

CHEMISTRY 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 27, 2021

MEETING TIME: 10:30am-12:30pm

ATTENDANCE:

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Cathy Weiss | UW-System Administration | cweiss@uwsa.edu |
| Scott Schumacher | UW-La Crosse | sschumacher@uwlax.edu |
| Todd Weaver | UW-La Crosse | tweaver@uwlax.edu |
| Aric Opdahl | UW-La Crosse | aopdahl@uwlax.edu |
| Jeff Bryan | UW-La Crosse | jbryan@uwlax.edu |
| Matthew Hammers | UW-La Crosse | mhammers@uwlax.edu |
| Kris Rolfhus | UW-La Crosse | krolfhus@uwlax.edu |
| Dan Grilley | UW-La Crosse | dgrilley@uwlax.edu |
| Janet Kirsch | UW-La Crosse | jkirsch@uwlax.edu |
| Nadia Carmosini | UW-La Crosse | ncarmosini@uwlax.edu |
| Heather Schenk | UW-La Crosse | hschenck@uwlax.edu |
| Keith Beyer | UW-La Crosse | kbeyer@uwlax.edu |
| Sarah Heuer | UW-La Crosse | sheuer@uwlax.edu |
| Basudeb Bhattachar | UW-La Crosse | bbhattacharyya@uwlax.edu |
| Lori Hanson | UW-La Crosse | lhanson@uwlax.edu |
| Eugenia Turov | UW-La Crosse | eturov@uwlax.edu |
| Ressano Desouza - Machado | UW-La Crosse | rdesouza-machado@uwlax.edu |
| Brandon Harris | UW-La Crosse | bharris@uwlax.edu |
| Val Schute | River Architects | v.schute@river-architects.com |
| Mike Adler | River Architects | m.adler@river-architects.com |
| Andy Hudzinski | River Architects | a.hudzinski@river-architects.com |
| Jeff Kuhse | River Architects | j.kuhse@river-architects.com |
| Coty Sandberg | SmithGroup | Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com |
| Emma Cuciurean-Zapan | SmithGroup | Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com |
| Greg Clark | NV5 | Gregory.Clark@nv5.com |

PROJECT VISION RECAP:

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

PROGRAM REVIEW:

1. Chemistry Department
 - a. Removed (2) student worker shared offices.
 - b. Removed (2) lab support offices.
 - c. Added Departmental Meeting Room.
 - d. Resizing Computer Labs and Faculty/Student Research to lab planning module.
 - e. Student Workstations enlarged.
 - f. Overall delta: -450 ASF.
 - g. No other modifications or revisions requested per Todd.
 - h. Nadia – Gen Chem Analytical Computer Lab? Do we really need?
 - i. Dan Grilley – space would be for interactive/group-focused work. Phase 1, Level 3 adjacency would be ideal. Similar space for Level 2 as well.
 - ii. Kris confirmed the pod-structure layout and collaborative environment.
 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. Faculty office adjacency to research labs in Phase 1.
 - d. 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
 - h. Eugenia commented on noise levels in the open area.
 - i. Ressano commented on safety of exterior porches/roof areas.
 - j. Keith commented that exterior porches/roof areas are secondary to classroom teaching spaces and office needs.
 - k. Survey to be sent to Design Committee
-

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.
 - l. Option 1 was noted as less corridors and more efficient. Option 2 is a larger floor plan with additional circulation.
 - m. Ressano commented that faculty will have "dibs" on window offices in Option 1.
 - n. Dan – is there a reason for two corridors?
 - o. Nadia – feels some faculty may want the interior office due to less glass to the hallway. Nadia commented that Option 2 may work better for emergency situations.
 - p. Keith – wayfinding may be more challenging for students.
 - q. Keith – would we ever consider putting offices in the link, between labs (Phase 1) and classrooms (Phase 2).
 - r. Kris – any opportunity for direct view/light to the exterior in option 2?
 - s. Dan – less student traffic in the Cowley Hall office area after Phase 1 opened. Concerned that students won't go to the faculty area in the southern bar.
 - t. Heather asked if there will be a consistency among the departments of how the office glazing is designed.
 - u. Todd – further conversation regarding ADA spaces.
 - v. Keith asked if west side could be Option 1 and east side could be Option 2?
 - w. Janet – glass quality? Glass to a certain height off the floor will be tempered.
 - x. Chemistry asked if there is any opportunity to change the footprint, organization, etc.?
 - y. Exterior windows will be inoperable.

CLASSROOMS:

1. The classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Cowley Hall 140 & 156
 - i. Greg noted that the current plan is to move toward fixed tables and movable chairs.
 - ii. Dan Grilley – simultaneous use of writing surface and projection screens work well in the large spaces in Cowley Hall.
 - iii. Demonstration area critical for Chemistry courses.
 - iv. Door security concerns expressed by Heather.
 - v. Nadia noted how these spaces are often used for Chemistry magic shows and have public attendance. A mini lab bench, running water and gas; need for projection and writing surface are needed.
 - b. Writing Surface
 - i. Desire for whiteboards and capture capabilities in all spaces.
 - ii. Document cameras are currently used in several courses. Drawing is part of the instruction for Chemistry.
 - c. Traditional Classrooms
 - i. Jeff Bryan noted that there is no reason to construct new spaces they already have in Centennial and other buildings.
 - ii. Jeff noted that whiteboards are crucial.
 - iii. Jeff noted that Centennial doesn't work with door, whiteboard, and screen locations.

