

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 1, 2022**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

<http://www.utoledo.edu/facsenate>

Approved @ FS on 11/29/2022

---

**Summary of Discussion**

---

**Note:** The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

**President Insch:** It is a little after 4 pm, so we are going to begin. Hi everyone. We are over here at the Health Sciences Campus in Collier, Room 1000A. There's lots of room for whenever you want to join us on every other Faculty Senate meeting. So welcome. I'm calling the meeting of November 1, 2022, the Faculty Senate of the University of Toledo to order. We will start by having our roll call. So Secretary Coulter-Harris, please.

**Secretary Coulter-Harris:** Good afternoon, Senators.

**Present:** Ammon Allred, Elissar Andari, Peter Andreanna, Tomer Avidor-Reiss, Gabriella Baki, Bruce Bamber, Sheri Benton, Terry Bigioni, Carmen Cioc, Daniel Compora, Deborah Coulter-Harris, Vicki Dagostino-Kalniz, Lucy Duhon, Anthony Edgington, Hossein Elgafy, Ahmed El-Zawahry, Collin Gilstrap, Karen Green, Sally Harmych, Samir Hefzy, Cindy Herrera, Mitchell Howard, Jason Huntley, Gary Insch, Alap Jayatissa, Catherine Johnson, Michael Kistner, Lauren Koch, David Krantz, David Kujawa, Patrick Lawrence, Glenn Lipscomb, Kimberly McBride, Alexia Metz, Mohamad Moussa, Julie Murphy, Amanda Murray, Kimberly Nigem, Grant Norte, Mohamed Osman, Elaine Reeves, Jennifer Reynolds, Linda Rouillard, Barry Scheuermann, Kathy Shan, Puneet Sindwani, Suzanne Smith, Robert Steven, Lee Strang, Steven Sucheck (Mike Young), Weiqing Sun, Jami Taylor, Berhane Teclehaimanot, Robert Topp, James Van hook, Jerry Van Hoy, Randall Vesely, Donald Wedding.

**Excused Absences:** Jason Huntley

**Unexcused Absent:** Jillian Bornak, Prabir Chaudhuri, Greg Gilchrist (for Eric Chaffe), Amanda Murray, Carla Patin, Yvette Perry, Paul Schaefer, James Van Hook

**Secretary Coulter-Harris:** President Insch, we have a quorum.

**President Insch:** Thank you very much, Secretary Coulter-Harris. I appreciate that. Thank you everyone for being here today. We have a couple of items to take care of, but first of all, we need to adopt the agenda. If I can get a motion to adopt the agenda?

**Senator Green:** So moved.

**Senator Rouillard:** Second.

**President Insch:** All in favor say, 'aye.' Put yes, or no, or abstain in the Chat for me. I assume that one has a lot of yeses. *Agenda Approved.*

All right, next on the agenda we've going to look at the Minutes. If there's not an objection, we'll approve both October 4<sup>th</sup> and October 18<sup>th</sup> at the same time. Is there a motion to approve the Faculty Senate Minutes from October 4<sup>th</sup> and October 18<sup>th</sup>?

**Senator Hefzy:** So moved.

**President Insch:** Thank you, Sir. Do we have a second?

**Senator Taylor:** Second.

**President Insch:** All right, so, are there any additions or subtractions to the Minutes? Okay, apparently there aren't any. So all in favor of approving the Minutes of October 4<sup>th</sup> and October 18<sup>th</sup> say, 'aye.' If you approve, put a 'yes' in the Chat for me. If you apposed say, 'nay' or put a 'no.' And if you abstain, put an 'a' in the Chat, or say, 'abstain.' *Motion Passed.*

I didn't have a chance to communicate with Provost Dickson this week. I'm not sure if she is with us or not. Are you with us, Provost Dickson?

**Provost Dickson:** I am.

**President Insch:** Yay, happy day. Hi. How are you? I apologize. We sent you the agenda and forgot to follow-up, so I appreciate your patience with me. If you have anything you'd like to bring the Senate up to speed with, that would be awesome. Thank you, Ma'am.

**Provost Dickson:** So, should we start with your report?

**President Insch:** Yes, all right, thanks for reading the agenda. Good afternoon everybody. I'm going to keep my comments fairly brief, just because we have a fairly full agenda. **Executive Committee Report:** Your Faculty Senate Executive Committee have been very busy the past four weeks. Two issues continue to attract a lot of our time – Recruitment and Retention and the Budget. We have two committee reports on those subjects on the agenda so I will not steal any of their thunder.

All of our Senate committees are running and beginning their important work. President-Elect Rouillard is continuing to fill the vacancies in some committees. If there is a vacancy in your college slot for a committee, please think about volunteering and contact Dr. Rouillard. And if you are currently not on a committee, and you have a colleague who wants to get involved, please let us know, as we still have some vacancies. We'd be happy to have you join us to continue the work of the Senate.

Two other issues are continuing as concerns. First, as you are aware, there are some challenges with the 50-year COMLS agreement with ProMedica. With ProMedica's current financial challenges, there is a need to re-evaluate this agreement. There have been some very preliminary conversations regarding this, but nothing really new to add to President Postel's comments last Faculty Senate meeting. We will continue to monitor the situation and update the Faculty Senate.

The second issue regards some concerns regarding concerns regarding UToledo's policies covering Maternity/Paternity leave and related concerns. The Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs is investigating this and will report back.

Also, the Executive Committee is moving forward with this year's Dean's evaluations. The survey instrument was approved the FSEC and will now be shared with the "to be surveyed" deans for their review. We are hoping to administer the survey during the first two weeks of February.

That concludes our report. Are there any questions? Are there any additions from members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee? Yes, Senator Rouillard?

**Senator Rouillard:** Regarding the committees, I'd like to invite some people from Health and Human Services to apply for some of the positions. I've sent out a couple of emails asking for volunteers to serve on those committees. We're still missing volunteers from the College of Nursing. So, if you have an inkling to volunteer, we would greatly appreciate it.

**President Insch:** Thank you, President Rouillard. So, again, HHS and Nursing have a couple of vacancies that we would really need to fill. And so, if you are from one of those colleges or you know a colleague who might be willing to do that, please let Senator Rouillard know so we can get those vacancies filled. Okay, now the boring part is over and now we go to somebody who really is important. So, Provost Dickson, it is your turn; you have the floor. Thank you.

**Provost Dickson:** Thank you very much. I don't know about important as much as busy. Good afternoon. President Insch; can you guys hear me? I'm hearing an echo. President Insch, President-Elect Rouillard, Executive Committee and Faculty Senate members, I'd like to start actually with 'congratulations' to the Department of Geography and Planning. They secured four of nine graduate awards at the Eastlake Division of the American Association of Geographers. Eastlake is one of 10 regions of the predominant International Organization for Academic and Professional Geographers of the American Association Geographers, which currently has over 10,000 members worldwide. The department secured the most credit rewards of any schools, and there were 20 schools present. So, congratulations! The work of our faculty is just amazing. And, it's important that we're all aware of it.

On another hand, it's hard to believe it's November 1st already. We're well into this semester; in fact, there's so many things going on. As most of you are aware, we have many, many things going on. One of the highlights this week [already] is a meeting I had yesterday with Tomer Avidor-Reiss. We had a really nice meeting about some of the recruitment stuff. We're excited to get the faculty involved, and listen to your ideas. We also had a meeting this morning with the President, and Dave, and a couple of people on kind of a smaller committee, trying to figure out where those interactions are. So we're really looking forward to getting the institution involved in that. We're continuing to move forward with our program prioritization and fiscal sustainability plans in preparation for the December Board of Trustees meetings. The Deans have been working very hard with their colleges to prepare for the upcoming Huron meetings, which will be the templates of what I present to the Board in December. I actually had another meeting today with the Senate member and explained that this right here is the template for how we will move forward, regardless of what any of you thought about that the Huron data; what your deans are planning right now will set the strategic direction for your colleges moving forward. So, if you're not aware of this work, or you want to know more about it, I suggest that you start having conversations with your deans. We're meeting with Huron on the 8th and 9th. This work includes developing ongoing initiatives and prioritization based on programs, fiscal opportunities for those that have been previously identified in anything that would be revenue generating or cost saving as we move forward.

As previously mentioned, we're also working on reviewing faculty workload so that we can assure the Board that everybody is working to contract. I want to make sure that I say that very clearly. This has to do with teaching. Again, I had a conversation today for full and part-time, tenure track, and lecturers. We need to be able to say that we are being efficient and clear in the workload expectation, so that the Board does not come at us, in terms of – and many of you heard me say this, some guy who mows his lawn at 10

o'clock on a Tuesday morning who lives [clearly] in every single state in the country; I want to put that to rest. And again, it is just your elaborations - are you working to your elaborations that map to the CBA? So, we've got that going on. We working also very strongly on student success efforts. We've been engaging various stakeholders across campus to understand what student success efforts are being done and by whom. This will allow us to identify gaps, and process, and personnel and provide appropriate support and allow us to create a more robust and targeted approach in the future. We're also working on a dashboard that will help us understand what students are struggling and where. And, ideally, I'd like to get that in a very parsed out, if you will, metric so that we know exactly where to intervene with students.

We've been busy in our office with other initiatives as well, including the new RPC system, so thank you for your continued patience as we work through those processes, working with faculty to develop and submit the OT 36 courses, and developing articulation agreements. Some of you saw the news coverage of what we did with Owens last week or the week before to create more opportunities and greater pathways for transfer students, updating CIP codes to ensure that our data is accurate and clean, and revising curricular processes to ensure that we're meeting the needs of our students. There are so many other things underway, but those are the things that we've been spending our time on recently.

So, that is what my update is for today. I'm happy to answer any questions or, you know, address things that you've heard that I haven't addressed.

**President Insch:** Go ahead, Senator Johnson.

**Senator Johnson:** I just had a question related to the budget... I think this is slightly relevant. In our college, what we're seeing is this push to have classes individually be breakeven or profitable as opposed to programs as a whole. So, what's happening is there's a push for, like, PhD faculty who are more expensive than instructors to teach, like, you know, large sections instead of senior level, 4,000 level capstone classes. I'm curious if that's the intent behind this and if not, you might need to reiterate with deans if that's not the intent. If it is the intent to move, we have experts in our fields who go to Fulbright in other countries to teach other universities how to do things that we do, and there's a push to move them out of those classes because they're small classes and into large sections. And so, I'm just curious how we can address that at the college level; if that is something that you're okay with happening, that's fine. But can you talk about why that is? If it's not, I just don't know if it's clear to deans, finance managers of the college level that is the case, right? They're trying to make class profitable as opposed to whole departments. So, I think that's the problem when you have, you know a lot of the experts are expensive faculty and they should probably be in the senior level classes and not the intro classes.

**President Insch:** Could you hear Senator Johnson, Provost? Could you hear her okay?

**Provost Dickson:** I did. I think I got the gist of it. My question actually is, I didn't catch who she was, so I don't know what college she was talking about? That would be helpful.

**President Insch:** She is wearing a mask so I am not sure who she is. I'm sorry, it's Catherine Johnson from the College of Business.

**Provost Dickson:** Oh, the College of Business. So, it's interesting that that's your perspective. There has not been anyone who has suggested that classes should be profitable. First of all, we all know, that's not true. Generally speaking, graduate programs, particularly PhD programs are not profitable. The very, very, very traditional model, I have worked in a non-traditional model, but the very traditional model is that you pay for your graduate programs by a robust undergraduate. So anybody who's focusing on the profitability of classes has kind of lost sight, and I'm happy to redirect your Dean. I find that very difficult to believe that that's where she's gone with this. But, I'm not telling anybody what to do. The only thing - and I'm not going to pretend to understand how to run a specific college. [But] I will pretend that I know how to run the credit college I ran before, but even then I am not getting involved. What we have asked them to do, and this is the 'key' term right here, prioritization. We have asked them to prioritize. If your PhD programs are your priority, then find a way to pay for them. That doesn't mean they have to be profitable. The bottom line is, we are not looking class by class. They were given that information if they wanted it. But what we're asking is that the college has a model for fiscal sustainability, understanding that it may take a couple of years to get there. But this is all about managing resources and prioritizing. So I don't know if that answers your question, but nobody has said anything about class sizes. Nobody has said anything about not teaching certain things. If those conversations are happening, they're happening at the college level, and they are based on the priorities that either the dean or in some faculty group setting.

**President Insch:** So, just to kind of reiterate what the challenge is, is that you have special -- I'll give you an example from the College of Business. We have someone who teaches tax; he's got a specialization in tax. Because he's got a specialization he's a little more expensive than others. So there might be a tendency, 'well, tax only has 35 students in it. Let's put him in a class and have him teach Intro,' which has 60 students in it because his salary is higher. So when you're looking at a class-by-class basis, that distortion can happen rather than looking at department as a whole. And that's the challenge, that some deans are looking at a class-by-class break-even and kind of missing out on that challenge of specialization, and by specialization they will be teaching smaller classes. Does that make sense?

**Provost Dickson:** It does. I'm going to say to you guys what I've said to so many academics over the years. When that happens, you need to pull up, because what you're doing is you're looking too granularly, which is what we academics do, which is why we're successful in getting through our programs. But, long term, that's not going to be a necessarily successful strategy because if you're going to place faculty based on their salaries or you're going to hire people based on their salaries then what happens is we are not ever going to excel as an institution. What we need to do, if we need a tax guy or woman, and the tax person is expensive, that's part of the cost of running the program or running the college. By definition, higher education is a communistic or socialistic endeavor. I'm sorry if I offended anybody, but it's true. Some of your disciplines are remarkably expensive and will never pay for themselves and others are far less expensive and have to subvert the more expensive ones. What is a university without music? What is a university without theater? I mean, we may decide that we don't want those disciplines, but they're remarkably expensive, particularly if they're accredited. So, those are decisions that deans need to make based on the priorities. And if it's important to have those things, then find out how you can fund them. It's just a matter of running your organization.

**President Insch:** I was giving an example. I have no information if that's actually happening.

**Provost Dickson:** I'm just taking it as the example, hypothetically speaking.

**President Insch:** I don't want my boss mad at me. All right, any other questions? Any questions coming through the Chat for the Provost? Well, thank you so much. I really appreciate your time. Thank you for being here and thank you for all you're doing for our UT family. Thanks.

**Provost Dickson:** My pleasure. Bye guys.

**President Insch:** Good bye. So we will now move on to our committee reports. We will start off with Prof. Edgington from the Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum.

**Senator Edgington:** Thank you very much, President Insch. I hope everybody can hear me well. Hopefully, you can all see this in front of you. This is our spreadsheet of our courses. At this time, we have 18 new course proposals we are bringing to you. These are all from the same program. This is going to be a new program in Radiation Therapy coming out of the College of Medicine. The committee did review all of these courses. We had some minor concerns here and there related to [maybe] some more specificity in SLOs, some grading issues as far as making sure that's clear to students, but overwhelmingly we agreed these courses are ready to come to Senate today for your review. I know typically I would go through and read each of these and each of the course descriptions, but given these are all from the same program and I know we've got a pretty tight agenda today, I was going to go ahead and just move to questions that senators may have or concerns they may have about the courses. So if you have any questions or concerns, please raise those now. I also know we have a few members of the Radiation Therapy program present to help answer some of those questions if you have them.

**President Insch:** We have a question from Senator Rouillard.

**Senator Rouillard:** Hi Senator Edgington. I have a question about specifically the radiation-- can you scroll back down? There you go-- the radiation courses that are related to the physics. It seems like those overlap with physics courses in our College of Natural Sciences and Math. I asked the current chair of that department, Nicholas Sperling, if anybody from the College of Medicine had contacted him about their course proposal. It looks like a course duplication. He responded to me that nobody had corresponded with him about this course or the second course in that sequence.

**Senator Edgington:** That did not come to the attention of our committee. No one had mentioned that duplication. What we could do is we could take that course out from the current list of courses and then I could contact Physics and the Radiation Therapy program and have them meet to discuss this going further. I think the 3100 may be the only course. Is there another one you saw? I'm trying to see if there's another with physics in the title.

**Senator Rouillard:** Physics 3230.

**Senator Edgington:** Physics 3230?

**Senator Rouillard:** No, I'm sorry. But there are two physics courses in that radiation therapy set of courses that I think needs to be discussed with the NSM Physics Department. They were quite surprised to hear about this.

**Senator Edgington:** Okay. So I will take out then, let me go ahead and italics that.

**Prof. Pearson:** If it pleases the Senate, I can speak to this?

**President Insch:** Why don't you come here? You can use the mic too.

**Prof. Pearson:** Okay.

**President Insch:** David from the College of Medicine and Lifesciences to address this.

**Prof. Pearson:** So I can speak to this. There is no overlap with any of the courses in the Physics Department. I'm actually an adjunct professor of the Physics Department. I haven't spoken to the chair of the Physics Department about this. Instead, I spoke to the dean of the college and explained to him the program that we were looking to create here. I admit that it probably is an oversight to not speak to the department chair of Radiation Oncology. I have spoken to him recently within the last couple of weeks just not about this program. The reason I can say with certain that this is not an overlap with any courses taught by the Physics Department, because these courses are very specifically aimed at teaching radiation therapists. Radiation therapists are the people who operate the medical technology used for treating cancer. It's X-ray generating machines. This program has to be accredited. There are no courses that fit the description that would allow us to be able to meet accreditation. With our accreditation we have to have very specific things in our curriculum. And I've looked at courses that I teach; I teach physics of radiation therapy in the Radiation Department, and I don't have any courses that overlap with this. There was one course that we were able to not include here, and that was a radiation biology course. And, that was already in existence. But every other course, though, there was nothing else that could be taught. And as I said, I am aware of all of the courses that the Physics Department teaches. I am in communication with them, but as I said, not specifically about this. If they were to teach this, they would have to create new courses to do that.

**Senator Rouillard:** You said you spoke with the dean. Is that the dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Math?

**Prof. Pearson:** Yes.

**Senator Rouillard:** Okay. Personally, I would feel better if you spoke with Physics faculty just to be clear.

**Prof. Pearson:** I can absolutely do that.

**Senator Rouillard:** All right. Thank you.

**Senator Wedding:** I also spoke with the chair of the Physics Department and he was surprised by these. There are more than two, you can look at the whole list. He thinks that there should have been some consultation with the Department of Physics, which is a thing we commonly do on this campus. It is a matter of courtesy and also as a matter of 'so-called' duplication or overlap. He feels like there are some overlaps that he would like to discuss, and I think it should be done before we move forward. There is no rush on this, is there?

**Prof. Pearson:** So, yes. We are trying to have this program up and running and in place before another program in this area closes its doors in May of 2023. We want to be able to be ready to fulfill the need and to train new radiation therapists; otherwise, it will have a detrimental effect to cancer care in this area - affecting all hospitals in Northwest Ohio and Southeast Michigan.

**Senator Wedding:** That's the program. Are you talking about the overall program or specific courses?

**Prof. Pearson:** I'm talking about the overall program, which can't move forward until the courses are approved.

**Senator Wedding:** What college are you talking about? [Are you talking about] Baker up in Michigan? They are closing next May.

**Prof. Pearson:** Yes, that's right.

**Senator Wedding:** It seems to me that this has been rushed through here, and I think that we should have consultation with the Department of Physics.

**Prof. Pearson:** I can absolutely do that. I hesitate to say that this has been rushed. This has been ready for four months and has just been waiting for this committee to meet. Because of the large number of courses, it was advised that we didn't hit the ground at the end of the last semester before the summer. So, we were actually just about ready just before the summer semester.

**Senator Wedding:** You are an adjunct. How long have you been on campus?

**Prof. Pearson:** This is starting to sound a little bit..., but I have been a PhD student within the Physics Department of the NSM College formerly when it was Arts and Science. I graduated in 2007 with a PhD from the department that you were referring to, Nick's department. I've been a faculty member at this college since 2008.

**Senator Wedding:** There is a great deal of relationship between the Department of Physics and the Dana Cancer Center and the radiation group, and I see no reason why you should not be talking with them.

**President Insch:** Well, so let's clarify because I think he said --Wait. What's your name again?

**Prof. Pearson:** David.

**President Insch:** And your last name?

**Prof. Pearson:** Pearson.

**President Insch:** So, I think that that David has indicated a willingness to speak with Physics. The question now is, are you okay with just having the one physics class, or do you want them to look at all?

**Senator Wedding:** I want them to look at all.

**President Insch:** Okay.

**Senator Wedding:** I want the Physics' chair to be involved in this, and they can certainly get that done.

**President Insch:** Okay.

**Senator Wedding:** That's not going to stop it.

**President Insch:** All right. So there a motion on the floor from Senator Taylor to table this.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** I have a comment. I want to say my hand is raised up and you do not call my name. This is Tomer Avidor-Reiss and I want to speak about this issue.

