



THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF ARCHITECTS
Practice Management Knowledge Committee

PRACTICE MANAGEMENT DIGEST



Advancing the Practice of Architecture

Spring 2012 Issue

As the Practice Management Knowledge Community, our mission is to advance the practice of architecture through discovering, generating, organizing, and sharing insights, resources, and tools that enable architects to practice more effectively.

Features

Letter from the Editor

By Raymond Kogan, AIA

Welcome to the first 2012 issue of the Practice Management Digest, which goes out quarterly to our almost 10,000 Practice Management Knowledge Community members! As this year's editor (and last year's PMKC Chair) I would first like to introduce the new members of the PMKC Advisory Group, then we will provide you with a wealth of information under this issue's theme of "organizational management" to help you manage your own practice. Finally, we will give you a link to the AIA's best practices, with some encouragement to submit your firm's own best practices to become a part of the AIA's growing body of knowledge.

This issue of the Digest begins with a thought provoking article about the emerging field of knowledge management in firms entitled "The All-of-the-Above Approach to Knowledge Management" by Christopher Parsons, founder and CEO of Knowledge Architecture, who will also be presenting our next webinar on March 22 (see below). Then we go where the rubber meets the road, into project and operations management with "Project Planning and Revenue Projections: Where Project Management Connects with Firm Operations" by Steve Evans, AIA of Stephen C. Evans Consulting. Since quality management can be problematic for many firms, our next article is "Knowing the Unknown Unknowns:

Achieving Certainty in Documents” by Michael J. Lough, AIA of Integral Consulting. Principals are at the vortex of most practice management issues, and we have an intriguing article entitled “The Principals’ Dilemma” by Rena M. Klein, FAIA (Rena is also on the PMKC Advisory Group). Finally, since the overall theme of this issue is organizational management, we have an article by yours truly, Ray Kogan, and my colleague, Cara Bobchek about firm organizational structures, “Designing Your Firm’s Organizational Model.”

Upcoming Issue

Our next issue, to be published in June, will revolve around the theme of human resources management: everything to do with the all-important people in your practice. If you would like to provide an article for consideration in the next PM Digest, please contact me at rkogan@kogancompany.com.

New PMKC Advisory Group Members

In addition to our current PMKC Advisory Group members of: Scott Kuehn, AIA (2012 Chair); Donald Simpson, AIA; Rena Klein, FAIA; and myself, Ray Kogan, AIA, I would like to introduce Mark Frisch, FAIA as the newest Advisory Group member and Jason Pierce, AIA in the newly created position of PMKC Young Architects Forum representative.

Mark Frisch, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C is a Principal with Solomon Cordwell Buenz in Chicago. Mark is a creative leader who has spent his professional life developing an understanding of how buildings work and innovating on their integration into the natural and built environments. He currently serves as Principal-in-Charge of Technical Design, where he is responsible for comprehensive technical oversight of the office, initiatives in innovative materials, systems and sustainability, as well as implementing the firm’s rigorous quality assurance program.

Jason Pierce, AIA, is a project architect with HOK in St. Louis. He serves on the Young Architects Forum Advisory Committee as the YAF Regional Liaison Advisor and has been Co-Chair of the AIA San Francisco

Mentorship Committee, chaired the Long Range Planning committee for AIA California Council in 2010, was Vice President of the Academy of Emerging Professionals with AIA California Council, and YAF regional Director for Central States. Jason is also on the editorial board for aecKnowledge.

The All-of-the-Above Approach to Knowledge Management

By Christopher Parsons

Much of the knowledge in architecture and engineering firms is tacit, silent—residing deep in the intuition and experience of employees. Codifying tacit knowledge is often the central goal of knowledge management initiatives. This is understandable, because the firm's core assets walk out the door every evening. Leadership hopes they return the next morning.

For many industries, especially product-centric industries such as manufacturing, that create repeatable goods, the return on investment for codifying knowledge is clear. If capturing knowledge can improve efficiency, quality, and profits while costing less than the time and money required to capture it, well, then, there you have it, a clear case for the return-on-investment (ROI) of knowledge management.

