

## BIOLOGY MEETING NOTES

---

**PROJECT:** University of Wisconsin – La Crosse  
PRAIRIE SPRINGS SCIENCE CENTER – PHASE II  
La Crosse, WI

**DFD PROJECT NO:** 19G1J  
**RA PROJECT NO:** 1290E

**MEETING DATE:** January 26, 2021

**MEETING TIME:** 1:00pm – 3:00pm

---

### ATTENDANCE:

Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:sschumacher@uwlax.edu">sschumacher@uwlax.edu</a>
Mike Ablor	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:mablor@uwlax.edu">mablor@uwlax.edu</a>
Anton Sanderfoot	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:asanderfoot@uwlax.edu">asanderfoot@uwlax.edu</a>
Jim Jorstad	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:jjorstad@uwlax.edu">jjorstad@uwlax.edu</a>
Brandon Harris	UW-La Crosse	<a href="mailto:bharris@uwlax.edu">bharris@uwlax.edu</a>
Val Schute	River Architects	<a href="mailto:v.schute@river-architects.com">v.schute@river-architects.com</a>
Mike Adler	River Architects	<a href="mailto:m.adler@river-architects.com">m.adler@river-architects.com</a>
Andy Hudzinski	River Architects	<a href="mailto:a.hudzinski@river-architects.com">a.hudzinski@river-architects.com</a>
Jeff Kuhse	River Architects	<a href="mailto:j.kuhse@river-architects.com">j.kuhse@river-architects.com</a>
Coty Sandberg	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com">Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com</a>
Emma Cuciurean-Zapan	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com">Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com</a>
Steve Hackman	SmithGroup	<a href="mailto:Steve.Hackman@smithgroup.com">Steve.Hackman@smithgroup.com</a>
Greg Clark	NV5	<a href="mailto:Gregory.Clark@nv5.com">Gregory.Clark@nv5.com</a>
Jim Viviano	NV5	<a href="mailto:James.Viviano@nv5.com">James.Viviano@nv5.com</a>

---

### PROJECT VISION RECAP:

1. Student-Centered
  2. Collaborative
  3. Face-Forward
- 

### PROGRAM REVIEW:

1. Biology Department
  - a. Reduced Vivarium size. Additional refinement needed as design moves forward.
  - b. Reduced Lab Support Staff Offices from 4 to 2.
  - c. Removed extra ADA office.

- d. Added Departmental Meeting Room.
  - e. Resized Greenhouse to match lab planning module.
  - f. Student Workstations enlarged.
  - g. Overall delta: -1,968 ASF
  - h. No additional modifications or revisions requested.
2. Adjacencies
- a. Locate as many offices on one floor as possible.
  - b. Private offices adjacent to shared departmental spaces (Reception, ADA, Work Room, etc.)
  - c. Biology relates to all departments.
  - d. Greenhouse, Mycology Lab connection.
  - e. Active Learning usage by Biology.
  - f. Science Education adjacent to Math Education.
  - g. No additional modifications or revisions requested.
3. Classrooms
- a. Increased 74-seat active learning classroom to 84 seats.
  - b. Added (1) one 84-seat active learning classrooms.
  - c. Increased 80-seat classrooms to 100 seats.
  - d. Changed 150-seat fixed theater style classrooms to fixed tables and movable chairs.
  - e. Overall delta: +10,500 ASF
  - f. Adjacencies – near student collaboration spaces
4. Misc. Instructional Support
- a. Recategorized Student Organization Space.
  - b. Recategorized Faculty Resource Centers.
  - c. Renamed Maker Space to CS Engineering Lab.
  - d. Resizing to match lab planning module.
  - e. Removed (1) extra Science Ed Support Space.
  - f. Enlarged Science Ed Lab.
  - g. Overall delta: -194 ASF.

---

**LINK:**

- 1. The link between phases 1 and 2 was reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. "Social Center"
  - b. Survey to be sent to Design Committee
  - c. Tony commented that one thing that Phase 1 lacks according to many is no central stair.

---

**DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES:**

- 1. The departmental offices were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Illustrations depicted are generic and not meant to show final design ideas.

