UWSP Paper Science Foundation, Inc.

Academic Advisory Committee Meeting
Thursday, May 13, 2004

Attendees:

Brancich, Teri – Appleton
Carlson, Kirk – International Paper
Danz, Tom - Whiting Paper Company
Dettlaff, Matt - Clariant
Drewinske, Chad – ELOF Hansson
Graham, Larry – retired (UWSP)
Gunderson, Don – Paper Science Foundation
Herzog, Frank – Voith Paper
Krommenacher, David – retired (Stora Enso)
Lazar, John - Appleton
Michels, John – Marathon Engineering
Molinardolo, Susan - Domtar
Peplinski, Jennifer – Green Bay Packaging
Pierce, Susan – Johnson Corporation
Sistler, Kevin - Ciba Specialty Chemicals
Thompson, Jeff - MeadWestvaco
Toigo, Marc – Buckman Laboratories
Wachowiak, Don - Stora Enso
Weber, Gary - Appleton Papers

Biasca, Karyn - UWSP Paper Science
Guay, Don – UWSP Paper Science
Radue, Bill - UWSP Paper Science
Ring, Gerry - UWSP Paper Science
Sanders, Faith – UWSP Paper Science

Jeff Thompson opened the 28th annual meeting of the Academic Advisory Committee. A revised agenda was distributed. Minutes of the 2003 Academic Advisory Meeting were approved by voice vote.

Welcoming remarks were made by interim chair Gerry Ring. Karyn Biasca spoke briefly about the process of evaluation of the senior presentations. The Advisory Committee was then divided into five groups and dispersed to various conference rooms for the presentations. Following the presentations and lunch, the AAC reconvened to critique the senior presentations.

Discussion of Senior Presentations:

- The subject matter presented was the best seen in years, very impressive
- Extra time given for projects seemed to help
- Good presentations, but a lot of assumptions were made [it was difficult this year to obtain the support materials needed, and the students waited too long to begin contacts – Ring, Biasca]
- Not enough financial information, mostly educational focus. “The educational value is immeasurable” was a common theme.
- There was an understanding of the benefits (of the project) but could have used more. Don’t treat it as “just an assignment” but more realistically
- (Faith, I think this bullet is similar to the fourth bullet above. If you see it differently, add back in an clarify)
- Strong presentation. Computer media helped.
- From theory to actual seemed to have more depth and internalizing
- Well conceived and adapted projects
- Good presentations, better than last year’s
- Thanks to Karyn Biasca, who required monthly progress updates on the projects and to the faculty, who watched all the presentations and critiqued them
- The use of PowerPoint seemed to be a very positive change, much improvement; some logistical problems, but that was good experience too.
- Projects are “do-able”

Several recent projects have become realities on the pilot machine (Radue) Bill Radue commented on several machine related senior projects which resulted in changes made to the pilot machine:

- A system to clean the couch pit
- Elevation of the stuff box
- Size press delivery system
- Hood modifications

He also spoke about future needs for the pilot machine: scanner and split stock

Chair's report (Gerry Ring):

[insert powerpoint presentation and/or Gerry and I will edit]

Paper Science Foundation (Don Gunderson):

- The Annual Meeting will be held on September 23, 2004. The location is changed in order to accommodate and tie in with Paper Days, the Paper Hall of Fame dinner and other activities taking place in Appleton that week. The board meeting, general meeting, reception and awards banquet will all take place in Appleton.
- The first annual phone-a-thon fundraising campaign was held in May; about 100 graduates made pledges of support. This will be an annual event.
- The annual report and alumni directory will be all one document and one mailing in the future.
- With a Foundation Executive Director now in place, the Foundation is doing what is necessary to separate itself as an entity from the Paper Science program. The foundation will be pursuing fundraising, networking and recruitment (scholarships) as it's primary objectives.

Update on assessment activities (Biasca): Karyn Biasca reported that the writing assessment of Paper Science students by the English Department continues. The Paper Knowledge Exam will no longer be used, as discussed last year. Finally, as mentioned during the morning session, the critiques by the AAC industry representatives continues to be used in the assessment process.

.