Knowledge in Architectural Firms

But in professional services, especially architecture and engineering, codifying knowledge is more complex, largely due to the one-off nature of architecture and engineering projects. Obviously, there are routine processes and procedures inside architecture and engineering firms that can and should be documented. Checklists, templates, and design guidelines can be powerful tools for capturing lessons learned on previous projects. However, most firms spend too much time creating documents and organizing databases, and not enough time connecting people. Both are important, and a balanced approach to knowledge management is the golden ticket.

A powerful use of documents and databases is to provide pointers to the people who might have answers to the problems we are trying to solve. An illustration of the evolution of knowledge management strategy is the recent surge in the deployment of social networking tools *inside* organizations to promote knowledge sharing. Again, firms should remember the importance of the balanced approach to knowledge management and not simply rush to adopt the tools that all the cool kids are using. It is not a question of either or, but yes and.

Two Degrees of Separation

My good friend Ed Friedrichs, formerly the President of Gensler and currently the Chairman of ZweigWhite, exemplifies this approach with a concept he calls [Two Degrees of Separation](#). Two Degrees of Separation means that within two phone calls (or e-mails) I should be able to either *find the person* who knows the answer to my question, or, *find the person who knows the person* who knows the answer to my question. Ed insisted that every asset uploaded to Gensler's first intranet contain the most

relevant expert's name, phone number, and e-mail address, because he understood that "data, diagrams and facts are rarely helpful to the person making the inquiry. After all, their problem is unique and needs interpretation to adapt what is on the Intranet to their individual application. Only a person with expert knowledge can interpolate for the situation at hand."

Amen to that.

Connecting People

An underleveraged component of knowledge management strategy in architecture and engineering firms is connecting people. The way you design your knowledge management strategy should flow from that insight. Your knowledge management team must be comprised of strong communicators *and* technologists. Think about how the systems, services, and value your knowledge management platform provides can be optimized to connect people, as well as organize documents.

Here are a few excellent examples of architecture and engineering firms that have taken a balanced approach to knowledge management:

- Einhorn Yaffee Prescott and their [A16 program for up/down mentoring](#).
- Arup's [integration of knowledge management and thought leadership](#).
- Degenkolb's [Technical Conference and New Technologies Group](#).

Is your firm taking an innovative approach to knowledge management? If so, I'd love to [hear from you](#).

Christopher Parsons is the Founder and CEO of Knowledge Architecture, a knowledge and information management consultancy to architects and engineers. He is also the producer of KA Connect, a knowledge and information management conference and community for the AEC industry. Christopher can be contacted at cparsons@knowledge-architecture.com.

Project Planning and Revenue Projections: Where project management connects with firm operations

By Stephen C. Evans, AIA, NCARB

Project Managers live in the world of *projects* which is where most firms of any size earn the revenue to support the practice of architecture and design. Operations leaders in firms live in all areas of the firm's professional practice and must keep an eye on marketing, business management, human resources, information technology, and all sectors and disciplines performing project services. From the perspective of an operations director, if there is a single-most important financial metric in the firm it is *good revenue projections* that come from project managers who provide timely *project work plans* and update them on a regular basis.

Very large, multiple-office firms utilize more specialization and focus in the roles and responsibilities of firm operations and project management. Large, medium, and small firms demonstrate the ability of professionals to wear several hats in firm and project leadership. An operations person in very large firms typically will be considered “management” with little or no time billable to projects. Other firms may have principals and market sector leaders sharing the role of operations. The same parallel is true with projects: project managers in very large firms with projects of corresponding size and complexity live mostly in “managing” the project while project managers in other firms can function as the designer, project architect, and project manager on projects affording these roles. The exact model is not as important as being clear within the firm as to the accountability for operations and project management, and making sure that the necessary functions are regularly accomplished.

