

University of Oregon

Interim Progress Report for Year Five

November 30, 2018

Contents

1. Executive Summary of the Two Most Recent NAAB Visits: 2007 and 2013
2. Interim Progress Report – Year Five
 - a. Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern identified in the review of the Interim Progress Report for Year 2: unpaid inters
 - b. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
 - c. Summary of Responses to Changes in the 2014 NAAB Conditions
 - d. Appendix
 - Bill Seider’s 2013 Memo about Jay Stephens comments on Practicum
 - Practicum Course Description
 - Practicum Architecture Firm Evaluation Form
 - Practicum Student Evaluation Form
 - New Faculty Profiles: Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg, Shevy Rockcastle

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE TWO MOST RECENT NAAB VISITS: 2013 and 2007

CONDITIONS NOT MET

2013 VTR	2007 VTR
I.1.4 Long-Range Planning	8 Physical Resources
	10 Financial Resources

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

2013 VTR	2007 VTR
A.9 Historical Traditions & Global Culture	13.9 Non-Western Traditions
	13.13 Human Diversity
	13.22 Building Service Systems
	13.25 Construction Cost Control

CAUSES OF CONCERN

2013 VTR
Relationship between Eugene and Portland campuses and curriculum
Lack of differentiation of graduate learning experience and expectation in course content
Academic advising
Unpaid internships
Inconsistency in delivery of capstone studios
Student command of digital technology
Social Equity

Interim Progress Report Year 5

University of Oregon

School of Architecture and Allied Arts

Bachelor of Architecture

(231 quarter credit hours)

Master of Architecture

Track I (non-architecture degree + 144 quarter credit hours)

Track II (pre-professional degree + 87 quarter credit hours)

Year of the previous visit: 2013

Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located:

Nancy Yen-wen Cheng, Associate Professor and Department Head
nywc@uoregon.edu, 541-346-3674 office, 541.556.4590 cell

Chief academic officer for the Institution:

Jayanth Banavar, Provost

Text from the IPR Year 2 review is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

I. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions

University of Oregon, 2018 Response: Satisfied by Two-Year IPR.

b. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Student Performance Criteria

University of Oregon, 2018 Response: Satisfied by Two-Year IPR.

II. Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern

Two Year IPR Review specifically required follow-up on: "Further explanation/clarification regarding unpaid intern process"

Unpaid Internships

2013 Team Assessment: Unpaid internships are unethical, raise a concern about consistency with AIA policy, and should not be allowed.

University of Oregon, Two-Year IPR Response: *The Practicum course syllabus has been rewritten to make it explicit that students assigned to a Practicum in an office cannot do any work that is for billable hours. We have worked closely with the AIA Southwest Oregon chapter to craft the Practicum to conform to AIA standards and believe we have now addressed this issue ethically. The syllabus for the Practicum course, ARCH 409/609 is included in this submission.*

University of Oregon, 2018 Response: PRACTICUM PROGRAM

At the University of Oregon, we are eager for our students learn about what architects do: the multiple facets of a normal architectural practice, including how design challenges are addressed and the process to realize a project in the built environment. Students are exposed to these

aspects in most “pro practice” courses but cannot clearly understand lecture topics without seeing them in an actual office. Our students can face difficulties in finding paid architectural employment in our base city of Eugene, Oregon which has a population ~170,000 with mostly small staffed architecture firms. So we offer a Practicum Off-Campus Experience course, as an on-ramp into architectural practice. This structured course provides an introduction to architecture offices for students including international student barred from working in the U.S. In this course, students spend 9-12 hours per week supervised by an appointed office mentor. The intention is that they get exposed to a broader range of professional practice than paid interns, who can be slotted into repetitive work. So the students attend meetings, visit job sites and observe activities such as marketing, conceptual design and project development. Being in an office environment for this educational exposure helps the students understand the rhythm and expectations of professional practice, which helps them subsequently get a paid internship. Enrollment in the program is not large: from 2015 to 2018, enrollment has ranged from 4 to 16 students each quarter.

How do we ensure that this is an educational process and students are not exploited for unpaid labor? Our Practicum supervisor, Otto Poticha, FAIA coaches offices and mentors about the purpose of the course, and has the students and firm mentors assess each other as a form of quality control. Firms are instructed that they cannot bill or charge for any of the work product that is used and developed by the student. Students keep daily logs that describe their tasks and their experience and conclude the term with a reflective report. The firm evaluates the students experience and has a “one on one” exit evaluation with the student. In addition the student submits an evaluation of the firm; which is passed on to the firm’s principal architect.

