy Greenway.

In preparation for a one hour in class scenario, outline your interests, concerns, fears, requirements, and objectives. As moderator, I will introduce the scenario and add complexity as it proceeds.

2. Separately, find publications and architectural critics whose perspectives you admire that are critical and balanced, even if highly opinionated. We will compare notes and assemble a list on 9/26.
As we have discussed, a major part of realizing design ideas lies in your ability to usher those ideas, upstream, against a current of formidable distractions, objections, and temptations.

For the remaining part of the semester, we will look more closely at the way projects actually come together, their Delivery Methodology, and the evolution of the architect’s role in that process, over time.

**Assignment- 5**

Due 3 October

No delivery model is well suited to all projects. A primary goal of this semester’s sequence of assignments is to enable you to wisely design and execute a given project delivery in anticipation to their unique set of requirements and opportunities.

In the next exercise, you will look at the relative advantages of traditional and alternative forms of project delivery.

Choosing the right delivery method for your project is critical to meeting your project objectives. Some of the more prevalent delivery methods include:

- **Construction Management at Risk (CM@Risk):** Under this delivery method, the contractor is usually selected based on their qualifications alone (although the contractor’s fee may be part of the consideration). The contractor may be selected before, at the same time as, or after the architect is selected. The contractor is usually heavily involved in the design process, working with the owner and architect to create the best possible project for the owner within their budget. Proponents of this delivery method believe that this collaboration helps the owner to get the best possible value for their dollar and reduces the owner’s risk. Under the CM@Risk delivery method, the general contractor holds the subcontractor contracts and works under a guaranteed maximum price (GMP) that is established once construction documents are completed.

- **Construction Management (CM) Agency:** Under the CM Agency delivery method, the selection process and involvement of the contractor in the design phase are very similar to those under CM@Risk. One of the main differences in this delivery method is that the owner holds the contracts directly with the subcontractors (in addition to their contract with the general contractor). Under this method, the owner carries all the risk and contracts for design, subcontractors, performance, schedule, quality, safety, budget overruns, errors and omissions, etc.

- **Construction Management/General Contractor (CMGC):** This term is often used interchangeably with CM@Risk and the selection method and contract are very similar to CM@Risk.

- **Design/Bid/Build (also known as Hard Bid):** In this method an architect is hired and completes the design process without the involvement of the contractor. When the construction documents are completed, the project is made available (advertised) for contractors to bid on. Contractors provide bids based on the total cost to complete the project and the selection of the contractor is based on price alone.

- **Competitive Sealed Proposal:** This delivery method is a variation of the hard bid method. Under this method, usually only a limited number of qualified contractors are invited to submit proposals and the selection of the contractor is based on a combination of the contractor’s price and qualifications.

- **Design/Build:** Under this delivery method, the owner selects the architect and contractor as a team rather than making two separate selections. Proponents of this delivery method believe that it provides an assurance that the architect and contractor will work well together (since they chose to partner with each other). In many ways, this delivery method is similar to a
Integrated Project Delivery (IPD): A relatively new delivery method, IPD has many models, each with its own unique variations. The selection process is usually based on the contractor's qualifications, and the architect and contractor are selected separately prior to the start of design. Under IPD, the owner, architect and contractor enter into a contractual agreement outlining how they will collaborate during design and construction. This often includes agreements on the use of design and collaboration tools such as Building Information Modeling (BIM).

Fast Track: A variation on the other delivery methods, this approach significantly compresses the overall project schedule by coordinating the design and construction activities simultaneously. A&P has considerable experience in Fast Track projects and their unique requirements, including integrated design and construction, overlapping schedules and concurrent work shifts.

Assignment

Come to class prepared to argue which option places the architect in the best position to realize their design objectives.