Tools to Use

One thing remains consistent in all firms and all projects –project plans and project revenue are necessary to see where you’re headed. The work plans can be simple or not, in Excel or created within an enterprise software solution with a project planning component. It really does not matter except that the enterprise solution, integrated with accounting and time-keeping, will provide important information that stand-alone Excel won’t – it will synchronize actual hours with planned hours in one place and provide reports for earned and projected revenue for your firm. After that it gets easier, and where most of us want to live our professional lives - providing great client service, and well designed and functional buildings that are built well, sustainable, and lasting.

How Much Detail?

I have a work plan motto – “Prepare project work plans that serve the project manager and teams, do not prepare plans that you must serve.” In other words, prepare project plans to the level of detail that works for the team, project size, complexity, and project manager. Do not go to a level of detail that is hard, if not impossible, to manage. Planning to three or even four levels, in some cases, in the Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) is adequate for most projects, don’t take too long to prepare and provide a manageable plan that can be monitored and updated as required. Planning to two levels by simply adding staff/resources at the phase level is not detailed enough; however, I’ve seen it work well for experienced project managers who are very engaged in the project work.

Following is the 4-level WBS described above:

Level 1 – Project Name

Level 2 – Phase Name

Level 3 – Task Name

Level 4 – Sub-task Name

An example of a common Level 3 Task would be “Building Elevations” and associated Level 4 Sub-tasks would be “North Elevation”, “South Elevation”, etc. For most purposes, staff assignments are made for

the building elevations to be completed over a period of time and Level 3 is really as far as you need to go to manage the project. Are you considering planning to Level 5 in your plan? If so, you would be micro-managing and definitely serving the plan, not letting it serve you and your project team.

Smaller Firms and Projects

We hear this statement all the time – “I only have small projects, a lot of them, and don’t have the time or see the need for doing project plans.” Project plans for small projects don’t need much detail, certainly don’t take much time, and if you are going to use resource utilization reports to help manage your staff you have to do them. Yes, you do want to use resource utilization reports to measure the chargeability of your staff and once you get to the point where you have accuracy and regularity in this metric you’ll never be able to live without it. Do project plans for all projects, no exceptions, and it’s not dependent on firm size at all. Lastly and in parallel with project planning, you need deliverable lists and cartoon sets for your projects.

Project profitability is most dependent on tailoring Scope of Services and fees to the documents and services you deliver. A project work plan that does not reflect the tasks and consider the deliverables for the project has little chance of succeeding.

Stephen C. Evans, AIA, NCARB, is the owner of Stephen C. Evans Consulting, LLC. His experience includes serving as Senior Project Manager with Populous, Director of Risk Management for HOK Corporate and Director of Operations for HOK’s North Central Region and Treanor Architects. He can be reached at steve@scevensconsulting.com.

Knowing the Unknown Unknowns: Achieving Certainty in Documents

By Micheal J. Lough, AIA

The single action that architects can take to improve the “certainty” which they expect of their Construction Documents is to increase the frequency, quality, and extent of reviews of the documents. Too often, documents at all design phases and the Construction Documents phase are issued without sufficient review. Insufficiently reviewed documents are a firm’s “Unknown Unknowns:” important details that firms don’t know that they don’t know, which can bite them later in the project. [More](#)

Architects would be well served to develop a structured review program with checklists to address document audits. This process encompasses the following items:

First-Party Audits

The architectural design team has the primary responsibility to review the documents; these are first-party audits.

The project team leader should conduct team meetings weekly with the architectural team to review progress. Each member of the team should have clearly defined responsibilities and specific goals, which are tracked at least on a weekly basis. The project team leader, the Project Manager and/or Project Architect, should touch base frequently, even daily, with the individual team members and make themselves available to address all questions or issues raised. The architect's review is a review of all the documents: consultant documents; outline specifications; code analysis; and other supporting and reference materials such as geotechnical engineering and acoustical consultant reports.

Larger project teams may designate an experienced team member as a document coordinator, who is responsible for coordinating the various drawings prepared by the architect as well as coordinating the architect's drawings with consultant drawings, consultant drawings with other consultant drawings, and drawings with the specifications.