Future dates, meetings and activities:

- Annual Fall meeting, September 23, 2004, Appleton
- Paper Science Job Fair, October 7, 2004
- Academic Advisory 2005: May 29, 2005

UWSP PAPER SCIENCE
Academic Advisory Committee
Thursday, May 19, 2005

Curti, Patricia – Domtar
Danz, Thomas – Geo. A. Whiting Paper Co.
Follett, Dan – Appleton
Glinski, Allen
Graham, Larry – UWSP retired
Hollenberg, David – Paper Tech. Transfer Ctr.
Holm, Thomas – Weyerhaeuser
Lazar, John – Appleton
McDonald, Joe – Whitewater Consulting
Michels, John – Marathon engineering
Peplinski, Jennifer – Green Bay Packaging
Rankin, Arthur – PIMA
Sistler, Kevin – CIBA Speciality Chemicals
Tepp, Sheryle – Stora Enco
Thompson, Jeff – MeadWestvaco
Wachowisk, Don – Stora Enso
Von Grumbkow, Michael – Voith Paper
Biasca, Karyn – UWSP Paper Science
Guay, Don – UWSP Paper Science
Gunderson, Don – PS Foundation
Razvi, Aga – UWSP CNR
Ring, Gerry – UWSP Paper Science
Sanders, Faith – UWSP Paper Science

Jeff Thompson opened the 29th annual meeting of the Academic Advisory Committee. Minutes of the 2004 meeting were approved by voice vote.

Welcoming remarks were made by Gerry Ring. Karyn Biasca spoke briefly about the process of evaluation of the senior presentations and the nature of the presentation itself. The meeting was then turned over to the seniors for the presentation.

Following the presentations and lunch, the Advisory reconvened to critique the senior presentations.

Discussion

- This was a very different project. This particular group of students did not have a lot of actual mill experience. The department received a number of positive side effects of the project – publicity, visibility on campus, TV coverage, newspaper coverage. For this project, however, no engineering economics were taken into consideration due to the nature of the project.
- This class had little interaction with Bill Radue as coops or interns; there were no clear leaders
- This was a direct and valuable learning experience for the students
- There was obvious teamwork, a broad scope to the project
- Team dynamics were very good
- Will a report be available? (yes)
- Can this project eventually provide some financial support for the lab? Perhaps community support to build on this base. – Community service.
- There is a chance of a grant from the New York Times and/or Gannett Publishing
- This was an interdiscipline exercise
- Don't replace the paper boxes for collecting the recycled newspapers! Plastic would defeat the statement about recycling.
- Teamwork – a niche market – applicable to the real world. Liked their enthusiasm
- There is a future here – other papers such as for scrap-booking, etc. What could be made?

- Very creative problem solving skills.
- Whole class was included – team format for presentation. Good dynamics
- Liked the format of one presentation vs. individual ones.
- PowerPoint presentation skills were excellent, extremely well done, much improved over last year's presentations
- The panel discussion at the end was good.
- Having just two people on a project wouldn't have worked as well – this was an excellent idea.
- Would have liked to have seen more paper samples as the presentation progressed
- Pictures of the children receiving the art paper would have been neat
- This has lots of possibilities – cooperative project with community, other university departments
- The students had "lived" it – that showed in their confidence of the subject matter
- Opens new possibilities for newsprint market
- Capstone project. Examine the economics in class

Curriculum: new course this fall, PS 101, taught by Don Guay with paper science and environmental emphasis, general degree requirement. This will increase the SCH and exposure to more students and students to the program (recruiting). Will be a fact based course, science-environmental connection, discussion of industry-government-environmental concerns. Value of paper in life.

PS 210 – changing the order of classes, eliminating the CIS course as unnecessary now – students get these course now in high school.

Chair's report: Gerry Ring gave a PowerPoint presentation about the trends and changes in the department. Print outs of the presentation will be available by request, or if anyone wants a copy sent to them electronically, please contact Gerry.

Foundation report: Don Gunderson gave a brief overview of Foundation activities.

Future meetings:

- Annual Meeting, board meeting, reception and scholarship awards dinner: September 22, 2005 – at UWSP
- Paper Science Job Fair: October 6, 2005
- Academic Advisory 2006: May 18, 2006

UWSP DEPARTMENT OF PAPER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING

Academic Advisory Committee
May 18, 2006

Bergin, John – Consultant	Nelson, Brent – Stora Enso
Button, Alan – Buttonwood Consulting	Neuman, Kristy – PCA
Curti, Patricia – Domtar	Rankin, Art – PIMA
Free, Jason – Neenah Paper, Whiting	Schmidt, Adam – Grain Processing
Gunderson, Don – Paper Science Foundation	Sistler, Kevin – Ciba Chemicals
Holm, Thomas – Weyerhaeuser (KY)	Tepp, Sheryle – Stora Enso
Kopchinski, Randy – Hercules	Von Grumbkow, Michael – Voith
McDonald, Joe – Whitewater Solutions	Wangen, Eric – Stora Enso
Michels, John – Poyry-Appleton	Weber, Gary – Appleton
	Wudi, Mike – Poyry-Appleton

Welcoming remarks were made by Gerry Ring.

