

CHEMISTRY MEETING NOTES

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

DFDM PROJECT NO: 19G1J
RA PROJECT NO: 1290E

MEETING DATE: December 22, 2020

MEETING TIME: 9:00-11:00am

ATTENDANCE:

Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	sschumacher@uwlax.edu
Mark Sandheinrich	UW-La Crosse	msandheinrich@uwlax.edu
Todd Weaver	UW-La Crosse	tweaver@uwlax.edu
Sujat Sen	UW-La Crosse	ssen@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
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
David Johnson	SmithGroup	David.Johnson@smithgroup.com
Coty Sandberg	SmithGroup	Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com
Lana Zoet	SmithGroup	Lana.Zoet@smithgroup.com
Emma Cuciurean-Zapan	SmithGroup	Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com

INTRODUCTION:

1. Coty Sandberg gave a brief overview of the agenda and goals for the meeting. The following items were noted:
 - a. Review program indicated in the December 2017 10% Concept Report.
 - b. Identify the high-level goals and needs of the department.
-

PROGRAMMING:

1. Emma Cuciurean-Zapan review the current program for Mathematics in detail. The following items were noted:
2. Classrooms:
 - a. Two spaces "might" be able to handle chemistry needs.
 - b. Existing Cowley Hall spaces larger than the program is calling for.
 - Chemistry provided course summary currently being handled in Cowley Hall.
 - Chemistry noted concern regarding Physics lecture sizes.
 - Most of Chemistry large lectures are held in Wimberly. Preference for classes to be held in science building.
 - Faculty would prefer spaces to be designed in a way that accommodates science rather than general education. Properly equipped for demonstration. Sink, bench, gas, vac, etc.
 - Use of screens and boards simultaneously is important. Two independent screens plus board space.
 - Space for a periodic table to be put up permanently.
 - Prep space adjacent to lecture halls is necessary.
 - 80 seat classroom capacity? Can these be increased? 100 seat capacity would allow more flexibility for scheduling. Tiered design vs flat floor to be determined.
 - Student recruitment advantage with science-focused lecture halls.
 - David Johnson suggested taking a closer look at flexible learning environments.
 - Staffing challenges – result in teaching larger section sizes.
 - Oregon State Center for Learning Innovation example.
 - General Chemistry is typically traditional style lecture.
 - Demonstration sinks need to be functional. Faucet doesn't come out far enough on Phase 1 sinks.
3. Shared Chemistry Computer Lab:
 - a. Guideplate diagram shown.
 - b. 20 seats.
 - c. Previous design had one on each floor.
 - d. Informal meeting space + scheduled instruction.
 - e. Upper-level independent classes and research activities.
 - f. Teaching wall/instructor area. Formal lecture would not occur here.
 - g. Cubbies may not be necessary.
 - h. Table in the middle desired.
 - i. Capability to have two desktop PC's at each table plus personal laptops.
 - j. Adjacent to level 3 labs of Phase 1.
 - k. Impromptu student/faculty use desired.
 - l. Access control required.
4. General Chemistry Analytical Computer Lab:
 - a. Consider opportunities for flexible arrangements (pods).
 - b. (2) sections of 20-25 running concurrently.
 - c. Laptops brought into the lab.
 - d. Minimal use as fully occupied computer lab.
 - e. 30 seats.

- f. Consider dividing into two smaller spaces. Could the space be dividable with a partition? Challenges with setup and take-down of moveable partitions noted by Scott. Divide room through the use of furniture, technology, other?
 - g. Adjacent to level 2 labs of Phase 1.
 - h. Impromptu student/faculty use desired.
5. Faculty/Student Research (Computational):
- a. Researchers would be disappointed if their space was shared with others.
 - b. Occupant of this room not present for meeting. Further input needed from Janet Kirsch. Scott to arrange separate discussion.
6. Work Room:
- a. Mailboxes, printing, office storage, microwave, small refrigerator, and office supplies.
7. Reception Area:
- a. Near student worker and ADA.
 - b. Branding has been important to other departments.
 - c. Non-suite arrangement desired.
8. Faculty/Chair Offices:
- a. 36 offices total.
 - b. Co-located on same floor, same location preferred.
 - c. Chair's office rotates. Private meetings occur, rare to be more than 3 people. Prefer similar office design as faculty.
 - d. Interactions with almost every department. Math not as critical.
 - e. Cross-disciplinary collaboration hasn't worked out in Phase 1 as maybe envisioned.
 - f. Student navigation easier if they know where the department is located.
 - g. Whiteboard space needed in the offices. 8' works well.
 - h. Desk between faculty and student not always desired.
 - i. Scott noted that office arrangements will have some flexibility and will not be standardized for everyone but there will be some uniformity.
 - j. Faculty/Student meetings – where is this occurring? Where does it want to occur? Will always be times when students drop-in with a question. Balancing office hours, work, and interaction. Offices in 10% plan included informal areas within the department areas for collaboration opportunities. Private and semi-private.
 - k. Makeup exam space needed.
 - l. Monitors in shared work spaces, nooks, etc. necessary.
 - m. Centennial spaces work really well. Group study and conference rooms.
 - n. Mersive wireless casting system.
9. Student Workers (Reception):
- a. Adjacent to reception/ADA area.
 - b. 2 student stations.
10. Student Workers (lab):
- a. Spaces are located in Phase 1.
11. Student Org Space:
- a. Could be configured in various ways. Centered around other shared spaces.
 - b. Dedicated space with ability to be secured.
 - c. Chem club demonstrations, meetings, study space, etc.

12. Lab Support Staff:

- a. Spaces are located in Phase 1. Not necessary for Phase 2. Chemistry would like to maintain the square footage for other functions.

13. Experience:

- a. Spaces appropriate for the connecting link:
 - Todd noted that classrooms located in the link will likely result in congestion.
 - Student collaboration areas.
 - Glass walled conference spaces.
 - Chemistry Computer Labs (function vs transparency)
 - Windows and natural light.

14. A link to the virtual whiteboard for viewing can be found here:

<https://app.mural.co/invitation/mural/smithgroup1662/1608068000945?sender=u7109dc06979f23e2f6bb6071&key=c05ac976-3426-48cf-8c8f-050b6227ac11>

PROJECT SCHEDULE:

1. Work Session No. 2:
 - a. Executive Committee Meeting: January 14-15, 2021 (TBD)
 - b. Design Committee Meeting: January 14-15, 2021 (TBD)
 - c. Departmental Review Meetings: January 15-29, 2021
-

OPEN ISSUES:

1. Classroom uniqueness – Todd to review with other Department Chairs.
-

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.