Management Responsibilities

Firm management needs to be responsible for document audits, ensuring they are conducted by the project team. To conquer the Unknown Unknowns, they should encourage second- or third-party Peer Reviews as part of the quality management process.

A sole-proprietor or a firm with a single principal does not have the option of management-conducted second-party audits (a second set of eyes) so a third-party audit with a consultant should be considered. In small and medium sized firms, second-party audits may be performed by a principal not directly responsible for the project. The effectiveness of a second-party audit occurs when the reviewing principal is not directly involved in the project.

Peer Review Program

Establishing Peer Reviews as a component of a firm's quality management process with second- or third-party audits is the surest way to slay the Unknown Unknowns and improve the certainty of the Construction Documents.

Second-party audits have the best chance to work in larger firms where senior staff can have a specific role as a second-party auditor. This staff/second-party auditor can wear other hats such as technical resources, internal code resource, or specification writer. However, if this staff person is an active participant of the project team (the specifications writer, for instance,) he or she cannot function as the second-party auditor. It is rare that a Project Manager with a heavy work load can serve as the second-party auditor for a different project; their focus remains on their projects and attempting to focus on someone else's project is a distraction. Discovering Unknown Unknowns is a serious detail-oriented undertaking that requires 100% focus. A better solution is to use a consultant with a strong technical background, experience in managing projects, and good design sensibilities.

Identifying the Unknown Unknowns and assuring certainty in the documents requires ongoing peer reviews through the project. A single Peer Review conducted towards the completion of the Construction Documents may uncover issues too late to handle them with finesse and within the

budget. Except for very small projects, at least three Peer Reviews should be conducted, one at Schematic Design, one at Design Development, and one at 75% or 90% Construction Documents. The function of a Peer Review program is more than just catching errors and omissions prior to the issuance of Construction Documents. The Peer Review plays an important role in correcting documents as early in the process as possible, which is more efficient for the project team.

While it is challenging to fit Peer Reviews into demanding project schedules, the best approach is to integrate Peer Reviews into the project schedule, rather than extending the project schedule.

Peer Review Criteria (Uncovering the Unknown Unknowns)

- **Compliance.** Compliance includes requirements such as regulatory requirements (zoning and code) as well as programmatic and performance requirements. The new trend in quality management of architectural projects is commissioning (or enhanced commissioning) where the owner engages the Peer Review consultant to ensure that their project requirements are met and comply with the Basis of Design documents.
- **Completeness.** The most important area in which to achieve certainty is in the thoroughness of the architectural drawings, consultant drawings, specifications, and other requirements appropriate to the phase. This is the heart of unknown territory and the most likely place to uncover accidental errors.
- **Coordination.** Another key area of certainty is in the coordination of the architectural drawings with the structural and MEP/FP drawings, the consultant drawings, and the specifications.
- **Technical detailing.** The technical detailing of the exterior building envelope is especially critical and more often than not documents do not sufficiently address the issues of water penetration, air and vapor infiltration, thermal performance criteria, fire-resistive requirements, constructability, structural factors, and other design intent and performance criteria. Thorough technical detailing review of the exterior building envelope as well as other detailing throughout the project will uncover Unknown Unknowns critical to the success of the project.

Micheal J. Lough, AIA, is the founding principal of Integral Consulting, a firm providing technical assistance, exterior envelope consulting, and Peer Review consulting services for architects, owners, development managers, and contractors. Contact: mlough@integral-consulting.net.

The Principals' Dilemma

By Rena M. Klein, FAIA

Harvard researcher, [Noam Wasserman](#) has discovered that most entrepreneurs must eventually choose between “making a lot of money or running the show.” In his article, [The Founders Dilemma, Harvard Business Review \(2008\)](#), Wasserman reports on research involving 212 American start-ups. Although his

research was not about architecture, or even professional service firms, Wasserman's findings have profound implications for the business development of small architectural firms.

In a nutshell, Wasserman's research shows that as a business grows, it inevitably surpasses the skills, energy, and resources of the founder. In start-up design firms, this occurs when the capabilities of the founding principals generate more opportunities, over a sustained period of time, than the principals can handle on their own. A happy circumstance, to be sure, but it may force founders to face what Wasserman calls the "rich versus king" dilemma.