ACTIVE LEARNING CLASSROOMS:

1. The active learning classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Keith commented that technology needs to have a purpose.
 - b. Video capture capability? Heather.
 - c. Nadia – UW-River Falls bowling alley renovation into active learning classroom.
 - d. Nadia – whiteboard quality is important. Some are better than others.
 - e. Keith – active learning spaces also need to work for traditional teaching and learning.

DEPARTMENTAL SPACES + TECHNOLOGY:

1. The departmental spaces programmed for Phase 2 were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. No comments or input provided.

OPEN ISSUES:

1. There are no open issues.

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 if there are any discrepancies.

ZOOM CHAT SUMMARY:

Eugenia Turov : I would be concerned this could be a very loud space where even quiet conversations would echo - can you comment on that, Coty?

Ressano Desouza-Machado : This idea of a balcony is great. It could be a study space,. If enclosed in "glass", it is now an all season room that is also safe.. I don't like the idea of those unsupervised getting too close to the edge thre.

keithbeyer : To me this type of design would be of secondary importance, and the classroom teaching and office needs are of primary importance

Janet Kirsch : Do both options 1 and 2 have the same ratio of "used" to "hallway" space? From the layouts you have shared, it looks like Option 1 might make more use of the total floor space.

lhanson : Of course ... I'm interested in what the department office looks like.

Ressano Desouza-Machado : Except everyone wil have dibs on the window offices,, then again I might be wrong

Jeff Bryan : I'm hoping for an office in the basement!

Eugenia Turov : I want to echo what Nadia is saying especially for safety concerns

Eugenia Turov : Especially for emergency situations

heather schenck : 100% agree

Nadia Carmosini : Storage is a good point.

Janet Kirsch : Good point, Keith

Jeff Bryan : I like Keith's idea!

keithbeyer : Not the same as an eye level window

grilley : I see plusses and minuses to both. I would love to see some hybrid options.

grilley : Would all offices need to have the same glazing?

keithbeyer : Is that requirement set in stone?

keithbeyer : I should say the requirement is set in glass...

Matthew Hammers : Did the other departments have strong feelings toward Option 1 or 2?

Nadia Carmosini : Are the Administrate Assistant offices located in the vicinity of each department?

heather schenck : Can you have different glazing options floor to floor or office to office?

grilley : thank you heather

Cathy Weiss : is there a maternity room schedule for elsewhere in this building?

Mike : yes, multiple

Cathy Weiss : and they usually have a sink, right?

Mike : sink, counter, soft seating

Cathy Weiss : Exactly, thanks Scott.

Mike : there are many things to factor into these considerations: daylight, view, privacy, distractions along primary corridors, student connectivity, student waiting, collaboration zones, etc. some want to hide, others want to be directly connected to students and other faculty.

Nadia Carmosini : The chair of each department changes somewhat regularly since it is an elected position, so proximity to chair might not be a high priority.

keithbeyer : Can the right side office section be option 1 and the left side option 2?

keithbeyer : So is that a yes?

Ressano Desouza-Machado : Is the footprint of the building fixed?

heather schenck : If we wanted to bring forward any floor plan ideas, how would that be done? And is the footprint of each floor required to be the same?

Todd Weaver : What is the timeline for departmental feedback on the office spaces?

Kristofer Rolfhus : can exterior windows be opened?

Janet Kirsch : Thank you, Coty!

heather schenck : In Cowley we are able to lock the lecture room doors. This is an important security feature that is lacking in Centennial. Even better would be to have a door release at instructor's podium so that instructor could let doors swing shut (locked) with a push of a button.

Eugenia Turov : And it would be cool if some rooms had sinks and/or ventilation so we could do demonstrations?

Eugenia Turov : Also is recording software/hardware going to be in the model?

Matthew Hammers : Like a document camera?

emma cuciurean-zapan : yes Eugenia, we are going to have adequate workspace area for demos with sinks

emma cuciurean-zapan : heather, we will certainly look carefully at locking mechanisms/security features for the classrooms

Eugenia Turov : Thanks, Emma!

Ressano Desouza-Machado : More than one document camera might be useful, since chemistry is the science of change. Old days, keep one white board there where you worked on the other one. But you can see the day of the whiteboard looks like it has come to an end.

Ressano Desouza-Machado : I agree with Eugenis, that a demo table with some bells and whistles is in order for the classrooms we use.

Todd Weaver : Swipe card access?

grilley : I agree with Jeff - lots of whiteboard all around the room. Allow students to collaborate on surfaces.

Nadia Carmosini : A survey would be efficient.

Eugenia Turov : I think we've all encountered tremendous tech glitches that make us very wary of relying solely on tech (just to echo what Jeff said)

heather schenck : Ditto. Let's keep an old time document camera in each room

Todd Weaver : Even the document camera fails and I am off to the whiteboard.

Eugenia Turov : ^yep

keithbeyer : We need to be careful not to use technology just because we can. It needs to have a purpose other than flash and glitz.

Matthew Hammers : I like that previous setup a lot

Matthew Hammers : for disco days

Janet Kirsch : Pod seating is GREAT for discussion classes!

keithbeyer : For me the main issue is that "active learning" classrooms have to be useable for "traditional" teaching as well.

grilley : Or flipped classrooms