A 2013 note from architect and mentor Bill Seider documents his conversation with AIA legal counsel Jay Stephens who in 2013 explained the factors that keep our program in compliance with labor laws. (see Appendix)

We have initiated a few changes since 2015. We now only offer the Practicum program in Eugene. We discontinued the Practicum offering in Portland because the more advanced students enrolled there are better qualified for paid employment, and the larger city offers many more strong professional opportunities. In Eugene recently, the number of hours were reduced to a maximum of 12, so that the firms are not tempted to assign students work on billable projects. During the term, in addition to spending time at one office, all enrolled Practicum students gather as a group in three different offices to get a better overview of the variety of practices.

We are eager to develop stronger support for paid internships. With the re-organization of our school into a College of Design in Summer 2017, our Professional Outreach and Development for Students group has greatly expanded into a centralized Student Services academic and career advising hub. This group has organized Career fairs in both Eugene and Portland for the last few years. Our Center for Asian and Pacific Studies has created a network of Globalworks internships for students in all majors and will strengthen the support for our summer architecture interns in Shanghai (begun in 2011) with housing, on-site emergency support and training in cross-cultural communications.

For the future, we would like to develop research internships, so that our graduate students can act as intellectual conduits between our department and architecture offices. Applying academic

principles and methods to real-world scenarios provides an excellent learning situation while demonstrating the value of professional education. We have a great model from a Spring 2018 seminar in which Mark Fretz, the outreach director of our Institute for Health in the Built Environment, supervised students in addressing research questions posed by professional firms. Individual students or pairs of students researched aspects of building performance. Students either informed the building design process through forecasting performance (i.e. computer simulations comparing daylighting quality in alternative designs) or by conducting post-occupancy measurements (i.e. indoor microbial growth; heat transmission through wall assemblies).

Overall, we are eager for students to take their skills and knowledge into the professional world. Our Practicum program provides a stepping-stone to the world of architectural practice.

III. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

University of Oregon, 2018 Response: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Our department has experienced a great deal of change due to upper administration flux and a major school reorganization. The university president and provost positions are now permanent after several years of short-term appointments. After 100 years as the largest unit of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, our department is now part of the School of Architecture and Environment, one of four divisions of the College of Design created in Summer 2017. Departmental staff and funding have been consolidated to the School level, requiring us to redefine roles and processes. We are developing procedures to modify current rules that currently only recognize the department and college dean, not an intermediate level. (I assumed this position in January 2018 after a six-month interim department head.)

The reorganization facilitates opportunities for teaching and research collaborations with Landscape Architecture and Historic Preservation, and gives a stronger footing to our Interior Architecture program, which has grown into its own department. As the Historic Preservation moved to Portland in Fall 2016, we are sharing coursework there and developing collaborative projects around cultural heritage.

Positive university initiatives include more transparent processes for hiring, raises and promotion (triggered by faculty unionization in 2013), regular assessment of undergraduate education and revision of student evaluation of teaching. These initiatives have generated useful discussion about how to maintain appropriate local practices in aspects such as teaching requirements and research metrics across a diverse range of hard sciences, social sciences, humanities and professional schools. Equity and Inclusion efforts have included leadership training, speakers series and workshops about identity and culture from many disciplines.

Our challenges include an aging faculty and a Provost-controlled institutional hiring plan that does not replace tenure lines but rather rewards research innovation. We had three retirements last year and have an aging faculty, so we are concerned about being able to get approval to hire designers who can't bring large research grants. As our funding is tied to graduate enrollment, our School has invested in a staff recruiter and student recruiting assistants. While our undergraduate application numbers remain very high, our graduate applications were down last year, which we attribute to a half-baked website for the new school and large tuition increases.

To make the most of the changing conditions, our faculty has been brainstorming about our department DNA and how future trends will impact our work. We are defining Centers of Excellence to coalesce our research efforts, develop advanced coursework and thus attract top graduate students and resources. Our Portland branch is a crucial connection to a generous and forward-thinking professional community, where students can complement their academic studies with hands-on experience in addressing challenging urban issues.

We see great hope in three of our research initiatives which have built a great deal of momentum through multi-disciplinary collaboration, as they provide cutting-edge ideas into our teaching. . In its first year, Urbanism Next attracted 500 conference attendees to examine how cities will be transformed by self-driving cars, the sharing economy and real-time monitoring. It subsequently was awarded \$1Million from the University President's office. The Tallwood Design Institute, a collaboration with Oregon State University's Colleges of Forestry and Engineering, is demonstrating the viability of solid timber construction through federally and state-funded research and design pilot projects. And the Institute for Health in the Built Environment has a great deal of industry support to bring together architects, biologists, doctors and engineers to examine the interaction between microbes and interior forces such as sunlight, air, heat and building materials. Through these initiatives, our school is rebuilding and rebranding to face a more dynamic future.