According to Wasserman, most entrepreneurs come to a point where they must give up unilateral control in order to grow their business. Simply put, founders who share control with cofounders and employees build a more valuable company than those who don't.

Wealth or Control

While letting go of control may lead to greater revenue and more interesting projects, many founding principals find giving up unilateral control to be extremely difficult. This phenomenon is explained by Wasserman, "The founder creates the organizational culture, which is an extension of his or her style, personality, and preferences. From the get-go, employees, customers, and business partners identify start-ups with their founders." This is especially true for architecture, an industry in which clients, colleagues, and community regularly identify firms by the talents and style of the founding principals.

Wasserman reports that most entrepreneurs tend to be overly optimistic about their potential for success. He cites a study done in 1998 which reports that 81 percent of founders expect to succeed at their endeavor but give similar business founded by others only a 59 percent chance of success. Many entrepreneurs believe that they are the only ones who are capable of running their company, even when there is evidence to the contrary.

The Principals' Dilemma

The first 10 - 15 years of an architectural firm's existence is usually spent working to establish a steady client base, a trustworthy staff, and a reliable project delivery processes. The start-up firm is often organized in a pyramidal structure, with the principals at the top in control of all operations. A firm such as this has unlimited potential to grow, based on the principals' capabilities, but it will be limited by the principals' capacity in terms of time and energy.

If founding principals are uncomfortable delegating responsibilities and authority, it will be difficult to successfully grow their firm. Beyond delegating and sharing authority, Wasserman's article reports that growth often depends on a redefinition of the founders' role and a redesign of the company's organizational structure. A "reinvention" of the founding principals' vision for a firm may be necessary as well, and may prove to be the most challenging aspect of this process.

The payoff for founding principals in relinquishing control may be opportunities for landing larger and more interesting projects, the possibility of increasing firm value, and potential for continuing the existence of the firm beyond the founders' active involvement. Firms that grow may allow founders to

retire with the promise of financial support provided by the ongoing firm. Firms that do not grow are not likely to become business entities that have intrinsic value beyond the talents and reputation of the founders. These firms usually do not continue beyond the founders' work-lives and are not likely to provide financial benefit during the founders' retirement.

Nonetheless, many founding principals are more comfortable being the "king" of their own domain, no matter how small. Practitioners who choose "king" over "rich" can have very successful and personally satisfying practices and may accumulate enough personal wealth to retire comfortably without needing to build equity in their firm. Wasserman explains, "For founders, a "rich" choice isn't necessarily better than a "king" choice, or vice versa; what matters is how well each decision fits with their reason for starting the company."

Wasserman emphasizes that the critical feature of this choice between money and power is the founders' level of knowing the personal meaning of success. Founders who want to be "king" will likely not feel successful if they share control, even if they make more money. On the other hand, founders who know their goal is to maximize earnings and retire comfortably will not view themselves as failures when others take the lead. In an industry well known for preferring control over riches, it is understandable that the vast majority of architectural firms are very small.

The [Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Outlook Handbook](#) states that architects start their own firms at a rate that is three times greater than other occupations. According to Wasserman, most entrepreneurs start out by wanting both wealth and power. But, based on research done by sociologist [Judith Blau](#), control is likely to be the prime motivator for entrepreneurial architects. However, at some point, most founding principals have to decide whether to grow their firm or stay small. If they understand that the choice is actually between "being rich" and "being king," they will have to figure out which is more important. Either one can lead to financial and personal satisfaction, but knowing which matters most is the key to success.

Rena M. Klein, FAIA, principal of [RM Klein Consulting](#), is the Editorial Director of [aecKnowledge](#) and Executive Editor of the 15th Edition of the AIA Architects Handbook of Professional Practice (2013 release). Rena can be reached at rena@rmklein.com.