Karyn Biasca gave some background on the two senior projects for the year. The ten seniors had been divided into two teams:

"Art Paper" (Team 1: Michael Parrett, Bryan Pierre, Corey Dercks, Rebecca Rock and Tom Baugnet
"Recycled Office Paper" (Team 2: Adam Mueller, Nick Krueger, Mike Wagner, Andrew Kozloski, Jeremy Ploederl

Following the presentations, the group broke for lunch in the Legacy Room. The meeting reconvened at 12:45.

Comments on the presentation were:

- There should have been an introduction and a statement of the goals of the project and then a summary and evaluation of whether the goals had been reached.
- The podium was visually in the way. Also, they could have used a pointer or laser pen rather than just staying at the lectern.
- There was too much data on the slides – perhaps they could have read the data and given the bottom line on the slide itself.
- Presenters generally did a good job in a rather intimidating situation, but turned away from the audience too much to look at the screen and slide.

This made it difficult to hear their voices, and they lost eye contact with the audience. There was also a fair amount of unprofessional details – hands in pockets, nervous mannerisms

- Possibly doing mock presentations and having them videotape would be helpful – people do things in uncomfortable situations like this that they aren't aware that they are doing and seeing themselves can be very helpful.
- The long "conference table" may it difficult to see and hear. Perhaps angling the tables would help visibility.
- The projects were "real life" scenarios – meaningful.
- Only the second group made a sample of their final product available to be looked at and the first group should have done so also.
- Do more than just read the slides to us – more variety – keep interest
- Talking with their customers (about the art paper) was very good and very good business.
- The high level of interest shown amongst the committee for these projects was noted. A lot of buzz, ideas, suggestions. Whole group jumped in because these were real projects, not just academic exercises – hands on.
- Keep the sense of continuity. Group 1 built on last year's project of recycling the NYT. Involve each year's class and build on previous work – improve and refine.
- There was little bleaching done with either project. This is an area, along with coating, that could be explored further.

<u>Curriculum discussion</u>:

- Dr Ring explained the SCH situation ….PS 103

Academic Advisory Meeting

Thursday, May 17, 2007

Biasca, Karyn - PS&E
Blomberg, Charles - Voith
Graham, Larry
Guay, Donald - PS&E
Gunderson, Donald - PS Foundation
Hollenberg, David - Paper Tech Ctr.
Lazar, John - PS&E
Nelson, Brent - Stora Enso
Neuman, Kristy - PCA
Rankin, Art - PIMA
Rogers, Bob - CNR
Sage, Jesse - Crane Engineering
Sanders, Faith - PS&E
Schmidt, Adam - Grain Processing
Sistler, Kevin - Ciba
Staven, Jeremy - Stora Enso
Tepp, Sheryle - Stora Enso

The 2007 Academic Advisory meeting was held on Thursday, May 17, 2007, beginning at 9:00 a.m., in the Founders Room of Old Main. Welcoming remarks and introductions were made by Dr. Karyn Biasca in the absence of the chair.

The senior presentation was entitled “Improvement of Basic Weight Control on the Pilot Paper Machine”. Presenters were Dyan Isaacson and Yan (Phoebus) Luo. A period of time followed the presentation to allow for questions and answers.

* * *

Minutes of the 2006 meeting of the Academic Advisory were presented and a motion made to approve as published (Sistler/Rankin).

Group Discussion of Presentations:

- It was a good presentation; interesting. With only two presenters, each did more. Don’t like to see people talking to a computer, not moving around.
- Speakers should get away from the podium; they can use a remote control to change the slides
- Presenters were nervous but it wasn’t obvious
- Dyan was very articulate. Phoebus impressed with his fluency in English, not his native language. Presentation went very well
- Would it benefit the students to do a run-through the night before with a smaller industry group (outside of UWSP)
- Are presentations video-taped before hand to help with learning how to do / not do a presentation, make them aware of body language, etc.

- Hand-outs with the presentation might have been helpful
- Presentation was somewhat difficult to follow for the part of the audience not already familiar with the terms and machinery involved; not really enough actual information given to persuade
- Did not have any hard facts dealing with cost of recommendation - “kiss of death”
- Could have used the graphs to “sell” the project better, not just show graphs. Didn’t know what it would cost
- Goal vs ID of what influenced - didn’t meet objectives or needed to retitle presentation? They didn’t finish the project
- Too large in scope?
- A neat project covering areas in industry that you wouldn’t get into right out of school - troubleshooting, control issues, design. Broad areas, not so specific. Like the scope, but again, financial information was missing
- A summary chart would have been helpful. Also the Y axis seemed to move so it was difficult to compare stats on various charts
- The project was complete if you look at it as saying this needs to be done or that needs to be done. But experience will show that management doesn’t always want to hear “what needs to be done”
- Seemed to be a lot of loose ends - i.e., were the valves too big? What was the problem there?
- Remember this was a student presentation, a learning experience. We are all looking at this from the side of experience
- Size and style of group presentation - only two people, one more talkative and assertive, the other less so
- Are they given the notes of previous meetings to guide them
- Is there a big difference between what is said during this discussion as opposed to what is reported on the written evaluations - or during the luncheon mentoring?
- Time frame for the project (18 months) was much too long. It is just human nature to put off working on it
- Was the lack of crew availability a factor - didn’t have enough to do a run
- Dyan didn’t always know an answer and she guessed a lot. You should just say you don’t know
- Yes, but as a student, you feel pressure to give some kind of answer and don’t think that “I don’t know” is permissible. Lack of presentation experience - you feel to have to say something

PS 210 Report Format (Guay): Feedback was requested on the general outline format for reports. Is it enough? Too much? Comments, changes?

- Looks pretty good as it is - so many different ways to present the report.
- Recommend have a section on a plan to move forward with project
- It is a good template to use
- Students should be given examples to emulate
- Often see really dismal reports in industry. Concise writing is valuable skill, be to the point, grammatically correct. Not too long - get to the bottom line. One or two line conclusion is acceptable, giving perhaps after stating the purpose of the

report. Know the expectations of the report, know the audience it is intended to reach.
- E-mail has brought changes - a different protocol. Put “nuts and bolts” in the first 5 lines. Don’t push “REPLY TO ALL”!!!

Department update (Biasca):
- Described transatlantic degree program, collaboration with Munich University of Applied Science, Tampere Polytechnic – University of Aplied Sciences, support from Stora Enso, Voith; potential for student and faculty exchanges
- Described WIST. Attendee reaction supportive and positive.
- Discussion of ABET accreditation, requirements, progress, plans

Foundation update (Gunderson):
- The Foundation and Department need the support of industry
- Need to present the industry in a positive manner
- Foundation by-laws have been revised to update them
- Foundation is financial secure; endowment funds are 2m+
- Scholarship program revamped and improved
- Industry input and comments are important to improvements

Old Business: none.

New Business: none.

Future dates, meetings and activities:
- 2008 Academic Advisory - Thursday, May 15, 2008
- Foundation Annual Meeting and Scholarship Banquet, September 27, 2007, at the Stevens Point Holiday Inn
- Paper Science & Engineering Co-op/Intern Job Fair, October 4, 2007
- Registration and information will be updated over the summer and available at website: https//uwsp.edu/papersci

Motion to adjourn at 12:00 carried. Lunch was held at the Tokyo Steakhouse (buffet)

University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
College of Natural Resources
Department of Paper Science and Engineering
Stevens Point WI 54481-3897
715-346-4817

Academic Advisory Meeting Minutes
Thursday, May 15, 2008 – 9:00A.M

Attendees:

Biasca, Karyn – UWSP Paper Science & Engineering
Danz, Tom – George A. Whiting
Follett, Dan – Appleton Ideas
Gennrich, Don – PCA
Guay, Don – UWSP Paper Science and Engineering
Gunderson – UW Paper Science Foundation
Holm, Tom – Domtar
Klaas, Kelly – Paper Science & Engineering
Mc Donald, Joe – Retired
Milhalski, Bob – GBP
Mueller, Adam – Packaging Corp of America
Nelson, Brent – New Page
Patton, Ward – Frontline
Rankin, Art - PIMA
Ring, Gerry – Paper Science and Engineering
Sage, Jesse – Crane Engineering
Tausel, Helmut – Voight Paper
Tepp, Sheryle – New Page Corp.
Wachowiak, Don – New Page Corp. (retired)
Weber, Gary – Great Northern Corp.
Webster, Tony – Green Bay Packing
Wilson, Kim – Paper Science and Engineering

Dr. Gerry Ring opened with welcoming remarks for the 32nd annual meeting of the Academic Advisory Meeting.

Minutes of the May 17, 2007, meetings were approved by voice vote.

Dr. Karyn Biasca spoke about the process of the evaluations of the senior presentations and the nature of the presentation itself. The meeting was then turned over to the seniors for their presentations.

Following the presentations a group discussion commenced followed by a brief tour of the paper machine and lunch.

Group Discussion:

Comments generated during the group discussion are summarized below:

This was thought to be the "best" presentation ever!