Reading

“Integrated Project Delivery”
(http://www.projectrealign.com/ipd-lean-from-pdg.pdf)
Old Friends Revisited

As we have discussed, a major part of realizing design ideas lies in your ability to usher those ideas, upstream, against a current of formidable distractions, objections, and temptations. For the remaining part of the semester, we will look more closely at the way projects actually come together, their Delivery Methodology, and the evolution of the architect’s role in that process, over time. For historical context, you will address the familiar but incomplete stories attached to some of the iconic buildings in the canon of World Architecture.

Critical Analysis of Delivery in the Architectural Canon

Research, analyze, and interpret the following historically familiar works of architecture, specifically the form of delivery used to realize the original design and construction (as well as can be determined by historians).

You are asked to assess the relationship between the delivery method, historical context, architects’ roles, and resilience of the design/construction teams to unforeseen adversity and obstacles. Organize your response, as a unified series of mini-case studies, organized by delivery type (some may not fit the exact definitions you have been given). In teams, prepare a PowerPoint presentation of your study. Choose, from the following list, as many projects as there are students in the class.

1. Taj Mahal, Agra, India
2. Great Pyramids & Sphinx, Giza, Egypt
3. Eiffel Tower, Paris, France
4. Empire State Building, New York, New York
5. Sydney Opera House, Sydney, Australia
6. Golden Gate Bridge, San Francisco, California
8. Coliseum, Rome, Italy
9. Parthenon, Athens, Greece
10. Hajia Sophia, Istanbul, Turkey
11. Palace of Versailles, Versailles, France
12. Complex at Calat Alhambra, Granada, Spain
13. Lightning Farm, New Mexico, 1977
14. The Bauhaus, Dessau, Germany
15. The National Congress, Brasilia
16. Viet Nam Veterans Memorial, Washington, DC
18. Autodesk Regional Offices, Waltham, MA
19. Class choice
20. Class choice

Wednesday, 5 October:
For review in class, bring an outline of the group’s approach and identify gaps and challenges in your research or methodology.

Wednesday, 12 October:
Presentations and submissions of final study. Submit an 11”x17” print copy of your presentation.
**Professional Practice: Project Case Studies I**

Analysis of Practice in the Design Process

Section I: Monday + Wednesday 8:00-9:40  
Ruggles Studios- Crit Room

Section II: Monday + Wednesday 9:50-11:35  
Ruggles Studios- Crit Room

Instructor: Daniel Hewett AIA LEED  
dmhewett@gmail.com  
617-291-2102 (cell)

---

Old Friends -Reflections  
Monday, 17 December 2011

**Delivery**

*Design/Build*
*Interiors*
*Des- Bid- Build*
*CM Advisor*
*Integrated Project Delivery*

Given the findings of your project and the discussion that followed, answer the following questions and come prepared to discuss them in class on Monday.

1. Which of the delivery methods, as represented by canonical projects, is most likely to allow the team to be flexible enough to respond effectively to unforeseen project events?

2. With which system do you feel your education and training, thus far, makes you most comfortable? Which do you hope to be prepared as your career advances?

3. In order to be most successful, what specific skills/talents might be most advantageous for an architect in each of these models?

4. Each of the Delivery Methodologies under consideration seeks to balance the relative importance and relevance of Schedule, Budget, Quality, and Liability. In your opinion, which is most successful 1) as intended, and 2) as typically realized in contemporary practice?

**Approach**

1. What was the most valuable insight you, personally, gained during this ten day scenario project?

2. How has the scenario project changed your understanding of which factors most significantly impact on an individuals and a team’s likelihood of success in practice?