Designing Your Firm's Organizational Model

By Raymond Kogan, AIA and Cara Bobchek

Think of the way your firm is organized—its organizational structure—as a management tool that you use to leverage the talents and skills of your people, promote growth and profitability, and meet the needs of the clients and markets that you serve in the context of the geographic, economic, social, and political environment in which you operate. The way a firm operates—how it is portrayed on its organizational chart, that often confounding diagram with its array of boxes connected by solid and

dotted lines—reveals two important things about a firm: how it orients itself to its clients and its work, and who reports to whom within the company.

A firm's organization structure has a pervasive effect on many vital items inside and outside the firm: the effectiveness with which the firm brings in work; the focus it brings to clients; the efficiency with which it executes the work (and, hence, its profitability); the level of collaboration, career paths, and even employee satisfaction within the firm; and finally, an infrastructure for the potential growth of the firm.

Common Organizational Structures

Organizing Around Clients or Markets. When a firm is client-centered, it is organized from the outside in. Ask yourself how your clients would prefer to see your firm organized—or better yet, ask them. Consider what attributes bind the firm's clients together as a coherent group or groups, i.e. a "market." Take into account all of the relevant variables affecting your clients: their needs, priorities, and personalities, as well as marketplace conditions, economics, geography, politics, the availability of labor, the cost of doing business; and, most importantly, their definition of their own success.

Organizing Around Project Types. Clients understandably want to hire design firms that can demonstrate specialized experience in the kinds of projects that the clients pursue. Therefore, many firms organize themselves around the types of projects that they build. For example, a firm might have one group specializing in developer office buildings and another in multi-family residential projects, each of which requires very different types of design expertise.

Organizing Around Geography. When a firm has multiple offices to serve clients or produce projects locally or in different locations, it often makes sense to the leadership to organize around those geographic locations. In firms organized around geography, a local office manager, rather than a market or discipline leader, for example, is usually the senior manager reporting to the president of the firm.

Organizing Around Principals. Firms that are led by a small group of principals—who typically have known and worked with one another for a long time—are strongly driven by those principals' personalities. For their clients, the principal is synonymous with the firm; the principal is the firm. Often, these types of firms develop multiple small teams under each principal, each headed by a project manager who is in day-to-day contact with the clients and develops relationships with his or her peers at their respective level in the clients' organization.

Organizing Around Services. Some multi-discipline A/E firms organize around the services they provide in discipline-driven departments such as an architectural design group, an architectural production group, a structural engineering group, a mechanical engineering group, an electrical engineering group, a site/civil engineering group, and a construction administration group. Each discipline comprises a department and is led by a director (of design, structural engineering, and so forth).

Organizing Around Studios. Architects often organize their firm around studios, which is really a universal and non-descriptive word that may also reflect an organization by geography, by client type, or

by principal. Therefore, a closer look may be required to determine exactly what “the studio” really represents.

The Matrix Organization. When a firm is large or diverse, it often has to reconcile how to manage a variety of work or project types, client types, and office locations. These firms sometimes adopt a matrix structure or organization.

The matrix structure has two lines of reporting, and the firm’s organizational chart looks more like a table (a matrix) than the customary up and down—often pyramidal shaped—hierarchical arrangement of boxes and lines. The rows, or “vectors,” of the matrix might represent project or client types, and the columns might represent the physical location of the firm’s offices—or vice versa.

A potential drawback of a matrix structure is that, on paper, it appears that an employee in the middle of the matrix has two bosses. Poorly defined matrix structures can be confusing, because essentially an employee actually does have two supervisors, so a matrix organization is more likely to be successful if there is a dominant direction of reporting: one or the other “vectors” of the matrix must take precedence.

Designing Your Firm’s Organizational Structure

Changing a firm’s organizational structure is one of the most challenging strategies that a firm can undertake. After all, changing the way a firm is organized may change every aspect of the experience of working in—as well as with—the firm. The type of change is bound to push some beyond their comfort zones, even when the changes are positive, as they should be if a firm makes them as a result of a thoughtful strategic planning process.

