

Annual Report for the Council on the Physical Environment (COPE) for the 2020-2021 Academic Year.

Membership of COPE (AY) 2020-2021

Member (Term Expires)	Source	Affiliation (Alternate)
Scott Schricker (2023)	Presidential	Dentistry
Sebastien Proulx (2022)	Presidential	Arts and Science
Kerry Ard (2023)	Faculty Council	CFAES
Jacqueline Gargus (2023)	Faculty Council	Architecture
Tim Leasure (2024)	Faculty Council	Music
Anthony Massari (2024)	Faculty Council	Engineering
Margaret Mudge (2023)	Faculty Council	Vet School
Emma Hetson (2022)	IPC	Pharmacy
Felipe Pacci-Evaristo (2022)	CGS	
Alex Poling (2022)	USG	
Lara Pfrimmer (2022)	USG	
Scott Dickson (2022)	Staff - Steering/USAC	Schottenstein/Facilities
Aaron Moore (Ex-Officio)	SVP, Admin & Planning	
Diane Dagefoerde (Ex-Officio)	Executive Vice President and Provost	(Nicole Six)
Scott Potter (Ex-Officio)	SVP Designee, Business & Finance	

Meetings

COPE held seven meetings during the academic year. The meetings were scheduled for the first Tuesday of every month from 4:30-5:30 by zoom. We initially attempted to hold hybrid meetings, but the consensus was that zoom meetings were preferred. Due to the long winter break we did not have a meeting in January. There were no pressing agenda items and given the proximity to the February meeting it was cancelled.

The Chair was also a member of the President and Provost's Council on Sustainability (PPCS). This committee met several times during AY 2020-2021. The PPCS discuss the metrics used by the University to measure sustainability and initiatives to achieve carbon neutrality. The PPCS also reviewed proposals that pertained to sustainability.

The chair also participated in monthly meetings of Faculty Cabinet. The Cabinet had a series of meetings with university leaders to discuss specific topics. COPE participated in the meeting that focused on **"Making OSU a compelling place to work"** and **"Impact of university efficiencies and reorganization."** The specific issues discussed by COPE were, "Making affordable childcare available to the University Community and Affordable family housing for students (Undergrad, Grad, Professional), as well as Transportation and Parking."

Committee Structure

COPE established a chair, chair-elect structure during the last academic year. However, there was no one willing to run for chair elect. One issue was the students were not able to run for chair-elect because they only had one-year terms. This is not due to committee or senate by-laws or rules, but rather how students are appointed by the student government organizations. The student members said they would communicate this issue back to their leadership.

Steering formed an ad-hoc committee to look at the structure of the Senate committees. COPE received this report, and a full response is attached to this report. Briefly COPE agrees with most of the recommendations and will work with Jay Kasey's office to establish closer communication and help set goals and priorities for the committee.

Initiatives/Resolutions

COPE supported two resolutions that originated from undergraduate student government (USG). Alex Poling was a COPE member from USG that put these resolutions before the council. One was a resolution encouraging the University to accelerate its timeline to achieve carbon neutrality. After COPE voted to support this resolution, it went to the Steering Committee and was then sent to the Senate for a vote. The full Senate supported this resolution on March 24, 2022.

USG also initiated a resolution to ask the University to provide capital funds to support the Byrd Polar Center. The Byrd Polar Center houses rare ice core samples, many of which are not replaceable. The freezers are in need of replacement, but there is not a funding source to solve this problem. The resolution was supported by COPE, was discussed at a meeting of the steering committee and forwarded to the Senate Fiscal Committee. This was discussed at the fiscal committee meeting on March 29, 2022. The fiscal committee followed-up with Peter Mohler on April 19, 2022 and received a response that ERIK was aware of the issue and wanted to expand extramural funding to support climate research.

COPE also did some preliminary work to understand the distribution of gender inclusive restrooms across the University. Alex Poling mapped the restrooms based on data given to us by the University. While many such facilities exist, it is clear that the density in older parts of campus are less compared to new facilities. It was noted that some restrooms listed might not be publicly available because they are in dormitories or in non-public areas of buildings.

Committee Meetings

During the year we had one outside presentation from Jeremy Gabis, Director, The Ohio State University, Office of Student Life Facility Planning & Design. This was regarding plans to build family student housing. It was clear that a solution was still several years away.

The chair and subgroup of COPE members had two meetings outside of the normal Tuesday meeting time. One meeting was with Mark Conselya and topics of discussion were building standards, transportation and carbon neutrality.

Another meeting was with Thomas Komlanc to better understand building standards and that impacted infrastructure decisions.

Scott Schricker and incoming chair Anthony Massari met with Jay Kasey to discuss ideas about how to better integrate COPE with the office of administration and planning.

AY 2022/23

Anthony Massari was selected as the chair of the committee for the upcoming academic year.

Response to Ad-Hoc Committee

At the beginning of AY 2021-2022 an ad-hoc committee was charged by the Steering Committee to examine the structure and roles of the standing senate committees. In Part 1 of this response, the ad-hoc committee's recommendations for COPE will be presented. The second section is COPE's reply to the recommendations of the report.

PART 1 Report Recommendations

Review of COPE Fulfillment of Duties and Responsibilities.

The feedback reveals that many of the duties and responsibilities are not being accomplished, as charged. The general feeling is that the scope is too large for this committee and the duties and responsibilities better describe the Board of Trustees Master Planning and Facilities committee than the senate committee. These include proposing policies, reviewing, and recommending actions on major projects, and recommending items for senate action. The committee listens to speakers from around campus and conducts meetings efficiently with appropriate opportunity for input from committee members.

Recommendations for COPE Duties and Responsibilities

- Narrow the scope of the committee to general policy directions and feedback on initiatives coming out of the Office of Administration and Planning.

Review of the Structure/Composition and Operation of COPE

While the committee has the right composition, there is an inadequate connection to decision-makers.

Recommendations for the Structure/Composition and Operation of COPE

- Clarify the connection to the board's Master Planning & Facilities Committee

Review of Communication and Alignment of COPE with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

The feedback indicates that administrative members are willing to share information, but not early in the development process. The committee is not being included or consulted on university decisions about the physical environment. Communication with decision makers is generally absent and the work of the committee is not as visible as desired.

Recommendations for Communication and Alignment of COPE with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

- Consider documenting (e.g., via a MOU) the committee's areas of responsibility with the Office of Administration and Planning
- Connect with Student Life facility planning and design office.
- Interact with Vice President of Planning, Architecture and Real Estate.
- Develop a formal connection to PARE, FOD, Landscape, and have representation on Planning and Development committees and/or design review.

Develop communication with Senate Fiscal committee.

PART 2 COPE Reply

COPE Duties and Responsibilities

COPE agrees that it is important to focus and clarify its responsibilities. Limiting COPE's duties to the Office of Administration and Planning does not significantly reduce our scope. Almost everything we dealt with this year and the previous year was with Office of Administration and Planning. One thing that would be helpful is to give COPE some specific responsibilities and place us in a specific workflow. Given the diffuse nature of how the physical environment is prioritized and managed, it is an outsized responsibility for the chair and/or co-chair to have to reach out and find specific tasks and projects for COPE. Having a set of task and responsibilities, without limiting COPE to these tasks, would be helpful. Reviewing all policy changes and building standards before they are sent for review might an appropriate role for COPE.

Structure/Composition and Operation of COPE

COPE agrees that we have an appropriate composition. However, COPE needs to have its membership set by the start of the academic year. It took a couple of months to get a representative from OCIO and we still do not have a designee from Scott Potter's office, and we never had a second staff member assigned to the committee.

COPE agrees that we need to have a greater connection to the Board's Master Planning & Facilities Committee. We would recommend one of two actions, allow the chair or designee from COPE to sit as a non-voting member on the Master Planning & Facilities Committee

including executive sessions, or have the chair of the Master Planning & Facilities Committee meet with COPE at the beginning of each semester to discuss priorities and initiatives.

COPE agrees that we need a better connection to decision makers, the question for COPE is who are the decision makers? This is particularly relevant when it comes to financial decisions. There are many good ideas, but how we fund and greenlight these projects is not clear. As an example, the Comprehensive Transportation and Parking Plan outlines potential actions in both the short and the long-term. Who sets the priorities for this plan and greenlights and funds these projects? Over the last year and a half, it is clear that no one we spoke with made these decisions. If COPE is to take a more active role in the decision process, we need to have some access to the decision makers or the ability to directly report to them.

Alignment of COPE with Administration, Other Senate Committees and/or Campus Community

COPE would like to work on issues that broadly deal with the quality of life on campus. Basically, issues that affect how students, faculty and staff interact with infrastructure and the environment. Specifically, we are interested in, housing, transportation, green space, accessibility and sustainability. Having MOU's would be a good step to formalizing relationships with business units on campus. These MOU's should outline specific tasks and/or regular meetings with the business units on campus.

We would like to get regular reports from and have a standing meeting with: Transportation, Landscape, PARE and FOD. COPE also agrees that we should have representatives on specific planning and development committees, either on an ad-hoc basis or part of an MOU. It would also be helpful to have a joint meeting with fiscal and the Office of Administration and Planning, to outline priorities and better understand how to advocate for issues or projects that are important to COPE.

While we had multiple conversations with many of these units, we did not establish any formal MOU's. At the end of the AY 2021-2022, Anthony Massari and I met with Jay Kasey to try and establish a more formal relationship between COPE and the Office of Administration and Planning.