river ARCHITECTS

TECHNOLOGY VISIONING MEETING NOTES

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

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

MEETING DATE: January 20, 2021

MEETING TIME: 8:00am – 10:00am

ATTENDANCE:

Cathy Weiss	UW-System Administration	cweiss@uwsa.edu
Scott Schumacher	UW-La Crosse	sschumacher@uwlax.edu
Mark Sandheinrich	UW-La Crosse	msandheinrich@uwlax.edu
Mike Abler	UW-La Crosse	mabler@uwlax.edu
Colin Belby	UW-La Crosse	cbelby@uwlax.edu
Todd Weaver	UW-La Crosse	tweaver@uwlax.edu
Robert Allen	UW-La Crosse	rallen@uwlax.edu
Mike Hoffman	UW-La Crosse	mhoffman@uwlax.edu
Eric Gansen	UW-La Crosse	egansen@uwlax.edu
Steve Harris	UW-La Crosse	sharris@uwlax.edu
Jim Jorstad	UW-La Crosse	jjorstad@uwlax.edu
Mark Valenti	UW-La Crosse	mvalenti@uwlax.edu
Brandon Harris	UW-La Crosse	bharris@uwlax.edu
Pete Sedivy	UW-La Crosse	psedivy@uwlax.edu
Brant Mayer	UW-La Crosse	bmayer@uwlax.edu
Casey Ingvalson	UW-La Crosse	cingvalson@uwlax.edu
Shelly Lesher	UW-La Crosse	slesher@uwlax.edu
Aric Opdahl	UW-La Crosse	aopdahl@uwlax.edu
Anton Sanderfoot	UW-La Crosse	asanderfoot@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

river ARCHITECTS

Nancy Sturm	NV5	Nancy.Sturm@nv5.com
Greg Clark	NV5	Gregory.Clark@nv5.com
Jim Viviano	NV5	James.Viviano@nv5.com

UWL INTRO
1. Jim Jorstad – Interim CIO
2. Pete Sedivy – Classroom Technology
3. Mark Valenti – Classroom Technology
4. Brant Mayer – Classroom Technology
5. Brandon Harris – Interim Assistant Director ITS Client Services
6. Casey Ingvalson – Classroom Technology

VISIONING
1. Nancy Sturm provided an overview of higher ed learning environments, student needs, pedagogy, etc. The following items were noted:
   a. One thing UWL learned in 2020?
      - Forced into going virtual for most classes. Faculty nervous at first but now have endorsed technology and virtual learning.
      - Students and faculty need campus.
      - We are resilient, ready to accept challenge.
      - Student's home technology is poor.
      - How much students rely on the computer/internet services provided on campus.
      - We can adapt!
      - We have a very strong sense of community and are willing to help each other.
      - How much I miss it.
   b. Next generation of students view traditional college path as old school.
   c. "The Reimagined University" – how important your vision is for the future of your university. Planning for future, not today.
   d. "What (some) faculty are saying about the shift to remote teaching and learning."
   e. 2035 example: What will your campus look like? What will a student need?
   f. Future of STEM and technology.
   g. Transformational Model: how, when, where, and why students learn? Outcomes, experiences, challenges, systems, and spaces.
   h. What are the desired skills for your students?
      - Discipline in online learning.
      - Problem-solving and training.
      - Cyber security training.
      - Communication.
   i. STEM Skills – Institute of the Future
      - Contextual Knowledge
      - Social Intelligence
      - Emotional Intelligence
   j. Experience
      - Student vs Faculty needs
      - Pedagogical Considerations
         - Sandboxing – place to experience and try new technology

- Delivery Mode
- Units of Instruction
- Modality
- Instructional Re-Design
- Professional Development/Peer Mentoring
- Assessment
- Pedagogy Challenges?
  - Keeping students engaged (always, but more challenging online)
  - All to be in the same room again
  - Non-verbal communication/emotion
  - Budget (campus-wide challenges)
  - Equitable access to high-speed internet and computer (online learning)
  - Technology competence variations among faculty and students
  - Some students have learned that they love on-line learning (others hate it), so we'll have to re-balance
  - Most of the illustrations involve a lot of space per student. Funding source challenges – space comes at a cost

m. Technology
- Trends, Challenges, and Developments
- Considerations
  - How useful will the learning environment and technology be in addressing issues of equity and inclusion?
  - What is the potential to have a significant and positive impact on learning outcomes?
  - What is its risk of failure?
  - How receptive will faculty be to adopting it?
- New Normal Technologies

2. Biggest Challenges – PSSC P2
   a. Ease of use
   b. Intuitive technology
   c. As EDUCAUSE has stressed, we need to restore where we were before COVID, evolve to new teaching strategies, and transform what we have been doing in and out of the traditional classroom.
   d. Not overwhelming faculty, staff, and students

TECHNOLOGY BENCHMARKING
1. Cowley Hall 140 (tiered environments)
   a. Retire the single seats
   b. Looks like a cave
   c. Students fight for spaces in the back of the room
   d. Large podium for science demonstration works well

2. Classrooms
   a. Two rows per tier
   b. Limited ceiling height inhibits markerboard use
   c. How many screens? Importance of multiple images? Howard Community College example is a nice compromise per Brant.
   d. Wide aspect ratios shortens the room depth and reduces the size of the projection screens needed

    e. Entering front of room can be distracting
    f. Markerboards become useless at larger rooms. Students can't see it from the rear of the room but faculty feel the need for as much writing surface as possible.
    g. Power at student stations is critical
    h. Camera projection of markerboard annotation?
    i. Remote capture for students important
    j. Chemistry and Physics demonstration bench size – more technology tends to take up more demonstration space
    k. Chemistry faculty often project the periodic table and it is up for the entire lecture
    l. Hybrid Flexible Classroom – Greg
    m. Too many screens may feel like a television studio
    n. Screen(s) at back of wall help faculty engagement with the students

3. Cowley Hall 151 (flat floor environments)
    a. Retire single seat, tablet-armchairs
    b. Tables and chairs provide flexibility
    c. Flexibility has challenges with power connections for students – how do we balance?
    d. Staffing of room reconfiguring is a challenge.
    e. Cart displays are an interesting approach and provide a lot of flexibility.

4. Active Learning Environments
    a. Many items factor into the planning of the space
    b. Shared content?
    c. UWL Wittich Hall example
        i. No comment – hasn't been used
    d. Shelly – need more two-way communication with faculty to share content (Wing Tech space offers this capability)
    e. Ability for faculty to move around the room is important.
    f. Wimberly Hall example – used by English Department currently
    g. Flexspace.com is a good resource for examples of what works and doesn't work.
    h. Scale-Up is a good resource on active learning environments.

5. Hyflex Classroom
    a. Potential pilot space
    b. Number of schools have built these types of classrooms with good success (Pete).
    c. Space like this needs to be done strategically from a budgeting perspective. Where and how many? (Scott)
    d. Needs to be intuitive and easy to use (Todd).

6. Purpose Built Spaces
    a. Course content production – provide a space for faculty prep?
    b. Poster presentation prep for undergrad research (Shelly).
    c. Content format/compression issues (Mike).
    d. Transparent boards (Aric).