Ray Kogan, AIA is the president of Kogan & Company, management and strategy consultants to design firms, and was the 2011 Chair of the AIA Practice Management Knowledge Community Advisory Group. Cara Bobchek is a senior consultant with Kogan & Company. Ray and Cara co-authored the book, Strategic Planning for Design Firms, published by Kaplan AEC. They can be reached at rkogan@kogancompany.com and cbobchek@kogancompany.com.

Upcoming Events

2012 AIA National Convention, Washington, DC, May 16-19

2012 Practice Management Lunch: *The Future of Practice* by Phillip Bernstein, FAIA, RIBA, LEED AP

As you register for the 2012 Convention, be sure to sign up for the Practice Management Lunch on Friday, May 18 from 11:30-1:30 (program EV309).

Our speaker will be the always forward-thinking and provocative Phil Bernstein, Vice President for AEC Industry Strategy and Relations for Autodesk and co-author of the book Building (in) the Future: Recasting Labor in Architecture. Phil will examine the challenges and opportunities facing the profession of architecture as we enter the second decade of the 21st century, during which the architects must reposition themselves in the building industry. Advancing digital technology, environmental concerns, increasingly globalized practice, and remediated relationships to constructors through integrated delivery are but a few of the large questions to be defined and examined.

Also take advantage of the **2012 Marketing Media Exchange**, a joint venture of the AIA PMKC and the Society for Marketing Professional Services (SMPS) on Thursday, May 17 from 11:00-1:00 in the AIA Town Center on the Expo floor. A/E marketing experts will be available to offer free (yes, free!) constructive critiques of your firm's printed and online marketing materials. This has been a very popular program in past years, and we are happy to bring it back.

Finally, look for additional programs and seminars being presented by members of the PMKC Advisory Group.

2012 Fall Conference

Your PMKC is joining forces with the AIA South Atlantic Region for our annual Fall Conference on September 19-21 in Atlanta. The entire day of Wednesday, September 19 will be devoted to practice management sessions, so save the date and stay tuned for more information.

Webinars

[Sign up](#) for our next webinar, *Beyond Marketing: Using Social Media for Recruiting and Retention, Research and Development, and Knowledge Management* by Christopher Parsons of Knowledge Architecture (author of our lead article in this quarter's Digest) on March 22 from 1:00-2:15 EDT. Registration is free and you will earn 1.25 CES credits.

Our June webinar, *Human Resources: Creating the Right Workforce For Your Future* will be presented by Sandy Blaha on June 14, 2012 from 1:00-2:15 EDT. You can learn more and [register here](#).

Best Practices

One of the PMKC's initiatives is to continuously improve the AIA's Best Practices. AIA Best Practices represent the collective wisdom of AIA members and related professionals. The AIA shares professional practice knowledge is through its collection and dissemination of individual Best Practice articles. This [article](#) will address what a Best Practice is, and how to write and submit a Best Practice article for review and consideration.

In addition, the Best Practices Committee would like to request expressions of interest from potential new members. The mission of the AIA Best Practices Committee is to:

- Develop, solicit and jury high quality knowledge resource articles that are readily applicable to the tasks at hand for members of the Institute seeking guidance on matters of professional practice, firm management and project delivery
- Identify and surface the collected practice-based best knowledge of AIA and allied members; advance knowledge-sharing for and among AIA members
- Monitor, maintain and update the existing collected body of Best Practice articles;

You can learn more about the AIA Best Practices on the AIA Website under the Practicing Architecture section. If you would like to be considered for participation on this committee, please contact David B. Richards, AIA at drichards@rossetti.com with information about your professional experience.

a/e ProNet Scholarship Winners

The AIA has selected Hannah Pempus and Gerald Reynolds to receive the annual a/e ProNet scholarship. The program, initiated by a/e ProNet, a national association of insurance brokers who are committed to providing liability insurance and loss prevention to architects, is awarded to architecture students who demonstrate a particular interest in the principles of management in architecture practice.

[More...](#)

Online Resources

Visit the PM Digest [archives page](#) for past issues.

Connect with Practice Management on:

