Building and Grounds Committee
Final Report
2019-2020 Academic Year

Membership:

David Cool (BSOM), Mateen Rizki (Chair, CECS), Brian Edwards (CEHS), Amelia Hubbard (COLA), Detrice Barry (CONH), Audrey McGowin (COSM), Giovanna Follo (LAKE), David Bukovinsky (RSCOB), Larry James (SOPP), Debbie Lynn Whisler (CaTS), Tom Webb (Disability Services) Greg Sample / Javan Conley (FMS), Kathy Warden (Parking Services), Bill Knots (Physical Plant), Mary Holland (Registrar), Seth Holbein (Student Government)

1. The committee discussed the need to develop a plan for infrastructure and classrooms to support distance education. The committee recommends a survey of faculty and students' preferences regarding the type of delivery mechanisms (synchronous, asynchronous, mixed) and the infrastructure needed. The committee also discussed barriers to faculty adopting distance education including the lack of facilities to support different types of distance offerings and the lack of testing facilities to ensure academic integrity.

   The committee reviewed the types of facilities available on-campus to support distance education and found there is a lack of infrastructure to support the needed variety of formats of online education. Specifically, the need to support classes offered both in-person and asynchronously is not fully supported. This format is well-suited to upper-level undergraduate and graduate classes that may require revising significant portions of course material every semester. The committee also noted there is a lack of infrastructure to support software-centric online instruction.

   The committee polled other Ohio public universities to determine what type of on-campus testing facilities are available for distance education courses. The results show that the majority of universities support some type of physical space for on-campus testing to (1) ensure academic integrity of examinations, (2) and to facilitate testing that cannot be done on a computer. Typically, the test centers handled some manner of accessible testing services, distance education test services, standardized test services, and services for make-up examinations. The committee notes that the current university solutions of using Respondus/Tegrity or requiring individual instructors and departments to develop local solutions is not acceptable, likely inefficient, and a hinderance to online education.

   Recommendations:

   a) **The senate work with the administration to survey students and faculty regarding their needs and preference for online delivery mechanisms and infrastructure needed to support online education.**
   b) **The senate work with the administration to plan and construct facilities to support a variety of online education delivery mechanisms. These should include well-designed physical spaces (i.e.**

camera systems, electronic support), specialized software to help faculty provide timely and effective feedback to students, and all necessary infrastructure to fully support accessibility.

c) **The senate work with the administration to develop a plan to create an on-campus testing facility. At a minimum, this facility should support on-campus testing for distance education courses. Ideally, the facility could offer a full range of services including standardized testing services, make-up test services, and potentially be combined with the existing ODS testing services**.

2. The committee reviewed the Biennial Capital Budget submitted by the University to the State of Ohio. The committee also reviewed the university's deferred maintenance list that was used to develop the capital plan. The committee noted that the deferred maintain list does not include the maintenance of learning spaces.

   The committee discussed the need to develop a process to assess and upgrade learning spaces and facilities for the entire campus including classrooms and laboratory spaces. The committee discussed the need to maintain informal learning spaces. The current approach to replacing furniture and fixtures based on acquiring new furniture only when we construct a new building is not a sustainable solution.

   Although the University conducted a review of all Registrar scheduled classrooms within the last five years and prioritized certain classrooms for modernization; this review did not include college and department level classrooms, laboratories, or informal learning spaces. The process for upgrading these spaces tends to be conducted on an ad hoc basis and usually requires "a squeaky wheel" to drive the process.

   Recommendations:

   a) **The senate work with the administration to develop a formal process for periodically reviewing all learning spaces (university, college, department) on campus to determine the state of the facilities (lighting, paint, carpet, etc.), furniture (tables, chairs, instructor station), and technology (screens, whiteboards, projection systems, etc.),**

   b) **The senate work with the administration to identify specific types of equipment that support multiple academic programs and develop a sustainable protocol to maintain these facilities in good working order,**

   c) **The administration designates one individual in each building with the responsibility to conduct periodic inspections of public areas, identify items needing maintenance, and report this information to (FMS),**

   d) **The administration curtails use of capital funds for new construction until a significant portion of deferred maintenance projects are completed – especially learning spaces,**

e) **The administration in consultation with the senate determine an appropriate level of funds to set aside annually to upgrade learning spaces. The committee suggests approximately $750K is needed to support learning spaces (see minutes of the February 3, 2020 meeting for details).**

3. The committee reviewed parking violation data provided by Parking and Transportation showing the distribution of parking violations by type and location over the past three years (2017-2019). The data indicates violations have increased by 23% on the main campus while enrollment dropped by 24% during the same period. Parking and Transportation issued 15,956 violations in 2019. The Parking and Transportation subcommittee notes that while the majority of parking tickets are justified, a significant number of violations are the result of confusing parking regulations, problems with signage, and a failure to accommodate the needs of students. Examples include (1) students coming on campus to conduct business during breaks when classes are not in session and receiving tickets for parking violations, (2) students living in on-campus housing being denied the ability to buy a parking pass for the main campus, (3) students in on-campus housing parking in inappropriate spaces when unloading goods (i.e. groceries), (4) rules that students are required to memorize that limit parking at different times of the day or on different days of the week, and (5) visitors being required to go to a parking booth that is not highly visible (i.e. not located at an entry point to the campus).

   Recommendation:

   The senate work with the administration to streamline parking regulations, allow students more flexibility to purchase access to parking that accommodates their needs, and identify violation "hotspots" and reconfigure parking spaces and/or signage.

4. The committee reviewed the Facilities Management and Campus Operations (FMS) plan for water treatment. The FMS described three options (1) continued softening of water, (2) use of Fairborn water, (3) installation of a reverse osmosis system. The continued softening of water is expensive ($40K/year) and increases salt in the watershed. The use of Fairborn water has significant upfront cost (~$1.5M) and still requires treatment of the water. The reverse osmosis system is the lowest cost option because it reduces the manpower required to maintain the system (~1 person per year instead of 2) and will result in better quality water in fixtures which will prolong their life. The University has a $4M appropriation that must be used soon to upgrade the drinking water. The plan is to clean the wells, bring the wellheads above ground, and move forward with the reverse osmosis system.

5. A member of the committee, Dr. Audrey McGowin, reported the results of her test on chloride levels in the groundwater. The samples were taken in September and October 2019. The results showed chloride levels of 400 ppm upstream from the salt barn suggesting there is a high level of salt in the groundwater (normal ~250 ppm). She noted that this might be the result of the application of too much salt during the winter. The FMS representative also noted that additional salt runoff may be coming from the businesses across Colonel Glenn Hwy that drain their groundwater through the University drainage system.