3. On reflection, what steps would you advise a group similar to your take, in the initial stage of Project Setup, in order to assure a successful project?
## Project Performance - Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL GRADE</th>
<th>Image Groups &amp; Individuals</th>
<th>Self Eval (50%)</th>
<th>Client Eval (50%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proj Grp</td>
<td>Individual (Questions)</td>
<td>Sub Proj Grp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUT</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Andrade, Pamela</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Belknap, Dan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bradley, Alex</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Freda, Chris</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Hopwood, Ashley</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Quinlivan, Geri-Ann</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reynolds, Katy</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Abzug, Stephanie</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Davis, Thom</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Lelievre, Erica</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Nickerson, Derrick</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Ricardelli, Daniel</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Rider, Matthew</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Briggs, Zachary</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Brownell, Alex</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Chen, Ximing</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Eksuzian, Brett</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Greenwood, Dennis</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Hartman, Casey</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Helferty, Joseph</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Laporte, Sara A.</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Liu, Yifan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Sun, Yukai</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Ved, Dipt</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Viana, Philip</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Davis, Alex</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Jonasen, Kyle</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Parisi, Saverio</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Sampson, Jonathan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Wen, Tony</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Allen, Bryan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Baggen, Alison</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Belguedj, Assia</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Hunsecker, Aaron</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Artiges, Daniel</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Bivas, Michael</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Brown, Bryan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Hartshorn, Ashley</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Janty, Marc</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>McCarty, Matt</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Tourigny, Chantel</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The matrix includes grades and comments for each student's performance across various criteria.*
## Project Performance - Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4.70 | 0.7   |
| 4.66 | 0.7   |
| 4.64 | 0.6   |
| 4.71 | 0.7   |
| 4.67 | 0.7   |
| 4.57 | 0.6   |
| 4.66 | 0.7   |

| 4.61 | 0.6   |
| 4.56 | 0.6   |
| 4.52 | 0.5   |
| 4.50 | 0.5   |
| 4.53 | 0.5   |
| 4.49 | 0.5   |

| 4.55 | 0.5   |
| 4.51 | 0.5   |
| 4.56 | 0.6   |
| 4.45 | 0.5   |
| 4.34 | 0.3   |
| 4.48 | 0.5   |
| 4.50 | 0.5   |
| 4.49 | 0.5   |
| 4.47 | 0.5   |
| 4.42 | 0.4   |
| 4.54 | 0.5   |
| 4.49 | 0.5   |

<p>| 4.66 | 0.7   |
| 4.62 | 0.6   |
| 4.66 | 0.7   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19 October 2011

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS:

Northeastern University Design Teams,

Your firm has come to our attention based on your noteworthy performance on recent projects.

On behalf of our founder, Sir Michael Lesse, we are pleased to invite your firm to participate in a two-step selection process for a prestigious undertaking.

As you well know, within the architecture profession, there is a concerning lack of effective educational opportunity for those transitioning between the academy and professional practice. As a young professional himself, Sir Michael Lesse seeks to correct this shortcoming in the boldest possible way. In his own experience, he saw the energy, optimism, and excitement that characterized his education at the AA wane in the face of the “dreadful and stultifying reality of real-world practice.” He is determined to find ways to better prepare young architects for the unique challenges of practice.

It is his considered opinion that the improved exchange of acquired knowledge and the most innovative dissemination methodologies related to the art of professional practice, especially among the youngest design professionals, can act as a significant catalyst to broader improvements in architectural practice, globally.

To this end, OE proposes the following undertaking and seeks your considered guidance to assure its successful realization.

An global online resource for the encouragement, selection, and dissemination of architectural case stories with greatest relevance to the most pressing challenges facing young professionals in contemporary practice.

In a design/build capacity, selected firms are asked to envision and develop a viable operational model based on the following assumptions.

1. Northeastern University will serve as the initial host institution with later commitments TBD.
2. An RFP will be issued to qualified firms following a brief meeting with Sir Michael Lesse.
3. Proposed project viability will be evaluated by OE and selected NEU Graduate School professors. The criteria for receipt of the RFP and ultimately, development rights, include: perceived level of interest, quality and depth of your team, clarity of roles and team offering, analysis of the underlying problem, availability, experience in the reinterpretation and innovation of the Case Study forma.
4. You are to work as professional firms, and to conduct all phases of this project accordingly, and will be treated as such.

Sir Michael Lesse will fly from London to meet with you during your regular class period, Monday, 24 October 2011, at which time he will present a project brief and answer your questions so that you may begin. Your firm is asked make a preliminary statement of qualifications, unique capacity, and interest, to last no more than ten minutes. Each firm should be prepared to discuss the terms of compensation for service.

In preparation for that meeting, please respond to the attached RFQ questionnaire.

Please submit your proposals, via your professor, by 5:00 PM, Saturday 22 October 2011.

With gratitude and anticipation,

Clifford Niles-Glenning, Director
Request for Qualifications

Request for Proposals vs Request for Qualifications

There are many means to determine a design team's qualifications for a project and there are many terms for the written requests that are used to obtain information on the architect's qualifications. Because these terms are often confused or misused, in the interest of clarity, we would like to clarify our understanding at the outset. The differences between the most commonly used terms: RFQ (Requests for Qualifications) and RFP (Requests for Proposals) are as follows:

Request for Qualifications
This is typically the first step of the selection process and is used when prior to a definition of scope of work for a project. The RFQ requests information about a design firm and the teams that they will provide to complete the design and engineering tasks. It typically asks for firm information, project team members, project experience and any other unique qualifications that the firm may have that would be reason to select them for the project.

The RFQ traditionally will not ask for a fee for the project. After the qualifications have been received, reviewed and ranked, we will proceed to the next step and issue an RFP, which will summarize the scope of work and request a fee proposal. Occasionally an RFQ is incorporated into the RFP in the interest of expediting the overall process.

Request for Proposals
After a short list of qualified design firms is selected, the RFP process will allow firms to provide a detailed project approach and fee proposal for the project. The RFP will provide the architectural firms with a detailed scope of work for the project, including relevant terms and conditions. This process allows the design team to provide a fee based on concrete project information with a full understanding of the project complexities and scope.

In smaller projects, where the project does not have a difficult scope, it is possible to skip the RFQ and issue an RFP directly in order to streamline the process.

OE Background
OE is a studio of highly creative and talented architects and designers who have acquired considerable professional experience designing advanced, complex and iconic buildings. The practice was founded by Sir Michael Lesse in 2004 and has established itself as one of the UK’s foremost architectural firms, with studios based in London, Birmingham and Beijing and registered offices in the Middle East. We are engaged in a broad selection of projects worldwide, ranging from large-scale urban master plans to luxury private houses. OE is a 100 per cent employee-owned organization; each member of staff shares in the profits each year without exception. This unique business model engenders a genuine sense of ownership and entitlement, creating an egalitarian working environment with a unified sense of purpose and commitment. As a result, we are able to attract - and keep - the very best architectural talent. We have created an environment where preconceptions do not limit innovation and creativity is not stifled by hierarchy. These values generate a stimulating working atmosphere in which our teams are able to produce exciting, ground-breaking buildings that enhance the lives of all who use them. In 2009 we gained ISO 9001 accreditation for our Quality Management systems.

Contract Characteristics
OE intends to award a design/build, Fixed Price contract. It will be up to the chosen firm(s) to develop a system for allocation of fees internally. An incentive structure in the contract will facilitate and reinforce the partnering relationship that will be essential for the successful completion of this project. The contractor will maximize customer satisfaction, and therefore the award fee earned, by effective management, innovation, and establishment of a cooperative, effective partnership with the OE.

A two-phased, best value design-build selection process in accordance with US Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 36.3 will be utilized for this source selection. This solicitation, Phase I, is a Request for Qualifications. Successful candidates from Phase I will be invited to submit proposals in response to the Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP). Phase
Il candidates will be given the \( \text{\&} \)'s total contract budget amount and asked to submit their best proposals within the stated budget.

**Guiding Principles.**
The overarching goal for this acquisition is to design and build a one of a kind Case Study database for use by young architectural professionals. \( \text{\&} \)'s seeks to work in an effective partnering relationship with the successful candidates to accomplish this goal.

**Challenges**
In addition to the items listed in the RFQ, below, the successful design/build team will need creative solutions to address the following significant challenges:

- 30-Day timeline
- Close coordination with \( \text{\&} \)
- Ability to set bold goals and reach them
- Ability to overcome unforeseen project obstacles
- Managing a fixed budget to achieve acceptable levels of quality in the completed project
- Compatibility and willingness to collaborate effectively with unnamed, potential project partners

**Partnership**
The degree of success of this project will depend largely upon the nature of the relationship between the Contractor and the \( \text{\&} \). \( \text{\&} \)'s intent is to work with the Contractor as an integrated team with common goals of improving quality, improving productivity, achieving cost savings, and achieving other economies and efficiencies across the full spectrum of performance. To the greatest degree possible, \( \text{\&} \) intends to adopt commercial practices to accomplish these goals. \( \text{\&} \) will provide the Contractor maximum flexibility to determine specific work methods that satisfy the performance-based requirements in the contract. \( \text{\&} \) expects the Contractor to take customer preferences into consideration, participate with the \( \text{\&} \) in continuous improvement activities (such as optimizing the phasing of the effort), and proactively address risks and challenges to project success. \( \text{\&} \) also intends to work with the Contractor to devise and implement processes that are appropriate for this design-build project, that maximize efficiency, and provide \( \text{\&} \) insight into project progress without an undue level of \( \text{\&} \) oversight.
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Business Overview & Background
Give a brief overview of your business, services, and specific markets and niche sectors you cater to. Provide important background information. Include distinguishing firm characteristics.

Firm Profile
Firm Mission
Executive Profiles
Unique team composition by strengths, interests, and experience
Firm Experience
Availability
Level of Interest in this Project
Office Locations
Service Philosophy
Any Past Legal Judgments

Team Technical Capabilities:
3D Modeling
Web Design
Database Creation and Management
Internal Quality Control Procedures

Assumptions & Constraints
Failure to be forthright and upfront about assumptions and/or constraints about which we should be made aware will open the door to nullification or renegotiation of the agreement at a later date the possibility of straining our relationship. Possible topics include: travel expenses, upgrade/modification costs, licensing rights, etc.

Terms and Conditions
Any terms and conditions in the RFQ response must be listed in order for the vendor to make a fair and honest response. These may include: financing options, contract length, renewal options, warranties, delivery penalties, service levels, etc.

Selection Criteria
The final section criteria and process will remain confidential.
1 November 2011

RE: MODIFICATION TO PROJECT

Northeastern University Design Teams,

On behalf of our founder, Sir Michael Lesse, I have been asked to extend his appreciation for your work to date.

Unfortunately, due unforeseen circumstances related to the recent economic bail-out of Greece and the resulting austerity measures anticipated by EU member states and, in particular, UK business concerns, I am writing to inform you that oe must immediately adjust the means of delivering the project for which you were being considered. The recent work of both firms exhibited impressive and complimentary qualities. Please understand that the following changes are, in no way, a reflection of the quality of the work with which we have been exceedingly pleased thus far.

In order now reduce our cost by approximately 50%, and keep the larger project on schedule, Sir Lesse request that you:

1. Merge the efforts of the two firms into a single entity.
2. Identify the strongest components of each proposal.
3. Clarify a unified project purpose and specify key project objectives
4. Schedule target deliverables.
5. Form specialized Departmental Teams* to address the specific tasks required to achieve those goals.
6. Submit the RFP including the plan for delivery, for review, by 11/6/11 by 5:00 PM.

It is Sir Lesse’s request that adjustments be made without adversely affecting quality and schedule.

We realize that this is a sudden and potentially upsetting change and wish to provide you every opportunity to make the assessments necessary to amalgamate your initial, separate, proposals in the most constructive, complimentary, and beneficial way. As such, Prof. Hewett will only be available to the entire firm from 11:00 – 11:30 on 11/2/11, and then, by appointment from 11:30- 1:30, if requested. The next regularly scheduled meeting will take place, as usual, Monday, 7 November. At that time, Prof Hewett will make a brief statement conveying our assessment of the new, unified, proposal before meeting with individual departments* to discuss their scopes and approaches.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions.

With gratitude and anticipation,

Clifford Niles-Glenning, Director

* Departmental Teams should be assigned, in their entirety to one meeting time or the other. Examples might include: Coordination, Communication, Marketing, Logistics, Graphics, Vision and Quality Control, Technology, User Experience, Site Design, Content Design, Content Editorial, Firm Management, etc... The final teams should be sized for efficiency, suitability to interest and skill set, and as required to meet your delivery objectives.
24 October 2011

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS:

Northeastern University Design Teams,

On behalf of our founder, Sir Michael Lesse, your firm has been selected to receive this Request for Proposal based on your RFQ response. We seek an improved exchange of acquired knowledge and innovative methodologies, related to professional practice, among design professionals as a catalyst to broader improvements in building practices globally.

This will be a two step process according to the following schedule:

- **26 Oct 11**  Phase I Proposal Due
- **31 Oct 11**  Phase I: Statement of Concept
- **02 Nov 11**  Phase I Proposal Due
- **21 Nov 11**  Phase II Presentation

**“Cäs”**

A global resource for the selection and dissemination of case studies addressing matters of professional conduct and project delivery with greatest relevance to individuals in their first five years of practice; a period typically spanning the transition from academic studies through professional licensure.

In Phase I- Statement of Concept, at a minimum:

1. Identify the unique challenges inherent in this phase of practice.
2. Develop a chronological matrix of target subjects to address these challenges
3. Consider key milestones in this formative period,
4. Stipulate appropriate learning modes, and develop the format, content parameters, and graphical interface for optimum educational benefit
5. Envision a viable operational platform

Base your work on the following assumptions:

1. The criteria for award of Phase II development rights include: quality and depth of analysis; reinterpretation and innovation of the Case Study format; viability of the proposed model, as well as exhibited professionalism in service.
2. Northeastern University will serve as the initial host institution with later alliances TBD.
3. Proposed project viability will be evaluated by NEU Graduate School of Architecture professors, and myself.

Sir Michael Lesse will not fly from London to meet with you during your regular class periods, but is available to answer questions submitted through me.

With gratitude and anticipation,

Clifford Niles-Glenning, Director
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS:

Northeastern University Design Teams,

Your firm has come to our attention based on your noteworthy performance on recent projects.

On behalf of our founder, Sir Michael Lesse, we are pleased to invite your firm to participate in a two-step selection process for a prestigious undertaking.

As you well know, within the architecture profession, there is a concerning lack of effective educational opportunity for those transitioning between the academy and professional practice. As a young professional himself, Sir Michael Lesse seeks to correct this shortcoming in the boldest possible way. In his own experience, he saw the energy, optimism, and excitement that characterized his education at the AA wane in the face of the “dreadful and stultifying reality of real-world practice.” He is determined to find ways to better prepare young architects for the unique challenges of practice.

It is his considered opinion that the improved exchange of acquired knowledge and the most innovative dissemination methodologies related to the art of professional practice, especially among the youngest design professionals, can act as a significant catalyst to broader improvements in architectural practice, globally.

To this end, OE proposes the following undertaking and seeks your considered guidance to assure its successful realization.

An global online resource for the encouragement, selection, and dissemination of architectural case stories with greatest relevance to the most pressing challenges facing young professionals in contemporary practice.

In a design/build capacity, selected firms are asked to envision and develop a viable operational model based on the following assumptions.

1. Northeastern University will serve as the initial host institution with later commitments TBD.
2. An RFP will be issued to qualified firms following a brief meeting with Sir Michael Lesse.
3. Proposed project viability will be evaluated by OE and selected NEU Graduate School professors. The criteria for receipt of the RFP and ultimately, development rights, include: perceived level of interest, quality and depth of your team, clarity of roles and team offering, analysis of the underlying problem, availability, experience in the reinterpretation and innovation of the Case Study forma.
4. You are to work as professional firms, and to conduct all phases of this project accordingly, and will be treated as such.

Sir Michael Lesse will fly from London to meet with you during your regular class period, Monday, 24 October 2011, at which time he will present a project brief and answer your questions so that you may begin. Your firm is asked make a preliminary statement of qualifications, unique capacity, and interest, to last no more than ten minutes. Each firm should be prepared to discuss the terms of compensation for service.

In preparation for that meeting, please respond to the attached RFQ questionnaire.

Please submit your proposals, via your professor, by 5:00 PM, Saturday 22 October 2011.

With gratitude and anticipation,

Clifford Niles-Glenning, Director
Request for Qualifications

Request for Proposals vs Request for Qualifications

There are many means to determine a design team’s qualifications for a project and there are many terms for the written requests that are used to obtain information on the architect’s qualifications. Because these terms are often confused or misused, in the interest of clarity, we would like to clarify our understanding at the outset. The differences between the most commonly used terms: RFQ (Requests for Qualifications) and RFP (Requests for Proposals) are as follows:

Request for Qualifications
This is typically the first step of the selection process and is used when prior to a definition of scope of work for a project. The RFQ requests information about a design firm and the teams that they will provide to complete the design and engineering tasks. It typically asks for firm information, project team members, project experience and any other unique qualifications that the firm may have that would be reason to select them for the project.

The RFQ traditionally will not ask for a fee for the project. After the qualifications have been received, reviewed and ranked, we will proceed to the next step and issue an RFP, which will summarize the scope of work and request a fee proposal. Occasionally an RFQ is incorporated into the RFP in the interest of expediting the overall process.

Request for Proposals
After a short list of qualified design firms is selected, the RFP process will allow firms to provide a detailed project approach and fee proposal for the project. The RFP will provide the architectural firms with a detailed scope of work for the project, including relevant terms and conditions. This process allows the design team to provide a fee based on concrete project information with a full understanding of the project complexities and scope.

In smaller projects, where the project does not have a difficult scope, it is possible to skip the RFQ and issue an RFP directly in order to streamline the process.

OE Background
OE is a studio of highly creative and talented architects and designers who have acquired considerable professional experience designing advanced, complex and iconic buildings. The practice was founded by Sir Michael Lesse in 2004 and has established itself as one of the UK’s foremost architectural firms, with studios based in London, Birmingham and Beijing and registered offices in the Middle East. We are engaged in a broad selection of projects worldwide, ranging from large-scale urban master plans to luxury private houses. OE is a 100 per cent employee-owned organization; each member of staff shares in the profits each year without exception. This unique business model engenders a genuine sense of ownership and entitlement, creating an egalitarian working environment with a united sense of purpose and commitment. As a result, we are able to attract - and keep - the very best architectural talent. We have created an environment where preconceptions do not limit innovation and creativity is not stifled by hierarchy. These values generate a stimulating working atmosphere in which our teams are able to produce exciting, ground-breaking buildings that enhance the lives of all who use them. In 2009 we gained ISO 9001 accreditation for our Quality Management systems.

Contract Characteristics
OE intends to award a design/build, Fixed Price contract. It will be up to the chosen firm(s) to develop a system for allocation of fees internally. An incentive structure in the contract will facilitate and reinforce the partnering relationship that will be essential for the successful completion of this project. The contractor will maximize customer satisfaction, and therefore the award fee earned, by effective management, innovation, and establishment of a cooperative, effective partnership with the OE.

A two-phased, best value design-build selection process in accordance with US Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 36.3 will be utilized for this source selection. This solicitation, Phase I, is a Request for Qualifications. Successful candidates from Phase I will be invited to submit proposals in response to the Phase II Request for Proposals (RFP).
Il candidates will be given the Æ’s total contract budget amount and asked to submit their best proposals within the stated budget.

**Guiding Principles.**
The overarching goal for this acquisition is to design and build a one of a kind Case Study database for use by young architectural professionals. Æ’s seeks to work in an effective partnering relationship with the successful candidates to accomplish this goal.

**Challenges**
In addition to the items listed in the RFQ, below, the successful design/build team will need creative solutions to address the following significant challenges:

- 30-Day timeline
- Close coordination with Æ’
- Ability to set bold goals and reach them
- Ability to overcome unforeseen project obstacles
- Managing a fixed budget to achieve acceptable levels of quality in the completed project
- Compatibility and willingness to collaborate effectively with unnamed, potential project partners

**Partnership**
The degree of success of this project will depend largely upon the nature of the relationship between the Contractor and the Æ. Æ’s intent is to work with the Contractor as an integrated team with common goals of improving quality, improving productivity, achieving cost savings, and achieving other economies and efficiencies across the full spectrum of performance. To the greatest degree possible, Æ intends to adopt commercial practices to accomplish these goals. Æ will provide the Contractor maximum flexibility to determine specific work methods that satisfy the performance-based requirements in the contract. Æ expects the Contractor to take customer preferences into consideration, participate with the Æ in continuous improvement activities (such as optimizing the phasing of the effort), and proactively address risks and challenges to project success. Æ also intends to work with the Contractor to devise and implement processes that are appropriate for this design-build project, that maximize efficiency, and provide Æ insight into project progress without an undue level of Æ oversight.
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Business Overview & Background
Give a brief overview of your business, services, and specific markets and niche sectors you cater to. Provide important background information. Include distinguishing firm characteristics.

Firm Profile
Firm Mission
Executive Profiles
Unique team composition by strengths, interests, and experience (include organizational chart with individual strengths)
Firm Experience
Availability
Level of Interest in this Project
Office Locations
Service Philosophy
Any Past Legal Judgments

Team Technical Capabilities:
3D Modeling
Web Design
Database Creation and Management
Internal Quality Control Procedures

Assumptions & Constraints
Failure to be forthright and upfront about assumptions and/or constraints about which we should be made aware will open the door to nullification or renegotiation of the agreement at a later date the possibility of straining our relationship. Possible topics include: travel expenses, upgrade/modification costs, licensing rights, etc.

Terms and Conditions
Any terms and conditions in the RFQ response must be listed in order for the vendor to make a fair and honest response. These may include: financing options, contract length, renewal options, warranties, delivery penalties, service levels, etc.

Selection Criteria
The final section criteria and process will remain confidential.
You will write two responses. The first is an opportunity to conjecture upon the link between the objects of your case studies and the various processes by which you have worked to study them. The second asks you to succinctly frame what you have learned, in clear and useful language.

1. When trying to assess the impact of practice upon product, what are the essential and most revealing factors and relationships to consider? Draw as many causal connections between practice and its impact on the design/building.

   Consider the dependence between built architecture and the delivery methodology used to take it from idea to built representation of that idea. Use examples from the exercises and built works covered in this course.

   With regard to buildings, consider issues including, but not limited to, cost, function, relevance to a community, aesthetic appeal, function, context, environmental compatibility, and meaning.

   With regard to project delivery, consider issues including, but not limited to the role of the architect, levels of autonomy and distinction between disciplines vs. collaboration; ethical practices; sustainable practices; cost and schedule control, client role, legality and risk.

2. Choose A or B. (20 Minutes)

   A. Supported by your experiences, observations, and reflections during this semester, develop a concise argument, in list form – worthy of distribution to next year’s first-year architecture students - for or against becoming an architect.

   B. With particular reference to complex and unpredictable projects, how has your understanding of the contribution, responsibilities, and challenges of the architect evolved over the course of this semester?