

PHYSICS 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: 8:00am-10:00am

ATTENDANCE:

Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	sschumacher@uwlax.edu
Eric Gansen	UW-La Crosse	egansen@uwlax.edu
Shelly Leshner	UW-La Crosse	slesher@uwlax.edu
Steve Harris	UW-La Crosse	sharris@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.khuse@river-architects.com
Coty Sandberg	SmithGroup	Coty.Sandberg@smithgroup.com
Emma Cuciurean-Zapan	SmithGroup	Emma.Cuciurean-Zapan@smithgroup.com
Steve Hackman	SmithGroup	Steve.Hackman@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. Physics Department
 - a. Removed (2) Lab Support Staff Offices.
 - b. Removed extra (1) ADA.
 - c. Removed Lab Prep Student Worker.
 - d. Recategorized Waiting Room with Observation Platform.

- e. Added Departmental Meeting Room.
 - f. Added non-scheduled 8-seat computer lab – located close to Physics.
 - g. Student Workstations enlarged.
 - h. Overall delta: +6 ASF
 - i. Shelly - three faculty researchers – two separate spaces needed (2+1) – different needs and uses. 5 to 6 occupants in the one space.
 - j. Sizes of observation platform spaces were reviewed. No changes 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. Physics Dept on fourth floor below observation area not critical.
 - d. Math adjacency.
 - e. Locate 8-seat computer lab close to department.
 - f. Physics labs are located on Level 0 and 1 in Phase 1.
 - g. Eric noted how the computer labs of Phase 2 with the Physics labs in Phase 1 would work really well and would like to see those remain if possible.
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.
 - g. Shelly noted that demonstration space needed in the large-format classrooms. Prep space also needed.
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. Shelly – rooftop meeting area – would not want an office located near the terrace space due to distractions occurring outside. Coty commented that the idea of a research area or occupied roof terrace on Level 2 isn't being pursued as much as it was in the earlier concept design.

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. Eric – collaborative spaces in option 2 would benefit working with a small group of students outside of the faculty office. Negative may be limited seating. Maybe consider limiting the size of the writing surface and provide seating within a smaller, more confined area.
 - k. Eric and Shelly commented on the challenge for scheduling of conference and meeting spaces.
 - l. Areas for student waiting is important.
 - m. Shelly concerned about the number of offices in the north-south direction (4 vs 5).
 - n. Eric – student waiting at interior area with offices along edge?
 - o. Eric concerned about the amount of storage available within the offices. Glass walls are going to result in storage challenges. An interior office would provide additional area for storage, writing surface, etc.
 - p. Shelly noted a concern regarding potential cost increases and if there is an issue, the potential for removing the office glass.
-

CLASSROOMS:

1. The classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Cowley Hall 140 & 156
 - i. Greg – current plan is to move toward fixed tables and movable chairs.
 - ii. Eric noted that these spaces will be used for outreach programs. Won't always be used by 18–22-year-old college students.
 - iii. Eric noted that theater-style grading of the room helps sight lines and is concerned about younger children using the lecture halls.
 - iv. Eric noted how fixed/swivel chairs would help for a number of reasons.
 - b. Writing Surface
 - i. Shelly feels whiteboards should be reimagined through the use of technology. Backs are to students and instructor are talking to the wall.

- ii. Shelly and Eric both agree that a digital solution through a large-format writing surface at the podium would be ideal. Eric noted how annotation tablets don't provide enough writing surface for science lecture/problem-solving.
 - iii. Shelly commented that writing surfaces in smaller settings are essential and screens should not cover the writing surface.
- c. Displays
 - i. Shelly noted that additional displays at the back of the room really help with keeping instructors engaged with students.
 - ii. Two screens not preferred per Eric. Three may be better to help with sightlines. Center used as the primary screen with supplemental information on the adjacent screens. Shelly agrees and feels that one continuous screen may be too complicated for instructors.
 - iii. Shelly L – LED, large desktop-style display surface seems too complex and difficult for faculty.
- d. Remote/Virtual Learning
 - i. Shelly noted that all classrooms should have recording capabilities and the ability to broadcast the lecture.
 - ii. Shelly noted that Undergrad Poster sessions are being held online more and more. Having the ability for students to engage in this activity in a virtual session would be an advantage.
- e. Traditional Classrooms
 - i. Demonstrations and daylighting are issues for science lectures. Ability to control lighting conditions is important.
 - ii. Scott noted that faculty typically prefer entrances at back of the room whenever possible.

ACTIVE LEARNING CLASSROOMS:

- 1. The active learning classrooms were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Current Physics classes don't utilize active learning.
 - b. Shelly noted that there would likely be a preference for forward-facing arrangements. Eric added that there is often a demonstration or setup needed in Physics.

DEPARTMENTAL SPACES + TECHNOLOGY:

- 1. The departmental spaces programmed for Phase 2 were reviewed and discussed. The following items were noted:
 - a. Lecture capture capabilities in the Physics spaces.
 - b. Ability to broadcast and interact with remote students.
 - c. Technology within the research labs to be determined.

OPEN ISSUES:

- 1. No open issues were noted during the meeting.

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.