IV. Summary of Responses to Changes in the [2014 NAAB Conditions](#)

University of Oregon, 2018 Response: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Our curriculum has generally been very stable. We have simplified the undergraduate history requirements so that all students take two global survey courses along with two electives, rather than having a larger array of options. We have piloted a new Global Modern Architecture course to provide a wider range of global cultures for our new graduate students. For these efforts we work closely with historians in the History of Art and Architecture department to ensure a broad range of appropriate offerings.

We are in the first steps of enriching how integrated design is taught in studio, by collecting learning objectives for beginning, intermediate and capstone studios, starting with building technology. From the School re-organization, we are looking at how to combine basic design and design communication courses for Interior Architecture, Architecture and Landscape Architecture students.

V. Appendix

MEMO RE: Practicum Course and Unpaid Interns

On Mar 25, 2013, at 10:44 PM, Bill Seider <bseider@pivotarchitecture.com> wrote:

Otto, Michael and Judith – As promised, while at Grassroots last week I did have a chance to speak with Jay Stephens, who is the head legal counsel for AIA National. I questioned him about the issue of ethics and the UO Practicum Student program as raised by the recent NAAB Team visiting the University of Oregon School of Architecture earlier this month. After describing the program with the following features Jay noted that he did not think that we were violating the AIA Code of Ethics by continuing this Practicum Class participation:

- ☐ Students are enrolled in, pay for and get academic credit for the Practicum Program Class
- ☐ Students spend time in an architect's office for twelve hours a week through a term period
- ☐ Students receive no pay or other remuneration from the firms they are assigned to
- ☐ Students do a variety of assignments while at the firm but that they are not taking the place of a firm employee

Jay referenced the Rules of the Board (I have attached the complete current version dated 12-06-2012) for another validation that we are not violating the Code of Ethics or other AIA rule. Here is the referenced paragraph that is used to define the term "working student", especially as it applies to honor and other award winners, but is equally relevant in our question:

10.112 Definition and Interpretation of the Term —"Working Students". As used in the Rules of the Board, the term —working students shall not include any individual satisfying the following conditions: (a) the individual is enrolled in a regular course of study calculated to lead to the award of a degree in architecture or other design-related discipline from an accredited educational institution; and (b) the individual is undertaking the unpaid internship for academic credit; and (c) the educational institution specifies that, in order to receive such academic credit, the individual is permitted to receive no (or only nominal) compensation in connection with the internship; and (d) such arrangement is consistent with the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdiction (whether federal, state or other) governing the arrangement. The employment of such an individual shall not be grounds for preventing any person from executing any declaration referenced in Sections 2.311, 6.613, 6.715, 10.011, 10.111, 10.31, 10.42, or 10.53 of the Rules of the Board.

In Jay's opinion the Practicum Students in our offices each term ARE NOT "working students" according to the above definition in the Rules of the Board.

Let me know if you need anything more in this regard or if I can be of assistance in this or other issues.

Bill Seider, FAIA
PIVOT Architecture
44 West Broadway, Suite 300
Eugene, OR 97401

d.541.762.1618
c.541.953.2277
t.541.342.7291
www.pivotarchitecture.com



Off Campus Introduction to Professional Office Practice-Practicum Architects in the Schools (AIS)

University of Oregon ARCH, IARC and LARC 409/609 -practicum -Architects in the Schools
Winter 2018-19

Instructor: Otto Poticha FAIA

Students have 2 options for this course:

1. Professional Office Practicum for 3 credit hours
hour

2. Architects in the Schools for 1 credit

The **Architects in the Schools (AIS)** is an off campus experience through the Architecture Foundation of Oregon. The student is paired with a professional architect and an elementary school teacher for a 6 week classroom residency offering an architectural design experience to 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students

The **Practicum Experience** is a teaching and professional relationship between the student and the office. It is an opportunity to view and participate in the various professional office tasks and to experience the workings and the processes that occurs in a professional office.

There are a number of local architectural and construction company offices that have volunteered to participate in this program. The students will select offices from a list provided by the instructor. The Instructor will assign students to each office. The office will assign a mentor for each student. The mentor will be someone within the office, one that has a minimum of two years of office experience. The mentor's role is to oversee the work of the student and to share experiences.

The student shall be responsible to develop a work schedule with the office that is mutually acceptable for both parties.

This schedule must include a minimum of 9 hours/week for under-grad. students and 12 hours/week for grad. students at the "office".

When the schedule is agreed upon, it will be the student's responsibility to/and without exception, adhere to the agreed upon days and times. The student is to present and dress themselves in an appropriate professional manner, at least to the level of the other professionals in the office.

The student will contact the assigned office and arrange for the first meeting. The student will develop a resume and portfolio for this meeting, which will include an interview at the same scope and inquiry as the office's standard interview.

The office will make every effort to expose the student to the following areas of the office practice and this listing should be used by the both mentor and the student as a checklist:

Programming
Site analysis
Schematic design and presentations
Design development (and the distinction between SD and DD) and presentations
Code research
Consultant coordination
Construction documents

Specifications and General conditions
Document checking and shop drawing review
Bidding and contract negotiation
Construction phase in the office and on site
Inspection reports, change orders and documentation of RFI's and other paper trails.
Marketing, public service and RFP's
Materials and Details research

The student is required to keep a weekly log of their experiences and the level of exposure. They are also to report to the mentor or principal if they are not getting the exposure and experiences listed.

During the term, three offices will be contacted for an entire class visit, hosted by the student assigned to the selected office. The visit will include presentation of the particular working methods and project process of that particular office followed by a tour and discussion with other members of the office.

The office at the end of the term will evaluate the student on the learning achieved, attitude and general performance. The student will also evaluate the office and the term's learning experience. Grading will be made by the instructor and based on the office evaluation. These evaluations will be recorded into the student's University record. The office, as an option, may write notes of advice and or commendation to the student. A copy of the log, the office/ student evaluation and the student/office evaluation will be placed into the student's permanent school record.

Employer Evaluation of Student's Practicum Performance

These evaluations are mandatory and are the student's grade for the term

We greatly appreciate your taking the time to complete this form. Please discuss your evaluation with the student prior to returning it to Otto Poticha @ the AAA dept University of Oregon.

We urge you to be candid in your evaluation

Student: Submit this form to your supervisor. After discussing the evaluation, you or your supervisor should return it to Otto Poticha @ the University of Oregon prior to the end of the term. This form will be placed in your record.

PART I

Student Name: _____ 409 _____ 609 _____

Dates of Practicum: _____
Pass _____ No Pass _____

Company: _____

Company Address: _____

Supervisor Name: _____ Title: _____

EMPLOYER EVALUATION OF STUDENTS PERFORMANCE

PART II

1. Professional Skills

How would you rate the student's skills in the following areas?

A. Design:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

B. Graphics:

1. Digital 2-D:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

2. Digital 3-D:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

3. Drawing:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

4. Model Making:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

C. Technical:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

D. Research:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

2. Collaborative Skills

How did the student perform in the following team settings?

In-House Project Team:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Consultant Project Team:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Client/Owner:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

3. Personal Skills

How would you evaluate the student in the following areas?

Learning Ability:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Attitude:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Organization:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Thoroughness:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Time Management:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Initiative:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Leadership:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Communication:**Verbal:**

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Written:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Graphic:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

4. Overall Evaluation

Please indicate how the student's performance ranks overall.

Academic Preparation:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Quality of Work:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Consistency of Work:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Professionalism:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

PART IV

Check the areas that the student had some contact or experience during the term.

- Programming
- Site analysis
- Schematic design and presentations
- Design development (and the distinction between SD and DD) and presentations
- Code research
- Consultant coordination
- Construction documents
- Specifications and General conditions
- Document checking and shop drawing review
- Bidding and contract negotiation
- Construction phase in the office and on site
- Inspection reports, change orders and documentation of RFI's and other paper trails.
- Marketing, public service and RFP's

Supervisor's signature: _____ **Date:** _____

OFFICE/EXPERIENCE EVALUATION

Practicum Fall 2014, University of OregonPoticha

Student Name: _____ Major: _____

Firm or Company Name: _____

Company Address: _____

Supervisor's Name: _____

Part I

Please complete with specific details and full descriptions:

What were your general duties/tasks? _____

What courses/skills were beneficial in the execution of this experience?

What specific contributions did you make while being in this office?

What aspects of the experience did you like the most?

What aspects of the experience did you like the least?

What did you learn about your field that was new to you?

To what extent has this influenced your career/academic goals?

Would you recommend this experience to another student?

Why or why not?

Part II

Did this experience provide you with the opportunity to develop skills in the following areas?

1. Professional Skills

How would you rate your development in the following areas?

