# river Architects

## MATHEMATICS MEETING NOTES

PROJECT:	University of Wisconsin – La Crosse PRAIRIE SPRINGS SCIENCE CENTER – PHASE II La Crosse, WI	
DFD PROJECT NO: RA PROECT NO:	19G1J 1290E	
MEETING DATE:	January 25, 2021	
MEETING TIME:	10:00am-12:00pm	

## ATTENDANCE:

Cathy Weiss	UW-System Administration	<u>cweiss@uwsa.edu</u>
Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	sschumacher@uwlax.edu
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse	rallen@uwlax.edu
Brandon Harris	UW-La Crosse	<u>bharris@uwlax.edu</u>
Val Schute	River Architects	v.schute@river-architects.com
Mike Adler	River Architects	<u>m.adler@river-architects.com</u>
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
Jim Viviano	NV5	James.Viviano@nv5.com

### **PROJECT VISION RECAP:**

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

### **PROGRAM REVIEW:**

- 1. Mathematics Department
  - a. Recategorized Team Room into Library
  - b. Reallocated extra ADA workspace.
  - c. Added Departmental Meeting Room
  - d. Resized Math Education to match lab planning module
  - e. Student Workstations enlarged
  - f. Overall delta: +105 ASF

## *river* architects

g. No modifications or revisions requested per Robert.

### 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. Math Education near Science Methods.
- d. Undergrad Library accessible to students, open and transparent.
- e. Offices all on same floor.
- f. Relatively close proximity between offices and Statistics Lab.
- g. No other modifications or revisions requested per Robert.
- 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

#### 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.

# *river* architects

- 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. Robert asked if offices located at the inner-most part of Option B would have natural light?
- k. Corridor width difference between Options A and B?
- I. Robert "love Option 2."
- m. Robert "Option 1 feels like a hotel."
- n. Robert "Option 2 might be a bit more isolated."

## CLASSROOMS:

- 1. The classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Cowley Hall 140 & 156
    - i. Only used by Math for final exams.
    - ii. Tablet arm chairs are insufficient. Greg Clark noted that the design of the larger classrooms is moving towards fixed tables and movable chairs.
    - iii. Ability for students to connect to power is critical (all classrooms).
  - b. Cowley Hall 151
    - i. Tablet arm chairs are insufficient.
    - ii. No power for student connection.
  - c. Cowley Hall 103
    - i. Two displays (favorable).
    - ii. Writing surface is visible to back row.
    - iii. Easy for students to collaborate.
    - iv. Includes chalkboards, which are favorable to Robert.
  - d. Writing Surface
    - i. Large rooms are challenging for viewing of writing surface.
    - ii. Ability to capture and project writing surface on the displays. Math faculty are currently doing this through digital writing technology within an MS Teams session and/or iPad.
  - e. Flexibility
    - i. Scott expressed concern of scheduling of reconfigurable arrangements during the day. Adaptability long-term.

### ACTIVE LEARNING CLASSROOMS:

- 1. The active learning classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Math students typically learn better vertically rather than horizontally.
    - b. Multiple writing surfaces desirable.
    - c. Math unlikely to use the 84-seat active learning spaces.
    - d. Groups of 3-4 typically utilized (Math).

## *river* architects

## **DEPARTMENTAL SPACES + TECHNOLOGY:**

- 1. The departmental spaces programmed for Phase 2 were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
  - a. Math Ed Labs
    - i. SMART boards currently used (1) Robert/Math to review.
    - ii. Post-COVID-19 needs may have different requirements.
    - Provide students the ability to show/share content, with faculty control (Mersive/AirMedia); technology needs to be hidden, not take away from putting "Math on display."
  - b. Library
    - i. Low-tech desired.
    - ii. No projectors or screens needed.
    - iii. Could use a monitor or two but not a high priority.
    - iv. Highest priority student ability to connect to power at tables.
    - v. Writable surfaces needed.
    - vi. Zone 1: workstations with printer and power.
    - vii. Zone 2: casual seating.
    - viii. Zone 3: less-casual.

#### **OPEN ISSUES:**

1. UWL to verify use of SMART board technology in the Math 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 <u>m.adler@river-architects.com</u> if there are any discrepancies.