The Council met 8 times during the year on a variety of issues. The major topics are outlined below, followed by some recommendations for COPE for 2017-18.

1. **Review of Human Resources aspects of Comprehensive Energy Management Plan (CEMP).** Extending the work of 2015-2016, COPE was charged (by the provost) to review the HR plan for CEMP. This included the determination of potential issues involving existing employees that may be impacted by CEMP and policies for existing and new employees. This included a number of discussions of the council, and several discussions with Alison Mincey (Associate VP for OSU office of HR), who provided expert advice and background. COPE played a role in determining some key HR requirements, including fair and individualized placement of all affected OSU employees, with no loss of employment. COPE also review and rated three external CEMP proposals and advised that 2 of them were above the bar (one of those was ultimately awarded the contract).

2. **Campus Safety and active threat events.** In previous years, COPE has been one of the drivers of the active shooter video. Since then the unfortunate active threat event took place in November 2016. Subsequently, we had several safety representatives present at our meetings. This included Monica Moll, (director of public safety) and Detective Shaffer to speak on training on active violence events, and ways that we might improve on training for students, staff and faculty. After these discussions, COPE provided a list of recommendations and sent them to Monica Moll in April 2017 (see attached).

3. **Outdoor events and space utilization.** It has come to the attention of COPE that there are unmet needs and demands for a variety of appropriate outdoor spaces for student
activities, especially associated with student groups on campus. Stacie Renker (Assistant Director for Risk and Emergency Management for Student Life) presented and discussed outdoor student events and space utilization on campus. It is clear that this is an important issue that needs to be addressed, and COPE should consider continuing this in 2017-18.

4. Framework 2.0. An outline of the OSU Framework 2.0 was presented by Amy Burgess, and the council had several general discussions on the issues.

Recommendations for 2017-18 COPE agenda: The beginning of the 2016-2017 year was spent in some discussions of the overall role and possible areas of focus for COPE in the near term. This should continue. While COPE had a relatively productive year, it was also clear that more planning and focus is needed in order to maximize potential impact that COPE can have on improving the OSU physical environment. Certainly there should be consideration of follow-up on each of the 4 topics described above, but there may be other issues (such as within the vast scope of Framework 2.0, for example the Mirror lake/south campus oval restoration) that may warrant consideration. Finally, the council recommended that a secretary be designated to compose official meeting notes.

In May COPE elected the new chair for the 2017-2018 year. COPE will be led by Jason Kentner.

The chair would like to thank all guests that gave their time to speak and meet with COPE members. In addition the chair would like to thank Jennifer Evans-Cowley for keeping us up-to-date each month on campus initiatives such as the CEMP. The chair would also like to acknowledge the work of Amy Burgess for providing updates on campus projects. Thank you to all members of this committee who gave up time each month and for extra meeting times for CEMP discussions. It has been a pleasure working with each COPE member.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrew Heckler, Chair, Council on the Physical Environment
Associate Professor
Department of Physics
OSU Council on the Physical Environment (COPE)
Recommendations for OSU student and employee education on active violence events
March 2017

The active shooter video has been very successful, and there are a number of ways to continue and expand the success of the efforts to educate students, staff, faculty, and administrators on the OSU campus during an active violence event.

To that purpose, COPE recommends the following:

1. Each population on campus can have a significantly different perspective on the role to play during an active violence event, regardless of whether or not their views are aligned with proper policy. For example, in a classroom environment, the many instructors (Faculty, TA’s), may feel that they have a responsibility for the safety of the students. Likewise, some students may feel that the instructor is “in command” and has some responsibility. Similar perspectives may arise among staff from those who are normally considered to be in leadership or lower level positions. These are very real perspectives that must somehow be accounted for in safety policies, education, and practice. An example is exam proctoring: what should an instructor and student do during an exam? Explicit discussion possibly with recommendations should occur. The process for incorporating these issues may involve our recommendation #2.

2. Meet with relevant populations (students, faculty, staff, admin) for two-way communication about active violence events. The two-way communication would include on one hand feedback from stakeholders about issues relevant to their environment, and on the other hand education and information sharing on safety policies, protocols, and practices. These meetings should include separate visits with student groups, faculty (for example in department meetings or a college-wide meeting), and staff groups (for example in a college-wide meeting).

3. Brief, online training tailored to specific populations (student, staff, faculty, admin) should be offered. Trainings should include protocols for a variety of relevant venues, including: classrooms, offices, research labs, and other public spaces (libraries, etc). These trainings could include videos and questions and could be used as a certification. Whether such training would be voluntary or required is a larger question beyond the scope of COPE.

4. Separate training should be offered for new student, staff and faculty orientation. Whether such training would be voluntary or required is a larger question beyond the scope of COPE.

5. A process for determining a robust and university-wide plan, including possible requirements or incentives, for viewing videos and undergoing training should be initiated.

6. Regular programs (e.g., once per semester) should be offered for students, faculty and staff separately. This is similar to #2 above, but on a regular basis.

7. Policies and practices should include protocols that ensure the safety of visitors and contractors on campus. This might include an audible messaging or warning system.