A. Design:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

B. Graphics:

1. Digital 2-D:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

2. Digital 3-D:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

3. Drawing:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

4. Model Making:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

C. Technical:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

D. Research:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

2. Collaborative Skills

How did your collaborative skills develop in the following team settings?

In-House Project Team:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Consultant Project Team:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Client/Owner:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

3. Personal Skills

Please rate how well this practicum helped you to develop your personal skills.

Learning Ability:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Attitude:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Organization:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Thoroughness:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Time Management:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Initiative:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Leadership:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Communication:

Verbal:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Written:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Graphic:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

4. Overall Evaluation

How did this practicum experience provide you with opportunities for growth?

How and from whom did you receive direction, support, and supervision during this experience?
(Please explain in detail)

Overall how would you rate this experience:

Outstanding	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A

Notes:

NEW FACULTY

Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg



*Associate Professor
Energy Studies Building Lab (ESBL) Director
Architecture*

Research Interests:

daylighting design, integrated design principles, energy performance and air quality and the microbiome in buildings

Email: kevinvdw@uoregon.edu

Phone: 541-346-5647

Office: ESBL

Website: <https://blogs.uoregon.edu/esbl/faculty-and-staff/kevin-van-den-wymelenberg/>

[Curriculum Vitae](#)

PhD, Education, University of Washington, 2012
MArch, University of Washington, 2002
BS Architectural Studies, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2000

Dr. Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg is an Associate Professor at the University of Oregon and is the Director of the Energy Studies in Buildings Laboratory in Eugene and Portland, OR. He teaches classes in daylighting, integrated design principles, energy performance in buildings, and design. Van Den Wymelenberg has consulted on several hundred new construction and major renovation projects with architects and engineers regarding daylight and energy in buildings since 2000. Five of these projects have been recognized with AIA's Committee on the Environment Top 10 Awards and many others are LEED certified. He has presented at many conferences including IES National, LightFair International and Passive Low Energy Architecture. He has authored several papers and two books related to daylighting, visual comfort, and low energy design strategies.

Dr. Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg served as Assistant and Associate Professor in the College of Art and Architecture in Boise from 2004-2015. He was the founding Director of the Integrated Design Lab in Boise (UI-IDL) and served there as professor from 2004-2015, completing over \$7M in funded research and outreach in daylighting and energy efficiency for the Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance, United States Environment Protection Agency, Idaho Power Company, the New Buildings Institute and others. Kevin is the Chair of the IESNA's Daylight Metrics Committee and co-author on IES document LM-83 that serves as partial basis for the LEED V4 Daylighting Credit.

Siobhan Rockcastle



Assistant Professor
Architecture

Research Interests:

sustainable architecture, high performance buildings, occupant well-being, space perception, environmental dynamics

Email: srockcas@uoregon.edu

Phone:

Office: 181 Onyx Bridge

Website: <https://siobhanrockcastle.com/>

PhD, LIPID Lab, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne (2017)

SMArchS, Building Technology Lab, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2011)

BArch, Cornell University (2008)

My research interests include sustainable architecture, high performance buildings, occupant well-being, space perception, and environmental dynamics.

My research, design, and teaching activities are centered around the belief that building science is about more than energy-efficient and carbon-neutral architecture. These factors are undeniably important, but they only address a part of the contemporary challenge facing present-day building construction and occupation. Over the past decade, human beings living between 41 and 45 degrees N. spent an average of 25% less time outdoors than they did only 10 years before. In pre-industrial times we spent a significant amount of time outdoors, where productive activities required daylight for visual acuity. With the advent of energy efficient and inexpensive electrical and mechanical systems, we have enabled our species to occupy indoor environments for increasingly longer periods, resulting in just under 2 hours of time spent outdoors on average each day. It's safe to say that we are rapidly transforming our habitation patterns, impacting the amount of exposure our biology has to dynamic natural systems: sky light, fresh air, and variable climatic factors. With this shift, comes a host of potentially negative impacts on our emotional, physiological, and perceived well-being.

As a researcher, I am interested in foundational questions about the impacts of environment on human health. As an architectural designer, this interest is grounded in methods of application, with a focus on integrating data-driven performance into multi-criteria design support. As an educator, I draw upon my experience working between the fields of science, engineering, and design to engage students in interdisciplinary methods of learning. To solve contemporary challenges in the built environment of today, we can no longer rely on traditional disciplinary boundaries. As architects, we must reach out and use our creative thinking to tackle environmental and social challenges in collaboration with the physical, environmental, and life sciences. With this mentality, my work seeks to build bridges beyond architecture, to improve the health and well-being of contemporary buildings and urban environments.