It was observed that the "finds" would vary on the projects…so back up data would be useful and very helpful. Students should realize this is not a project in isolation. It needs to be looked at as a whole. Clarify how students get their numbers …verbally they did not give to much information in this regard. It was noted that water and energy costs needed to be included the project. All these things need to be incorporated into the whole process with the concerns of how everything impacts as a whole on the paper machine.

When presenting trial data students need to clarify what the conclusion was for the specific trial. "Does this thing work"? Some one would like the word trial dismissed and use experiment only as using the word "trials" is hurting the paper industry.

How well did they anticipate future needs for future projects? It was asked who decides on the student projects? Both Karyn and Don choose the student projects. It was admitted by the faculty that the students did not do a great job in remembering what they had grilled them on the day before their presentations.

Who ever advises the student needs to give more guidance, to take credit of the design. Faculty noted that students were very good at some things but resistant to others…

Questions were proposed as to the ramifications after the installation? Any way to accelerate a project like this? Answer: Based on people's time, it takes time.

In time as the Paper Science and Engineering Department develops budgets and a full time lab manager it was thought that things will improve a great deal. Noting the fact that this semester the students did have a projected due date, however the equipment was only installed in the past two weeks.

As compared to the old days….Hands- On Live vs. Manufactured presentations how do you feel that live presentations are more beneficial to students? It was agreed that hands-on projects are much more superior to the canned projects. It allows more interaction between themselves and teamwork. Students working with live projects were told no a lot by faculty members, they were than forced to re-think and use their thought process. Control valves were learned. Hands-on has many more details and obsticles that arise to make the students think. Hands – on allows the faculty to intertwine in the projects vs. canned projects. It's a much more realistic and more valuable experience and also fun for the faculty, as well as offering open ended solutions with constraints, which works for our accrediditation. Safety issues are big concerns, plans for a new platform are in place. Group would like to see more safely measures put into place for the benefit of everyone.

We will have 8 seniors graduating next year. The project topics will be:

Pressure Screen – has the wrong basket – rejects 90%.
Implement Head Box Controls – thick stock okay but head box needs help

Dr. Ring thanked Joe McDonald for his years of endless service to the department and students. He asked him his thoughts. Joe response was he though that dvd had an invention and we might be able to use this in 3-4 years. Run is going a lot longer than expected. He has learned a lot from the students and would do it the same way. He would like to share new ideas with the industry folks, even though he is aware that industry does not like change but has the enthusiasim. WIST is gaining more steam and our relationship with the university can help you with ideals, and projects. It's people like Joe that make us important…

Dr. Biasca thanked everyone for their participation in the student project.

Curriculum:
Dr Biasca passed curriculum hand outs to everyone. Dr. Ring would like to see if our current curriculum is still valid and what everyone's thoughts were? 2 Semesters of design and drop senior seminar. PAPR 490 & 495 were dropped. PAPR 445 no stars it is an elective. The syllabus includes making boxes, sheeting, coating, printing, using different grades of paper. Currency paper is also taught.

PAPR 460, the Dr Biasca teaches was reviewed and explained the process control and the math associated with this course. This can also model control process next year she will incorporate Math Lab a software program that will enhance the course a great deal.

More discussions followed on why was PreChem substituted? Paper Industry is expanding and will use bio chem. As requirement as well for the Biofuels minor. Dr. Ring explained that the chemistry department does not want our paper science students in bio chemistry because the are doing poorly and they could have failed.

Biochem is the better choice. Since 1977 because of the changing industry we have not attracted the best and the brightest we are starting to see a change in this now. Pchem is an easier option Biochem is harder.
It was asked if we still had statistics in our curriculum and it was noted they are taught in PAPR 314

Chairman Update: Number #1 priority at the moment is the ABET accreditation. This is being pushed by the Dean Chris Thomas. We are working diligently towards this achievement. It is the hope that was the department becomes accredited it will lead to new majors and minors. We will be the sole engineering department for the campus along with Environmental Engineering with the disciplines in the College of Natural Resources. Majors and Minors will also be in the Paper Science and Engineering Department. WIST is becoming a reality and we are working diligently to move in this direction.

We have two new additions to our staff. Kelly Klass joined the department in January as our new Lab Manager. Kim Wilson joined the department in December as our new Academic Department Associate. We continue to have students working every semester to help us as well. Our Career Fair will be held again this October and our graduating students should all have jobs by November.

Our incoming student target is 25. 16 freshman and 9 matriculated. Our goal is to graduate 15 seniors a year.

Future Meetings:

September 25, 2008 – Paper Science Foundation Annual Meeting
October 2, 2008 - Paper Science and Engineering Career Fair
May 14, 2009 – Academic Advisory Meeting