- b. Coty clarified the DFD Sustainable Design requirement for 50% glazing at interior wall of offices/space along the exterior. Hallway-facing offices would not be required to have 50% glazed area.
  - c. Coty noted the desire for a distribution of collaboration spaces throughout.
  - d. Coty noted there are a number of options for treating the collaboration areas through various means of technology, writing surfaces, etc.
  - e. Glazing required at all offices for security reasons.
  - f. Scott noted that UWL Administration is open to looking at the various options and will review the merits of each option.
  - g. Scott noted that Option 2 could be less distracting in how the offices are arranged. Coty added how students often wait in the hallway.
  - h. Scott noted that new furnishings will be provided as part of the project. Further discussion will happen at a later time.
  - i. Scott noted how the amount of glazing at the interior wall of the exterior offices is a requirement while the interior offices would likely not include as much glass.
  - j. Mike Abler will be circulating the departmental office package to the department today for review and comment.
  - k. Mike Abler noted that frosted/texture glazing will help with distractions in hallway traffic.
  - l. Scott noted that Option 2 could be less distracting in how the offices are arranged. Coty added how students often wait in the hallway.
  - m. Scott noted that new furnishings will be provided as part of the project. Further discussion will happen at a later time.
  - n. Mike noted that Biology may lean towards Option 2 for the following reasons: equity, opportunity for collaboration space, daylight, etc.
- 

#### **CLASSROOMS:**

- 1. The classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Cowley Hall 140 & 156
    - i. Capability to put content on the screen from different locations in the room – faculty roaming.
    - ii. Greg – current plan is to move toward fixed tables and movable chairs.
    - iii. Mike Abler – faculty like to use an iPad or tablet and project to the screen; faculty prefer remote ability - freedom to move around the room and not tethered to a cable.
    - iv. Tony – wider classrooms are better than deeper.
    - v. Tony – a strong desire to have capture capability to record audio, video and teacher in all classrooms.
    - vi. Mike Abler – asynchronous technology is not a priority, students need to be on campus for lab work; definitely 1 screen, maybe 2, not sure about 3; having a whiteboard is very important to Mike A, likes the Univ of Maryland Ed St. John classroom example; prefers a capture solution that contains all 3 aspects of a session (audio, video and camera capture of instructor) but understands the challenge of recording, storing, and archiving large files.
  - b. Cowley Hall 151
    - i. Tony noted that Biology is currently perform active learning activities in this classroom.
  - c. Cowley Hall 103

- i. Tony commented that this space is challenging if instructor tries or wishes to utilize both projection and the writing surface; understands using digital content is the future.
  - d. Writing Surface
    - i. Important to most in Biology.
    - ii. Common complaint by faculty is the inability to use both the writing surface and the projection screen simultaneously.
  - e. Displays
    - i. Most faculty may not need three screens.
    - ii. Annotation-capture and projection critical.
  - f. Remote/Virtual Learning
    - i. Tony noted many in Biology currently capture their lecture – audio and screen and sometimes capture video of the instructor.
    - ii. Most biology students need to be on campus for lab instruction. As a result, lecture capture isn't as critical. Student responsibility to be in class.
- 

#### **ACTIVE LEARNING CLASSROOMS:**

1. The active learning classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
    - a. Annotation via tablet likely more important. No front of room.
    - b. Video capture of instructor is important but file size and storage becomes an issue.
    - c. Tony noted there are some things that can be done actively in a traditional classroom setting. Dedicated active learning spaces are often less flexible.
    - d. To what extent is technology provided?
    - e. Tony noted the difficulty of getting input and the varying degree of opinions.
    - f. Groups of 6 to 8 likely for Biology. Standardized group sizing is important. Ability for both student content sharing within their group and the ability to project student content to the large classroom screen/display is beneficial, that level of technology is the current baseline at UWL.
    - g. Tony noted the goal should be to design for consistency in the classrooms as classes get moved from room to room all the time; it's easier to plan and create course material if the faculty knows how many students will be in each collaboration group
    - h. Variety among the three spaces currently in the program? Mike Abler feels all should look the same but could have different digital capabilities. Scheduling challenges were noted.
    - i. Mike Abler noted the interest among Biology for an active learning environment.
    - j. Brandon noted similarities among spaces are important for troubleshooting. Consistency and standardization.
- 

#### **DEPARTMENTAL SPACES + TECHNOLOGY:**

1. The departmental spaces programmed for Phase 2 were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Document cameras at UWL have worked well for Biology.
  - b. Mycology and Medical Mycology labs don't use a lot of technology. Lab courses tend to bring students to the microscope for demonstration.
  - c. Science Education/Nutrition Lab: SMART board technology requested. May not require additional displays/projection. Mike Abler to verify. SMART board technology in K-12 learning environments to be verified.

- d. Jim Jorstad commented that a robust wireless network is needed along with AC power for students.
- 

**OPEN ISSUES:**

1. UWL to verify use of SMART board technology in the Science Education Methods spaces.
- 

*Note: This constitutes our understanding of the issues presented. Contact River Architects, Inc. via phone at (608) 785-2217, or e-mail [m.adler@river-architects.com](mailto:m.adler@river-architects.com) if there are any discrepancies.*