**President Insch:** His hand was raised?

**Group of Senators:** In WebEx.

**President Insch:** Oh. Go ahead Senator Avidor-Reiss if you want to talk.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** So I spoke with the Dean from NSM today, and he said that he's very surprised that this thing is moving forward. He said that he spoke with somebody that came to him and asked them not to move forward before this is discussed with him. So he was really, very surprised to hear these things are here. I just want to express that, that that needs to be discussed both with the Dean of NSM and Physics.

**President Insch:** So David – David, I am going to put words in your mouth, right?

**Prof. Pearson:** Okay.

**President Insch:** So, what I understand is we're going to table the entire set of courses. David will then go back and reconnect with the dean again and then with the chair of Physics; let us know how those conversations went, and then if he gets that done during the next week or so, we can bring this back off from being tabled at the next meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup> of November. Does that sound right? I have two more hands. Go ahead.

**Senator Wedding:** I have a concern that Marc Seigar is surprised that this is moving forward when we've been told that Marc Siegar had approved it. So, there's some contradiction here and we certainly have to have interactions now with not just Marc Seigar and the chair, but anyone else in the areas of that college, Natural Science and Math, and maybe even other colleges, HHS. To just move forward like this at top speed when you still have until next semester, that's a lot.

**Prof. Williams:** It did get all the way up to the state for approval. We actually had it ready last spring and it was a week late in having the Senate look at everything. I think if they just look at the student learning objectives for each of these RDON courses they'll clearly realize they do not have any courses that even match them. The student learning objectives are directly from the accredited agency, and they're very radiation therapy focused. They're not general physics---

**President Insch:** Can I have your name just for the record?

**Prof. Williams:** Candace Williams.

**President Insch:** Thank you, Candace.

**Senator Johnson:** I would say, the point of the Senate having faculty from every college is that somebody can reply from Physics if they are here so we can vote on it today. Because, if it does in fact overlap, which I believe it's because the Medical School has such different accreditation and... goals than the people on the Main Campus, I don't plan to understand that. I don't feel it is my place to gate keep a program in the Medical College. I mean, is there somebody from NSM that is here that can say, well, it is overlapped and we can just vote today because, if everybody hasn't a concern about this, I think we heard it all?

**President Insch:** Well, the challenge is that NSM is a college that may not have a member of the Physics Department to talk about it here at Senate.

**Prof. Pearson:** They do actually. Sorry.

**Senator Rouillard:** I have a question.

**President Insch:** Yes, go ahead.

**Senator Rouillard:** Just a couple of questions, an information question and then a question about this as a BS degree. Why is this being housed in the College of Medicine? Why isn't this being housed in HHS or in NSM and the appropriate faculty teaching the course? This is a new model to have a BS offered through the College of Medicine. So that's one comment. My other question is: do you know why Baker College in Wayne State University is closing down their radiation therapy programs? **[Correction: Wayne State is not closing its radiation therapy program. LMR]**

**Prof. Pearson:** I can speak to Baker because we've been in consultation with the program director for the Baker College. So I do know why they're closing down that program - yes.

**Senator Rouillard:** And what is the reason?

**Prof. Pearson:** They are changing the structure of their college. They are moving all of their medical programs to a specific campus that is further north in Michigan and the people who run that program do not wish to move to northern Michigan.

**Senator Rouillard:** And what about Wayne State? [\[see above\]](#)

**Prof. Pearson:** I'm not familiar with the Wayne State program closing; that is news to me, so I can't speak to that.

**Senator Rouillard:** Their program is housed in the School of Pharmacy, which is an undergraduate college. And I'm not sure where I heard this or if I just saw it online, but my understanding was that they were closing down their program too. So I was wondering what the reasons were.

**Prof. Pearson:** I can speak to the program director to see what we come up with that. But, as you said, there are various colleges where this could be housed. However, it is the Radiation Therapy program that wants this. The Radiation Therapy Department within the College of Medicine is the one who wants to start this program. So, if you're asking, why could it not be in another college? They have to want to start the program. And if they want to start the radiation program, they're absolutely able to do that. But we're the ones who want to do this because it's going to benefit us the most. Within the field of radiation therapy, we're the ones who benefit from this because we need people to do this job.

**Senator Rouillard:** I'm sure of that, but personally I have concerns with locating a BS degree in the College of Medicine.

**Prof. Pearson:** On what grounds?

**Senator Wedding:** The Graduate School. Are you setup to handle an undergraduate program?

**Prof. Pearson:** We are not the only undergraduate program within the College of Medicine.

**Senator Rouillard:** What is the other one?

**Prof. Pearson:** Neuroscience is the other one. Neuroscience would've come through this committee within the last few years.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Neuroscience is combined with NSM. It's not by itself.

**Prof. Pearson:** That's true.

**Senator Wedding:** Are we going to table this then; is that what we've decided?

**President Insch:** Yes. We're actually going to vote on it right now. So the vote is to table this so the faculty that are opposing this, the department can speak with the Dean of NSM and with the Physics and any other interested parties. We have senators here who are aware of this, so if this touches on anything in your school then you can reach out, make sure you reach out to David, so we can make sure we can get this moving. So, that is the motion.

**Past-President Bigioni:** So moved.

**Senator McBride:** Second.

**President Insch:** So all in favor say, 'aye.' Put 'yes' in the Chat. All opposed say, 'nay.' I think that was five or six 'nays' here. It looks like more yesses than nays, though. All right, so we will table this until next time.

**Prof. Pearson:** Thanks.

**President Insch:** Thank you for being here. All right, Dr. Edgington, anything else from the Undergraduate?

**Senator Gilstrap:** We need to do the vote for the other stuff.

**President Insch:** We are tabling all.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Oh, we're tabling all.

**President Insch:** Anything else, Sir?

**Senator Edgington:** That was it. That's all I had, just those 18 courses. We will table everything and wait for a future date.

**President Insch:** I seem to have 'linear dyslexia' somehow. I can't read the agenda. I should've put Dr. Lawrence; Dr. Lawrence actually has a hard exit. Dr. Lawrence, you are up. Thank you, Sir.

**Senator Lawrence:** No problem. It's probably appropriate, in fact, the correct order is to have the Undergraduate Curriculum go for first. So, that's fine. I don't have a report from my committee. But I did want to sort of flag and just make note of something that maybe people are aware of. As we move forward in the program proposal process, there are changes coming up. This is in regards to pipeline programs. I'm not here today to talk at length about pipeline programs. That's something that can be discussed...share that information about opportunities. But I did want to make sure that this group communicated to their colleges and others who may be thinking of submitting a proposal for a pipeline and the Provost office is working on a streamline, waiting as those to go through CIM. But for this group

it is worth noting that these pipeline [programs] from an undergraduate or graduate degree will also require program modification to the corresponding undergraduate program to come through the program review process, as is norm. Because that will be required in order for the undergraduate students to be able to earn 9 credit hours if they join a pipeline program. Again, I'm not getting in the nuances of details, but just a heads up to folks. If you're part of a program that's talking about doing a 4+1 pipeline from your undergrad to a master's degree, keep in mind that not only will you be putting in modification for the graduate, [but] you also have to do one to modify your undergraduate program requirements. Thank you.

**President Insch:** Thank you, Lawrence. I appreciate that very much. We will now have some quick reports so we don't have to take too much time away from Matt.

**Senator Gilstrap:** You can send mine out.

**President Insch:** Senator Gilstrap is willing to just send and have you guys look at the PowerPoint and if you have any questions about that, you can talk with him. Now we'll move on then to the Retention Recruitment Committee with Senator Avidor-Reiss and Yakov Lapitsky.

**Prof. Lapitsky:** So I will get us started today. Good afternoon. Can everyone see the slides?

**President Insch:** Yes.

**Prof. Lapitsky:** Perfect. So thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today. For those of you who I haven't met yet, my name is Yakov Lapitsky. I am a Professor of Chemical Engineering, and I am serving as co-Chair of the Faculty Senate Recruitment and Retention Committee. What Tomer and I would like to do in this short presentation, is give you a brief initial report on what the committee has been up to over the first month or so of its existence.

So first off, why was this committee formed? In recent years we've heard a lot about various external factors related to demographics, pandemics hurting enrollment in our states and region's universities. But if we look at these full enrollment trends, which are normalized here to the fall 2015 numbers, several institutions in our states have been doing quite well in weathering the storm and have actually ended up in some cases increasing enrollment a little bit. Unfortunately, the University of Toledo was not one of the institutions, and if anything, our downward trajectory is becoming a more rapid. And if you look at the most recent numbers that come from our 2022 full census, our slope seems to be every bit of steep as the worst ones in the state. Despite the fact that nationwide the decline in undergraduate enrollment is actually being stemmed, this continued loss in enrollment is threatening every aspect of our university's mission. It's threatening the quality of our instruction. It's threatening our ability to maintain the critical mass of faculty and staff to have competitive research programs, and also as our faculty and staff numbers dwindle, it's threatening our ability to serve both our community and our profession. Given the urgency of this enrollment crisis, the purpose of this committee is to study the problem and to develop recommendations of how faculty and staff who are familiar with the challenges that are specific to their disciplines can work together in partnership with administration in order to try to reverse this traveling trend.

So what are the specific responsibilities of this Recruitment and Retention Committee? The committee aims to study various aspects of our past and present recruitment and retention practices and how these practices have correlated with success in these critical areas. It aims to also benchmark what we're doing in these areas to what other peer institutions do. Further, we will identify opportunities how to enhance quality, and, in some cases, perhaps the quantity of faculty and staff involvement in the student recruitment and retention. We'll define metrics for how faculty and staff involvement in these areas will be evaluated as well as how it's going to be recognized by the University as critical work. And finally, we aim to advise the administration on ways that they can strengthen their collaboration with faculty and staff in various academic units to improve their outcomes in these areas.

As far as where we are in this process, the committee received its charge on September 23<sup>rd</sup>, and had its kick-off meeting on September 30<sup>th</sup>, where subcommittees charged with starting various aspects of recruitment and retention were formed. These subcommittees started presenting their findings on October 14<sup>th</sup>.

And as far as what you can expect from the committee in this forum, today Tomer and I will be giving you just a brief initial report. At the end of the month, we will provide a preliminary report to the Senate followed by at the end of spring, and a final report with specific recommendations to the University's administration by spring's end.

So, with that, I will pass the floor to my colleague and Committee Chair Tomer Avidor-Reiss from Biological Sciences, who will tell you more about our committee's composition and early activities.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** The composition of the committee is really diverse. We have about 30 members right now from different colleges. You can see the list of representation from all the colleges that have active graduate and undergraduate program. Out of all this group of people, 26 are actually members of subcommittees that I'm going to discuss next.

Here are the seven subcommittees that we have. The first two subcommittees are focusing on recruitment. The first subcommittee focus specifically about different practices that are done in the University of Toledo. The second subcommittee is looking on recruitment, but looking for practices in other universities. Then the other two committees are about retention. Again, one focusing on retention inside of UT, what we do here, what we did in the past. The next subcommittee is looking at retention again, in other universities to see what we can learn from them. The fifth subcommittee is to align with our goals that Yakov just told you, is really looking on the different parameters to measure faculty enrollment. And the sixth committee is really a response to David Meredith's request. If you remember, he came to us about a month ago and he suggested some ideas about how faculty can help. One of the things that he asked us to do is, if the faculty from different units can start to define their valuable position, and this committee is charged with doing it university-wide, but also later, to break it down to different units, to have the faculty make those definition statements. Then the last day of subcommittee is really organized by mostly one person that organizes and collect formation. It's really focused on this recruitment debacle that we had about a month ago, that really, I would say, [it] kind of showed many of us how bad things can go. And if you look at the details, you will know that this was not a single event. There's actually a trend here. Many mistakes are repeating again and again, even though it appears to be

some improvement. So we are trying to make here a very quick [report] to provide as much information as we can to give some input on how to improve these recruitment days that are happening.

The next slide just shows you, it gives you a taste of one of our subcommittees. It gives you a taste on how to operate. They usually have about four to five members. Here is an example of the committee that deal with what David asked us to do. We have a chair and four members. They already came with some ideas. Again, everything that I'm going to show you today is the beginning of hypotheses and preliminary observation. They are suggesting that we focus on...providing a lot of benefit on the practical level partnership in place. But again, they are going to work on it around the course of the semester and next semester to give something that is really more specific to different program.

The next slide is really kind of the summary slide. It's basically saying, look, we are really in a big problem. We are in a crisis in my point of view and University of Toledo is really heading down dramatically. And I think it'd be a good discussion to maybe set up the issue, are we in a crisis or not, because it looks like we are in big trouble. The key thing is really what we are trying to do here as a committee. We are trying to change the care. And the key thing is we're trying to be constructive. We are trying to work together, faculty, staff and administration. [We need to] work in high priority and make the issue urgent to reverse this enrollment because this is really devastating to every aspect of the operation of the University of Toledo.

So, thank you, and I will be happy to answer any question that you have.

**President Insch:** Any questions for the committee?

**Senator Hefzy:** Could you please put the slide V. P. back up?

**Dr. Lapitsky:** Which slide, Dr. Hefzy?

**Senator Hefzy:** Next one.

**Dr. Lapitsky:** This one.

**Senator Hefzy:** Next one. It is 3. V. P.

**Dr. Lapitsky:** Oh, this one, okay.

**Senator Hefzy:** Yes, this one. Could you talk a little bit about this slide?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Yes, we can speak on it. Again, I want to be very careful. This is just a menu that the subcommittee are starting to work, and this is the idea, the initial idea. Again, this is very important to understand. We are just starting to discuss different ideas. So here is what was presented in the last meeting. They say that one of the things that characterize the University of Toledo is that we are [a] practical University. We emphasize the practical side of education. We have strong emphasis on hands-on learning, that's one characteristic. And the other thing that characterize the University of Toledo is

partnership. We believe education is a partnership between faculty and students. We've stopped mentorship and high expectation. And then the last point is place. We are part of the fabric of Toledo and Northwest Ohio, but also open to the rest of the country in the world. And again, I want to emphasize, this is an initial starting point of discussion.

**Senator Hefzy:** This is very excellent ideas. My next question, are these 3.V.P going to be used by the recruiters? We have central recruiters, I believe. Am I correct? We have central recruiters?

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Yes. The idea is to communicate this information to the Office of Recruitment and to the recruiter once we have all those things in place.

**Senator Hefzy:** The time is running out. This is the time where recruiters go to recruit students for the next fall, and the fall after. So, in my mind, time is an essence.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Yes, we agree with you. We do have different, you know, in our committee people that want to move things more quickly and people that are a little more questionable and want to have more discussion. But we are going to inform you guys here at Senate about what we are finding and we are also communicating with the Office of Recruitment with Dave Meredith. So, I think once the subcommittee involved that feels comfortable with the finding and the ROC Committee as a whole feel good about that, I think we can move forward and provide it. I agree with you; we need to move forward quickly. But I think that's a balance act how to do that.

**Senator Hefzy:** Thank you very much.

**President Insch:** Well, thank you very much, gentlemen. Obviously, you can see that that committee is doing an awful lot of work; a lot of people involved. If you are still interested in joining, they would be more than happy to have others join in the crusade. Please feel free to reach out to the co-Chairs and I'm sure they'd be more than happy to put you on a committee.

So, now we're going to move on to the last piece of business for today. Matt is here with us and he was going to present some information about the budget, where we are currently and then answer any questions that you might have.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** All right, can everybody hear me in the room? Good afternoon. I'm Matt Schroeder from the Finance Department. It's good to be back to the Health Science Campus, and good to be back physically in front of everybody, and I say, hello to everybody participating via the Webex. I thought it is probably best that I show up in person vs. doing it online. Gary was kind enough to invite me in to give an update as it relates to fall of 2022 performance, along with where we are financially speaking through the first quarter. So, with that being said, maybe we'll level-set. I do want to recognize the work that Faculty Senate just heard about or the preliminary work that Faculty Senate just heard about from the Recruitment and Retention Committee. I think that those efforts are going to be critically important. And, you know, at first blush in terms of what I just heard a few minutes ago, I could not agree more. We are in the middle of an enrollment crisis and everyone, faculty, staff are really going

to need to rally if we're going to fix this anytime soon. And I'll go a little bit deeper on that topic here in a minute.

So, to begin with as it relates to fall performance, this is just a really level-set where we are currently and this is looking at previous fiscal years just to, again give you a sense of where we are within the state of Ohio and our public peers. So this is based on full-time equivalent students. We call them student FTEs. A student FTE is 30 credit hours an academic year. We often talk about 15 to finish and so, 30 is obviously 15 a semester. Historically speaking, this is ODHE data. It's readily available on the ODHE website. It hasn't been manipulated, but you can see our performance going back 11 years from percentage change, and then the overall 'kegger.' And what I tried to do is, is just sort of highlight those Ohio peers that we align with in terms of overall performance or closely aligned with.

Ohio U, I think many of us have read the headlines this fall. Ohio U has seemed to figured it out as it relates to their inbound undergraduate class. Wright State, Akron continue to struggle. I will point out, though, and this will be a theme later in the presentation, even though Akron and Wright State continue to struggle, they have made some really good progress behind the scenes as it relates to their operating margins---

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Excuse me. We do not see the slides.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** All right, we have Collin on the job. Just one second. Can you guys see that, that are participating via the Web?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Yes.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** Yes. Thank you.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So, what I was focusing on is the red box. Again, based on student FTE performance using Ohio Department of Higher Ed. data, going back the last 11 years. Our compounded annual growth rate, you see on the right hand column. And then for each of the snapshots in time, whether it was year 11, 7, 5, 3 or 1, you see the percentage change. As I was saying, we were clustered, you know, similar performance as it relates to Wright State, Akron, OU. Where we differentiate from these schools? Again, I'll reference this in a little bit more detail here in a few minutes. Our margins are not as, I'll say, robust as the schools that we we're clustered with. So a little bit of a teaser as it relates to more to come. This ties directly back into what the Recruitment and Retention Committee was talking about. I think the Recruitment and Retention Committee was using 15th day census numbers from Institutional Research. These are numbers that we pull directly from Banner. There's maybe a little bit of timing issues, but you get the sense of what has been going on since fall of 2011. We have lost right around 35% of our student FTEs in that time; that is the orange line, to where we land, just under 13,000 student FTEs this fall. And then the green bars are the tuition and fee revenue that has come in, in those years. I will tell you, this is not adjusted for inflation, but if you look at 2011, and you put that into real dollars or adjusted for inflation, in today's dollars, that would be right around \$305.6M. So, quick math: About \$111M related to that 35% reduction in student FTEs has come out of

our coffers, or come out of our revenue streams on an annual basis. That is obviously material both from a student FTE standpoint and then also from an operating budget standpoint.

These are a couple dashboards. And Don, I apologize because I know you've seen a lot of this already as part of the AAUP negotiations. But, you know, a snap shot in time beginning this fall, just under 13,000 student FTEs. Year-over-year change down, just over 8%. And then over the 12 years, we've seen a compounded annual growth rate or reduction of just under 3.5%. Then, when we go over here, as it relates to tuition and out of state surcharge, this is annualized. So, our budget this year is just under \$195K, in tuition and fee revenue. [The] prior year, we came in at \$205M and some change. I'm sorry, \$194M, not thousand. And feel free to interrupt me, those in the room or those online; because I cannot see your questions, feel free to interrupt me at any point in time. And I think Collin, you've got the slide deck so we can post that to MyUToledo as well if that makes it easier for everyone. All right, so when we look at the new domestic undergrad students that enrolled this fall, it says just under 2,000 new domestic undergraduate students that entered the University of Toledo – 95% of those students are from within 200 miles of the University of Toledo. So a couple two, two-and-a-half-hour drive, maybe three depending on how fast you drive or slow. But then when we look at the net tuition and out of state surcharge that our new domestic undergraduate students are generating, just under 94% of that is from within that 200-mile radius. I think this is some very, very powerful data when you look at it through the lens of the continental United States and then you zoom in to the Tri-state area. I think this really tells us a lot and without going into too much detail for this group, we have been working with Academic Affairs on it. I think at a high level this tells you a lot about obviously where our students are coming from. But we have gone even further behind the scenes to really identify what is the composite, or what does an undergraduate University of Toledo student look like. Question?

**Senator Johnson:** Has Dave Meredith seen these number? He's trying to set up stuff in Charlotte and Florida. I think when he...we asked him nicely, why are we doing this? Do you have a sense for why don't we recruit in Chicago instead of Cleveland, I guess is my question?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So that is a question for Dave Meredith, but I will answer it this way. The University of Toledo has to diversify where our students come from. As it relates to those regions, investment in those regions will take time. Right? You think about, you know, within the Tri-state area there's really, really strong brand recognition for the University of Toledo. It's going to take time to develop that brand recognition in Dallas, Fort Worth. I don't think anyone has said to Dave, 'Dave, you know, these regions in the Southeast and Southwest are a bad play. I think everybody just needs to understand it's going to take time to really grow that base. And again, Dallas, Fort Worth as an example, Atlanta, Carolinas. Then once you do grow that base, the amount of applications that you're going to need in order to yield 'X' number of students is going to be significant because in those regions in general, your yield percentage is going to be much lower than what it'll be historically coming out of the Tri-state area. I think what Dave has been doing in terms of a long range play and strategy in trying to diversify outside of the Midwest - and also he's looking at things internationally- I don't think that's wrong, but going back to the Recruitment and Retention Committee, I think someone said in that update, a sense of urgency. We have to focus not only on the near term, but the long term. Right now from just a pure finance perspective and frankly, selfishly speaking, I care most about the near term. And I also care most about what the next five years looks like. And the reason for that is, the Board of Trustees has asked

the President along with Central Finance, and Academic Affairs, and a number of other areas, which I have slides on here, to put together a five-year forecast by the end of December. We'll talk about all the various components of that five-year forecast. But when we have enrollment nose diving, we have tuition and fees nose diving and we are successful in terms of maintaining 75% retention. Hopefully that continues to creep up by a few percentage points. But then also the headwinds, and these are good headwinds of graduation and graduating out more students. As I've talked with Faculty Senate before, the whole that a Dave Meredith, or even the College of Graduate Studies has to fill is getting bigger, bigger, and bigger. So, diversification is good. But in the near term, in addition to diversification, we need to take advantage of some of the opportunities within our backyard, but then most importantly, concurrently to taking advantage of those opportunities where we have brand recognition, we have to do more to retain the students that we enroll. I think all of us understand. And I know, again, maybe a couple of years ago at Faculty Senate, nobody is saying that our students should, you know, have a call pass as they matriculate through. But, there is an obligation by the University of Toledo that if we're going to enroll 96% of the students who apply, it's very, very important that the support services are in place so that those students can be successful.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Excuse me. There are a number of questions in the Chat from Mohamed El-Zawhary. Do you want to quarter-back this, Collin?

**Senator Gilstrap:** Sure. So this is about enrollment. "Is the drop of student enrollment seen nationwide?" I'll go quickly.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So that's a Dave Meredith question. I cannot speak to the national trends. I can just speak to the opening slide, what we've seen in Ohio.

**Senator Gilstrap:** "Do we market UT nationally and internationally?"

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Dave Meredith question, I apologize.

**Senator Gilstrap:** "What are extra are extra-curricular activities does UT have that can attract students?" I think these are sort of outside---

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, these are outside of that---

**Senator Gilstrap:** How is UT tuition compared to the nation?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** I will answer that question. Tuition at the University of Toledo - I want to tease it, but then we do have a slide in the deck - tuition at the University of Toledo, when we compare to our Ohio peers, [it] is the second from the bottom. That's not a good thing, right? We are very, very affordable. So other than Shawnee State; so, Shawnee States is at the bottom and then the University of Toledo. And this is looking at a combination of sources, but primarily driven by IPED's Data. So, it's just not the University making it up; we're pulling it from my IPED's. We're second from the bottom. Think about the University of Toledo and the portfolio of programs that we offer, both at the undergrad and grad. And then pause, and think about what is offered at Shawnee State. Apples to oranges

comparison; way more heavier on the STEM side as we all know STEM costs more than some of our other programs that we offer, humanities etc. And then when you look at not only the tuition, you look at again utilizing IPED's Data. Where do we stack up amongst our Ohio peers as it relates to discounting? We're second from the top. So you are second from the bottom in terms of your tuition or your retail price, and then you are discounting at a rate. That gets back to my margin that I opened up with, is that we're clustered with Wright and Akron. Wright and Akron, despite a lot of the negative headlines that they have garnered, they have started to adjust and grow their margins behind the scenes. That's where, from a peer finance standpoint, I really see the opportunity for the University in the next one to five years, is that, as enrollment continues to contract, which it will, I don't think there's any secret about that, given the hole that I talk about with graduation retention rates, and then also we drill down and look at the students that are matriculating through the amount of credit hours that they have matriculated through the amount of credit hours that they've accumulated and how those students that are generating credit hours are starting to age out, enrollment will continue to go down. And in doing so, one of the only levers we have left because we will not grow our way out it in the interim, is we have to look at our discounting. We have to look at our net tuition revenue. And we have to be very, very thoughtful in growing those margins or that net tuition revenue; do it in a way, though, to where it is not going to negatively impact enrollment. But, if it truly comes down to price for the student and the student begins to shop, these I guess 'changes' or adjustments that we would make on a peer pricing standpoint, it wouldn't be enough to, I guess, force a student to leave. It's really understanding where we stack up to our peers, and I'll give you an example. For example, let's say the spread between the University of Toledo and one of our Ohio peers is \$2K. In my mind, you have \$2K to play with, because if that peer is truly a competitor that our potential students are either transferring out to or applying to [the] University, but enrolling in peer 'x' and they are \$2K more, then I have a little bit of cushion to work with, to preserve enrollment, but grow tuition revenue. I'm sorry, that's probably way too much finance speak and I don't mean to get that far into the work, into the weeds. But again, just in a declining enrollment environment, net tuition revenue frankly, right now is the only lever that we have.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Thank you. There are a lot of questions in the Chat about sort of enrollment and tuition. There's one other question here from Mohamed Hefzy that just says, "Is there a threshold for financial exigency, and is there a threshold of the number of students that will create a fiscal exigency situation?"

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So I have in the packet our income statement through Q-1, a combined basis. I have our balance sheet through Q-1 in the packet as well. We'll touch on those. You know, a couple comments about financial exigency, which I appreciate the question. There are a couple of drivers that are in place. All of us in the state of Ohio annually have to report our Senate Bill 6 scores. We report them out quarterly, but it's really the annual Senate Bill 6 score that matters. When your Senate Bill 6 score kicks to 1.75, and it's based on four different ratios, which I don't remember off the top of my head, but when it kicks to 1.75, that will trigger financial exigency - the state of Ohio will come in. For a number of years, we've been right at 3. We bumped up in fiscal 21, because of the stimulus money that flowed in, we bumped north of the 4. Everybody around the state bump north in terms of where they were at that moment in time, due to the amount of stimulus that they had received from the federal government.

**Senator Hefzy:** Currently we are a 4?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, we are just north of 4. That was based on the previous fiscal year. We just closed out of fiscal 22, [and] so we will update our Senate Bill 6 score this month and we will present it to the Board on December 7.

**Senator Gilstrap:** “Do we know where other institutions are as well?”

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So, it is a 5-point scale. But I do want to put an asterisk on the 4. So, historically, meaning in the last few years, maybe last five or six years, we’ve been right around 3 -- 1.75 is bad, per Senate Bill 6. We bumped to just north of 4. Everybody in the state bumped up because of the amount of stimulus that flowed in, and the stimulus impacting the ratios that the state looked at, that was for fiscal 21. Fiscal 22, which we've just closed, we submitted everything to the auditor state in October. We will update our fiscal 22 Senate Bill 6 score this month and we will present it to the Board on December 6. Did I answer your question?

**Senator Green:** I’m just wondering like, is there a point where we should be a little nervous... start packing our bags?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Let me, can we table that question because you're probably asking the wrong person? I'm always nervous. Our office is always nervous. Our office is nervous because again, it gets back to the committee update prior to me presenting. The sense of urgency right now is just so critically important around here. Central Finance, on its own is not going to solve the problem. Academic Affairs is not going to solve the problem. The President's Office is not going to solve the problem. I mean, it's similar to what we talked about in the sort of opening dialogue with AAUP, I think that was last month beginning of October. It is going to take all of us to solve this problem. It is also very realistic in my humble opinion to assume what the University of Toledo looks like today, is not what it's going to look like in the future. What does it look like in the future? I have no idea. But, what I do know today, is that we are still built physically, and from a staffing standpoint, I'm going to use staffing generically compensation line in the income statement, we are overbuilt when we look at it. When we look at certain metrics as it relates to (and I'll equate this to Faculty Senate) an instructional standpoint, (and this is just the pure dollars that we spend on instruction) that spend is a spend that would equal roughly 18,300 student FTEs. When we look at how the University has evolved over the last few years, we have tried to divest of physical assets. We continue to make that a priority. So, for example, the Scott Park Campus is currently out to auction. We're working with Department of Administrative Services, the Glendale Medical building across from the Health Science Campus is currently out to auction. Northwest Tech is currently out to auction. So we are going through all of our non-core assets right now along with the number of financial opportunities outside of the academic side of the house to really tighten the belt and to begin the process of restructuring and reprioritizing what is important from a university operations standpoint. I'm not going to talk about what Risa had teased maybe an hour ago about program prioritization and courses, and things like that. That is a provost conversation. That's not a finance conversation. But right now we are looking long and hard at everything to try and shift, I guess the trajectory that we're currently on.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Go to the next slide?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, if you could Sir. We'll make sure you guys get this deck so that Faculty Senate, or we could just post it to MyUToledo, like we did a lot of the budget materials.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time on these. These are just snapshots of various dashboards that we look at. The key takeaways, applications - and I'm sure you've heard this from Enrollment - up almost 32% for fall 2022. But, unfortunately, something went on at the yield side of the house where yield, and this is the third box on the top row to the right, yield came in just over 16%. Not too long ago, if you see sort of that...Mendoza line, we were yielding 30%. I know this is something that Dave and his team are looking long and hard at. And then, you know, going to the bottom right hand corner of the margin before instructional costs and overhead. This is for new first-time undergraduate students. Their margins are at 54%. We'd like to see that margin closer to 70%. It is starting to creep up in a favorable direction, but it's still a way off. Collin, if you want to go to the next slide.

Then looking at fall 2022, student FTE metrics. Again, you see top right hand corner, just under 13,000 student FTEs, both undergrad and grad for the fall. You creep over, student FTE undergrad is down 9.2%, but over the last 12 years or since fall of 2011, just down over 36%. Then we've also looked at the bottom left hand corner. Grad has also seen an almost 34% decline since fall of 2011.

I'm going to jump to the next one. So, real quick on tuition metrics from a peer finance standpoint. Top right hand corner we talk gross, tuition, and fees. We have budgeted \$194M this year. That's down almost 6% compared to last year as it relates to comparing budget to actuals. Gross tuition and out of state surcharge per FTE, you know, has started to creep up a little bit. Unfortunately, at the undergraduate side, not only are we second from the bottom in our tuition, but we're also constrained by the state of Ohio as it relates to what we can do. So a number of years ago, they forced all the four-year publishing [State of Ohio] into the tuition guarantee program. And so, with the tuition guarantee program we can only increase by three-year rolling average of CPI. Don't ask me what category of CPI, I can't remember. Then if in the Ohio biennium operating budget, if they give us any tuition flexibility -- so last year and this year. This is the last year at the current biennium operating budget. We bumped up around 4.6%. Still didn't get us out of the 'cellar,' though from an undergraduate standpoint. Then, when we look at the overall margin - the new undergraduate students margin of 54% - when we look at everything fully loaded, still underperforming. What we'd like to see is 70% or more. That 70% comes from looking at IPED's data and where everyone else is. So we still have quite a bit of work to do.

And then finally, I know previously we've talked SSI, SSI not only being a zero sum gain. So those of you that are new, the state of Ohio and their state support of instruction is just north of \$1.5B. The way that it works, it's based on performance within the model completion graduation rates. There's some set aside for grad. There's some set aside for medicine. Then there's also a set aside for at risk. At the end of the day, the way that it works is that each and every university has to perform in the model. So, if our SSI would to go up, that means a couple of things: Either the state of Ohio put more money into the SSI pool. Or, we've taken market share from someone else. Or, there potentially could be a third component where the state has tweaked the model, which they have a tendency to do every couple of years. The last tweak that

they made to the model was based on putting some criteria in place based on data from Job and Family Services at the state level as it relates to producing in demand degrees. Unfortunately, the University of Toledo and NEOMED produced the most in demand degrees currently out of all of the four years in the state of Ohio. So the way the model is structured, we're only going to go down. As more schools produce in demand degrees it's going to erode our market share. Now, you'll see when we get to our financials, SSI has gone up a little bit year-over-year, and that's because the pie has increased. They also made an adjustment going from a three-year average to actuals as it relates to enrollment or completion numbers. So that advantaged us this current fiscal year, but we'll continue to lose market share. Looking at this, if we were to have hit the Mendoza line, which that 7.6% is called out in the strategic plan that just sunsetted. If we were to maintain that market share of 7.6%, that is just north of \$10M. So you think about that -- I opened up with \$111M, I'm pulling out \$10M right here. It's just been one thing after another where from a revenue standpoint, we've just had a major erosion going on over the last 10 to 12 years. Do you want to go to the next slide, Sir?

I'm going to dive in now to Q1 financials. So, a couple, I guess, foreshadowing points on financials. Number one, and I said this to the AAUP at the beginning of the month. The Board of Trustees has asked us to change up our format this year. And so those of you that listen in to the Board meetings, going back to April of this year, you started to see the introduction of an actual income statement and balance sheet on a full gap basis. That was a request from the Board. There are no shenanigans. There's nothing going on behind the scenes. The Board wanted to start to see a traditional income statement and balance sheet. So, for the April Board meeting, the June Board meeting, in the Board package you would've had your traditional income statement balance sheet, and, what I think many in this room have been accustomed to over the last few years, I think maybe going back to 2017sh under Dr. Gaber and Larry Kelly at the time, was more of a sources than uses cash basis. The reason why the Board wanted to transition to an income statement and balance sheet, as they understand, for the University of Toledo to be successful that we talk about diversifying enrollment. But, we haven't talked about from a diversification standpoint, which is also the online component and what does that look like going forward, which again, outside of my lane. But, you know, maybe a topic for a future Faculty Senate meeting. The Board realizes, even though we have to expand within the online space, we are still very much a bricks and mortar institution. Unfortunately, what we have done as an institution, you know, going back 12 years. We have made a conscientious effort to forgo investing in our facilities, whether it's classrooms, labs, common areas, dormitories, etc. And the reason The University of Toledo made those decisions back then, and is still the case right now, is to avoid budget cuts. So, instead of dedicating base budget of, I'm just making it up, '\$20M' to address deferred maintenance; over time, they gradually -- meaning, previous administrations would just take that out and frankly reduce it almost to zero. So when you look at our budget that was approved by the Board in June, I think you'll see capital around \$3.5M-\$4M bucks, which for an institution of this size within an operating budget including the clinical side of north of \$1B dollars and you've got within the academic side of the University, which is obviously north of \$200, I think, \$40M operating budget. That is not enough to handle deferred maintenance and that is barely enough to address, as I would describe them as, those 'oh, shoot' moments: a waterline broke, a rooftop went down etc. And so, with going forward with a traditional income statement, it keeps the deferred maintenance top of mind for the Board, to the point, that as we look at our five-year financial forecast, investing in those research labs, investing in the classrooms is becoming more and more of a priority for the Board. It really shifts us away from just, you know, trying to 'duct tape' everything together to get by. But, to understand that if

the University of Toledo is going to rebound from this, we cannot allow all of the things that I mentioned to continue to deteriorate. And, I think all of you as faculty members, either on this campus, the Main Campus or research, you see the deferred maintenance on a daily basis. You get the emails, like, last week, something happened in Gillham Hall. It was literally a clog in the water line that popped. And then you had multiple classrooms flood out. You know, all of that adds up. All right. So, tied to Q1 financials. Gary, how am I doing on time, sir?

**President Insch:** You got about that and half-hour.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So, Q1 financials. Before we get into Q1, I'm just going to call out some trends that we've seen over the last 10 years or so. So, on the top right hand corner, and when I reference net position, that's really looking at the University of Toledo's balance sheets and looking at assets and liabilities. And, at the end of the day, what is the overall strength of the University's balance sheet? The balance sheet is a snapshot in time. It's obviously not an operating budget. So what we've tried to demonstrate here is the erosion of the balance sheet. Why is the balance sheet important? Is because when we go out and as we start to make our classrooms, or labs, our clinical, when we start to reinvest we have to go to the capital market to get that. So they're going to look at our ability to repay that debt. So here you see the erosion of the net position on the balance sheet. But then you do see an increase from fiscal 20 up to 21, and that is stimulus. You know, 'no bones' about it. The University of Toledo, both academic, clinically and our students benefitted from COVID, in terms of the stimulus dollars. Unlike many institutions, we really, really try hard to be thoughtful with those dollars as it relates to, and this sort of give me cold chills talking about PPP and other things back in the day. But we were able to preserve some of that to allow us what I would say is, it is a fighting chance, or some breathing room as it relates to restructuring and right sizing. So you had the peak or the bump up type of stimulus and now we're back to erosion on the balance sheet.

You then over on the right hand side, you see cash and investments and you see an increase as it relates to cash investments, you know, just over 5%. Cash and investments for us would be what we have as it relates to Board designated reserves at the Foundation, which I believe through Q1 was right around \$200M. Then you have what we have in working capital, which is handled by our Treasurer.

**Senator Wedding:** Is that a total number for both the Foundation and here?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Cash and investments, yes. That is--so we got a couple 100 here a couple 100 over at the Foundation.

**Senator Wedding:** So we're sitting on about \$457 assets, liquid assets?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Liquid is loosely defined. It depends on it where it is, but yes, absolutely. So this was at the end of fiscal 22 looking at our balance sheet. Obviously if you look at our balance sheet through Q1, it'll be a different number. But that was at the end of the fiscal year.

So, I'm going to try and equate this to us as individual consumers or just individual households. When we look at our working capital, that is essentially our checking account, and when we have a couple \$100M

in working capital, it may sound like a lot of money. But then when you take that and you boil it down, as it relates to days cash on hand from a working capital standpoint, at the end of September, we were at 101 days cash on hand from a working capital standpoint. The goal is 90. That will be, and I say this without hesitation and with confidence, that will be our high watermark for the foreseeable future. We know by the end of the fiscal year that, that will burn down and we'll continue to burn down rapidly. There are a couple things in play. And I'm not saying this to incite panic. It's just a reality. But with our working capital, you have the cash that flows in from the clinical side of the University, which is pretty predictable. You know, roughly \$8-\$8.5M a week. Then on the academic side, you really have two big infusions of capital. One in August. One in January. And then you get a little bit that comes in in May as relates to summer. As with any of our households, you want to try and operate as much as possible within your checking or savings accounts. So that's our working capital. All of us, whether we're in STRS, OPERS, the alternative retirement plan, you have then your retirement assets. So that, in my opinion, the best way to describe that would be our Board designated reserves that are at the Foundation. The University of Toledo made that decision back in 2011 to move their Board designated reserves over to the Foundation. The reason being at the time, you know, nothing nefarious was, the Foundation has a joint investment committee, all of which are made up of professionals from the investment space. The return that we've realized on that portfolio over the last 10 years, has just been north of 6%. And so, from a business decision standpoint, it was a really, really good move. With the Board designated reserves, or our personal investment accounts for retirement accounts. That is the last bucket of money that you want to tap. So once you tap that, and once you use it, it is gone. And so as we talk about restructuring, right sizing, and reorganizing and reprioritizing the University, whatever word you want to use. We are really, really trying hard to do that within our working capital and within the time period that we have with our working capital. Because from an institutional perspective, similar to all of our endowed funds, we have to manage this place into perpetuity, right? We can't just simply say, 'I'm only going to be here five years, so let's just burn it down. It's somebody else's problem.' So, from a central finance academic fair standpoint, we are really thinking into perpetuity to bring sizable change forward. I'm going to pause for any questions right there.

**Senator Wedding:** How much stimulus did we get? I think they got \$29M [and] one year they got \$9M, and it went over to the hospital, UTMC. I saw that. But I didn't see the academic side get that much. I thought we got about \$14M in June of 2020. When you say, stimulus, you mean the COVID money?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, sir. And I know Sabrina is looking it up.

**Sabrina Taylor:** In total academic of enterprise is \$86.9M. Now, keep in mind, a pretty much share of that was designated for student aid.

**Senator Wedding:** Twenty-nine million I know went to UTMC, that one year. How much of it went to the other?

**Sabrina Taylor:** I don't have that the hospital's stimulus in front of me.

**Senator McBride:** I do have a question.

**President Insch:** Okay, Senator McBride, go ahead.

**Senator McBride:** Basically, I have heard from at least one program that they went from all face-to-face to online and have subsequently lost at least 50% of their enrollment. I'm just curious about what UT's perspective is on letting programs decide or have flexibility about what modality is going to be best for them and most successful?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** That's probably not a finance question. I guess from a finance standpoint, one of the key tenants of incentive based budgeting is to really empower the colleges to figure out, you know, where are the growth opportunities and to manage both the revenues that land with the college now and their expenses appropriately, in terms of what goes, what doesn't go forward. That's really a department chair, dean, provost conversation. Not a finance question. I'm sorry.

**Senator Gilstrap:** We have a question here from Tim Brakel. "Please clarify SSI as awarded for summer classes."

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Tim, SSI does not differentiate between summer, fall or spring. SSI focuses on completions. It would not differentiate if we have a J term as well.

**Unknown Speaker:** Can I ask a similar question?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, sir.

**Unknown Speaker:** Do two-year degrees count for that?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, absolutely.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Did you guys hear that online?

**President Insch:** Go ahead and repeat it.

**Senator Gilstrap:** The question was, does the two-year degree count towards SSI? The answer is yes.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Don, I'm looking for the stimulus number, and I know I got it in here. I'll follow-up after---

**Senator Wedding:** The \$86.9M is both for the academic and the UTMC?

**Sabrina Taylor:** No. That is academic only.

**Senator Wedding:** Academic got \$86.9M over three years?

**Sabrina Taylor:** Over three years.

**Senator Wedding:** Okay. So that would be fiscal 20, 21, and 22?

**Sabrina Taylor:** Yes. Just a tiny amount came in in 2022.

**Senator Wedding:** That's right.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Does that answer your question, sir? There's a hand up, Collin.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Senator Steven, you have a question?

**Senator Steven:** Yes. I just was looking for clarification. You mentioned that we're spending too much on instruction at the level of salaries. Was that referring to faculty? Or faculty, and staff, and administration?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So that was not inferring to any one category or individual. That was just simply referencing within the academic budget to spend on instruction. Generically defined suggest, again comparing to peer data that where we would be based on that current spend, would be similar to an institution that was instructing just over 18,200 student FTSs.

**Senator Steven:** So, does that include everybody?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** That would include, and Collin, we've got a slide here. Let me pull up a slide here real quick. So this is looking at our instructional expense. So, instructional would not include professional staff. This looks at our instructional expense. So this is a dashboard that we have in central finance. So, in the bottom right, a portion of the screen, you'll see our instructional expense compared to our Ohio peers. You know, just right around 8,000 dollars per student FTE. And then what I have circled is based on that instructional spend that one could assume that we are built to instruct. Again, just under 18,300 student FTE. There is no other judgment or assumptions around this dashboard other than the instructional spend based on the number of student FTEs within our Ohio peers -- is how. How do we get there? That's not a finance question. That's an academic affairs question and dean question. I can also say, and this will even be more controversial and I don't mean to. But when we go back and we look at, you know, the last 12 years, and if you look at follow, I think it was 10-11 and 12, or 11-12 and 13, and you look at the loss of student FTEs. Again, right around 35%. But if you go and you look at your faculty to student ratio in that three-year average, you get 11,12,13 or 10,11, 12, whatever three years it was. We are right now, probably 300 faculty too heavy. I'm not casting any judgment. I don't know where that is or what it looks like. I'm just purely looking at faculty to student ratios. And when you lose 35% of your student FTEs and your faculty, again generically defined are relatively stable, those ratios are going to change.

**Senator Rouillard:** Matt.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes?

**Senator Rouillard:** You say, 300 faculty too heavy. Are you talking about only tenure track and lecturers or are you including tenure track, lecturers and part-time?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yeah, so I'm just looking purely, or I shouldn't say 'I.' When we look at it, we're just purely looking at faculty generic. So, we are all in, right? So it could be visiting. It could be part-time. It could be lecturers. It could be tenure track. The other caveat, again I said it and I'll say it again. I don't know where those faculty are. I don't know what it looks like. But again, just looking at the ratio, there's something potentially there that as we look to adjust for, you know, at the end of year five – is it 13,000 student FTE? Is it 11,000 student FTEs? Everything should be looked at and I will throw professional staff in there as well. And again, I throw our infrastructure in there as well.

**Senator Rouillard:** We would also have to look at student services over that time. Student services are probably going to be even more important for these students coming back after COVID.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes. I would say, everything should be fair game. Everything at this point.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** I hear you say, we are 300 faculty heavy. My question is, what about administration? What is the ratio of administration? How heavy are we on the administration side?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So when we look at administration, and that's obviously an easy come back, which is expected. You know, let's define administration beyond just what I would call 'senior leadership.' So when I think of administration, it's not only around the senior leadership table. What I would describe would be our top 50 leaders, which would include deans, it would also, you know, going beyond the top 50 leaders, [include] department chairs, associate deans, etc. I have heard the provost say that she, and I'm not going to quantify for this group because again, not my lane. But I have heard the provost say that she has already observed some opportunities on the administration side. Right before that question, you know, I said softly to Linda, right now we all need to be vulnerable. Whether that's administration, whether that is Faculty Senate, Grad Council. If we are going to fix this, we have to be willing to have some difficult conversations. And I know as we sit and we talk with the number of stakeholder groups, you know, there appears to be maybe more willingness than I have seen in my time at the University of Toledo, which is fantastic. At the end of the day, though, again, going back to the committee that presented the update prior to me, a sense of urgency right now is so important. And with that sense of urgency, making some decisions together to start affecting some change. Because as we all know, a lot of the low hanging fruit is gone around here and some of these changes will take time. But we cannot continue to 'kick the can' on making decisions.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** I would like a more complete answer to my question. You said 300 faculty too heavy. That's good. I appreciate your honesty and giving us the numbers. What about the administration? How heavy we are there? What is the percent of reduction we need to see?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So, I will follow-up with an answer on that one. I am going to reference though right now, because this is what I remember off the top of my mind. A few years ago ODHE came out with an administrative headcount ratio. That was out on the ODHE site. I don't

know if it is still there, but it was a few years ago. And with that administrative headcount ratio – go figure, the University of Toledo was at the bottom. And so we were not at the mid-point. We were not, you know, the last one in line. We were somewhere between the midpoint and the bottom as it relates to being leaner from an administrative headcount than most in the state of Ohio. That was a few years ago. I am also remembering right now, which we can dust this off, NSM within the last 12-18 months asked for some data on this, and I know we have the data. So, Collin and Gary, I can follow-up with you on that one.

**Senator Avidor-Reiss:** *[Indecipherable]* ...comparing total to total...comparing dollars. That would be very useful information.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes. It is a fair question. I know it is a question that comes up, and so forgive me, I don't remember it. But I know we've given that answers to the deans and so we'll just dust that off for you. Don?

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Ahmed El-Zawahry has also another question, and it concerns the number of faculty we're speaking of. He asks, does this include clinical faculty?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** We will be looking at all faculty.

**Senator Coulter-Harris:** Okay.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** We are not slicing and dicing. Again, our definition of faculty, as I answered Linda, you know, it's all in visiting, lecturers, tenure, tenure track, and so---

**Dr. El-Zawahry:** Can I just chime in here?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** And then I'm going to ask Don Wedding his question. Yes, go ahead.

**Dr. El-Zawahry:** So clinical faculty is different situation, because clinical faculty is working in the clinics; mainly, this is a job. So, if you are adding them into the whole faculty, it is not going to be fair for the whole faculty calculation. Because a lot of the clinical faculty will be mainly doing clinical work with the patient. This is just for a FYI.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, understood. Don, you have a question?

**Senator Wedding:** Yes. Right now based on the AAUP numbers, we have about 600 faculty. That is lecturer, tenure, and tenure-track. I'm confused. If you cut that by 300, of course you will be down to---

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yeah.

**Senator Wedding:** I'm not hanging you with that.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** I know.

**Senator Wedding:** I hear you. The other thing is, the total amount of payroll for the AAUP faculty is somewhere around \$65-70M.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** And so, that represents the academic budget. That is a general fund of about 15-16%.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** So you're looking at faculty, which represent not a very large percentage of the cost. They are a percentage. The other thing is that ratios. I have been working with ratios of students per full time faculty. I can't get my hands around how many part-time or visitors we have and all that. But just looking at full-time faculty, the ratio on this campus, not the Medical Campus, are running 20:1. I'm sure you've heard that number. I haven't seen that data generated. Maybe very well forget it with deciding who is part-time and all the others. But, on a full-time basis, just taking the overall number of students and FTEs, it's about the same for both FTEs and headcount. It's not that much different. But it's about 20.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes. And obviously we've talked. You know the AAUP numbers better than anybody in this room or online. When we're looking at faculty again, you know, all in, our number, and I'm thinking of the spreadsheet in my mind, it is right around 1000. So it'd be the AAUP, plus everything else.

**Senator Wedding:** I'm giving you all the AAUP---

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Absolutely.

**Senator Wedding:** So your number include part-time?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** So part-time and the Medical School and so forth?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** Yes, it's 1,000.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes. And maybe let me pull the question back. I'm going to also summarize an action item. So, the action item from this part of the presentation that I've heard. How am I doing on time?

**President Insch:** A few minutes.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** We are going to dust off some of the data we've provided the deans within the last 12 months or so, and Gary, we will follow-up with you on that one. Number two, as it relates to the faculty and my comment based on losing 35% of our student FTEs, and how that faculty, student ratio has changed. Maybe going back to the 30,000-foot level. I think that we all could agree, and this is not a trick question, but we all can agree with losing 35% of our student FTEs. Again, all of our spend really needs to be looked at very thoughtfully and carefully. But not to the point of analysis paralysis, but to start informing some decisions. And so, Collin, let's get back. Gary, I know I've got two minutes. What do you want me to do, sir?

**President Insch:** If you're okay, if you want to, how much time do you want to do? Fifteen minutes or half hour?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Maybe we'll try and get through some of the financial comments. Collin?

**Senator Gilstrap:** Question from the Chat. It's talking about, "No one should think their job is safe." So another way of asking this question is, "Is the senior leadership actually willing to consider their jobs, their salaries, and their bonuses in time to address what sounds like we all agree to be a crisis?" That's from Ammon Allred.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So, let's maybe start in terms of answering that question, let's go back to spring of 2020. You know, COVID hits. The governor declared a state of emergency on, I think, on March 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup>. It was right around that point in time. Not only did senior leadership, but a number of our professional staff based on their earnings took pay reductions. Senior leadership at the time, along with the deans took a 20% pay reduction. Professional staff, depending on what they made, took a percentage or were furloughed. Then we did layoffs and other things with CWA, ACME per contracts. Right now, and I'm just giving you an example. I'm not at all suggesting that. But I'm giving you an example that senior leadership and the professional staff have demonstrated a willingness to have skin in the game, period. You know, based on the events of COVID. That being said, jumping forward now to fiscal 23, looking at fiscal 24, which will be the first year of the five-year financial plan. We know right now based on our early forecasting and looking at some of the preliminary plans that have come in, revenues are not keep pace with expenses, number one. Number two, we know looking at our annual operating budget, you know, 75-80% of our spend is on talent. Right? We are a very heavy people organization. A lot of what is delivered in the classrooms and in the labs is intellectual property. Right? And we - and pardon, I guess, the analogy here. We are selling to our students a degree that in many cases does not have a tangible value on day one when they walk across the stage. But the potential to have a tangible value in terms of the talking points of earning another \$1M in lifetime earnings, etc. will come in time. And so I think we have a couple things we're facing. Number one, the proposition to whether it's direct from high school, transfers, adult, military, online etc., we really have to begin to demonstrate the value proposition, and then ultimately, the value of a University of degree. Which I am a recipient of, and I know some of you in this room are recipients of University of Toledo degrees. So many of our alumni use those degrees to launch. And I think that we have missed telling that story in recent years. So, that that's point number one. Point number two, as it relates to the five-year financial plan and what that looks like. Again, at the end of the day, the University of Toledo is

going to look very, very different. But how do we get there being as efficient as possible, working within the six collective bargaining agreements that we have, working with our professional staff, working with both the clinical non clinical side of the house? That is the heavy lift over the next five years. And until we have that five-year financial plan in place, which is just a few months away, 60 days away, it's very tough at this point in time to even speculate what are those different levers look like. I mean, we were talking about different levers. At the end of the day, though, as I said, a lot of this is going to take time; we just have to start quantifying what the levers look like and the consequences of various decisions. Again, I'm not here to preach doomsday or anything like that. It's just the reality of where we are with enrollment. And really, at the end of the day, the lack of diversity and our revenue streams. Don?

**Unknown Speaker:** Is he going to follow-up, because I want to ask a question regarding the number of faculty? You are saying it is just in the numbers, and that is fine. But, numbers [*Gabled*] ...are not neutral things. The numbers that you guys have is constructed in various ways. And yet after [*Gabled*] ...this very reduction [*Gabled*], but all of your raises and your bonuses have gone up. So you're asking us to kind of get an increasingly top heavy load. And I'm not hearing anything about the sacrifices you folks are willing to make when you're asking us to lift more and more. So where in the five-year plan is that? And that is the last question I have.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So number one, I'm not asking you to do anything today, first and foremost, right? Number two, last time I looked there is a Collective Bargaining Agreement in place. I think Don and I know better, and Collin as well than anybody having sat around the table over the last 30 days, that it is going to take a lot of conversation, a lot of collaboration, and a lot of, you know, very thoughtful, not only dialogue, but action with the AAUP. Management cannot do anything unilaterally. We have a Collective Bargaining Agreement and we need to honor it. What I am doing today is simply foreshadowing the realities that we have as it relates to our fiscal health and trying to dispel any myths or rumors that are out there. That everything is just 'A-okay' at the University of Toledo' and just go ahead and ignore that 35% reduction in student FTE. I'm trying to interject a little bit of a dose of reality as it relates to things. Again, in partnership with our faculty, or staff, and all of our bargaining units, things have to change at the University of Toledo. We have to turn this ship around and we cannot do it either solely on the shoulders of administration, nor solely on the shoulders of faculty. I mean, this is, in my opinion, the first step in what hopefully will be a rallying cry to again, introduce the sense of urgency and to underscore that all of us are going be asked to do more. Some of us may not want to do more. And that will be an inflection point for some of us. And others may want to step up and do more. At this point in time, I don't know what the future looks like. But what I am foreshadowing to Faculty Senate and anyone that will listen to me. We are under a directive from the Board to really put together a five-year financial forecast. And as I sit here today, as the Enrollment and the Retention Committee mentioned, we have a challenge on the enrollment front and it's a challenge that can no longer be ignored. Don?

**Senator Wedding:** There's been a lot of cost cutting on campus supposedly by going after the part-time faculty. The part-time faculty budget is only about \$5M. Am I wrong about that?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** I don't know what it is.

**Senator Wedding:** Well, I seen the number. It is about \$5M. Terry Romanoff and I were discussing it, and he agrees with me. He looked it up. Our share of the budget is about, using an AP budget, is only about \$65M-70M. So, you are talking about small amounts of money for faculty. At least, that faculty. I understand the total is \$1,000. But, I think Dr. Tomer's position is right on target. There are other costs that are driving this this matter that have to be looked at. Right? And that includes the administration. Now, the idea that the administration took 'big cuts' in 2020, I have those numbers, and the total amount of money that was cut by the senior leadership was only a few \$100,000 dollars. The people that really took the cut were the CWA, which got hacked for almost \$2M. I got those numbers. That was back there. So, it was the little people that took to hit. And we, the AAUP, we wrote the contract. We don't know yet. I think the whole thing was a bit overplay. The people in between, the deans and that bunch, the middle management took a cut somewhere around \$400,000. Those are numbers. I've got those down and started to put it in a newsletter. Maybe I should. But anyway, I think that Dr. Tomer is on target, that it is other costs that is driving this. And it is senior leadership. If you took senior leadership, all of their salaries... *[Indecipherable]* ...a little.

**Senator Gilstrap:** Don, that's a good point. It kind of a segue into something I was going to present today and succeeded my time for. But I sort of want to understand, in the IBB model, how are the academic support units kept efficient? Like, in the colleges, on our level we've been sort of losing colleagues and things like this. And so, what is the mechanism by which academic support units are kept efficient?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** So I'll start and Sabrina chime in. Within IBB there's two different governance processes that are built within the model. So, on the academic side of the house, there's an academic governance process that plays out, and that's tied to the revenue producing colleges. And that plays out within academic affairs on these support units. So that would be like, the Presidents' office, Central Finance, Student Affairs, Facilities, et cetera. They, as well have a governance process. And so those individuals that lead up those units would put together their annual operating budget. And similar to what we used to do back in the day when revenues were outpacing expenses, there would be a budget hearing or a budget committee meeting. With those support units they would roll up to this committee, and I believe we have a couple deans on that committee and I forget who else, but those support units would then have to justify, do they need an increase? Do they stay flat? Is there a reduction? And then that review committee then funnels a recommendation up to myself and the provost. Is that how it works out? What I miss? But, in terms of the review of this support units. It's not the support units policing themselves. It's diversity of backgrounds and opinions on that review committee, starting with a couple of deans and then going beyond that.

**Senator Green:** So no one can opt out of using one of those services? So a college can't say, I'm not using this? You're still forcing, they still have to pay for it?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Right. So we will use HR for an example. It is probably a terrible example, so Don, you are not allowed to comment on HR. But we will use HR for an example. Central HR service, HR would be a support unit. It would be part of that overhead. And the College of Business is an example. You can't say, I really don't like HR. I'm not going to use them. Right? Now, under IBB, though, if I'm a college and I'm paying for HR or I'm paying for some other things like

Facilities, and we've seen this at other schools. The bar and the expectations now are elevated because they are paying for those support units. So, one of the first shoes that has dropped is Jason Toth's area. So Jason and his team do remarkable things based on a limited budget. But now the deans are seeing that directly or the revenue producing colleges are seeing that directly in their IBB, which is online. They can go out there and they can see it real time. It's available on our report's website at the University. And so when they are seeing their occupancy costs, they're seeing what facilities is charging them --and then they go ahead and see a dirty classroom or a dirty office, it is triggering conversation and accountability. Does that answer your question?

**Senator Green:** Yes, and like, for cost drivers to allocate. Do those get reevaluated? And if so, how?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Do you want to take that one?

**Sabrina Green:** Sure. They would continually be evaluated. We are still kind of ramping up in the model. This is the first year. *[Indecipherable]*...

**Senator Green:** So it would be like, faculty...we should change the cost models for certain service to allocate each college?

**Sabrina Taylor:** What I can tell you, is that when we developed a model with that committee, the one thing everybody kept asking is, what does that driver look like? So, we tried to build that separate so that way...*[Indecipherable]*...without trying to manipulate the model. I can tell you, when we...down and looked at different scenarios...*[Indecipherable]*...

**Senator Green:** Things like that, are you going to go back and say, well, maybe we should change a driver and how to allocate this over?

**Sabrina Taylor:** We absolutely can.

**Senator Green:** Can we...for feedback?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** I think the big takeaway, and then Linda, we'll go to you. We don't expect the model to remain static. One of the things, and I remember JD Smith, I think over a year ago, presented an update to Faculty Senate because he was involved in helping to determine the model, I think along with an individual out of Engineering - I'm drawing a blank on his name, but it was clever process. We have said all along the model will continue to evolve. I've taken a position recently with the deans. The model is not going to evolve in year one. It's probably not going to evolve in year two. But year three is a natural inflection point to really look at the model and make necessary tweaks or changes to it. Linda?

**Senator Rouillard:** Can we go back to the HR example? Is the support cost of that kind of a support is going to be differentiated by usage in any way? So, with Facilities, it's a little bit easier to create a percentage that this unit should pay vs. that unit should pay for support and do it by square footage. But, with HR, how can you determine what each unit should pay for support in that? Now, the hospital, for

instance, is probably going to use HR a heck of a lot more than any other unit on campus. Are you going to just straight across the board divide the cost so HR or are you going to differentiate it according to usage?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yeah. So I'm going to start and then Sabrina chime in on the HR example. So, I will start with the clinical side of the house. You're absolutely correct. Clinical from an HR standpoint is very demanding. In fact, in the last couple of years, we've increased the contribution that the clinical side of the house makes to HR, and I think it bumped up 1.4, or 1.5sh in the last couple of years. And, in fact, HR and a number of other services, I think this is part of the financial opportunity. I do have a slide in there tied to financial opportunities. I don't know if we'll get to it today. But in the next 30-days or so, we're going to go back and we're going to refresh what we call from a central finance standpoint, the cross charge. So, making sure that services, like human resources, facilities, etc., everyone is paying, contributing their fair share. When I say everyone, really focusing on the clinical side of the house. Because there are a number of centralized services that live and breathe on the Main Campus that support the clinical operations. In addition, one of the other assumptions that we are building in, because another slide I have, which I'm not going to go there yet because it will open up Pandora's box, but we know there's going to be a structural deficit for next year. And we know we're going to have to bridge that structural deficit. So in this year's operating budget that the Board approved, there's a line item called Mission Support and it's \$2.5M that transfer from the clinical side back to central university. We're looking to increase that to \$5M this year, and then looking at not only 24, but going forward on what that mission support would potentially look like. Because we're in a very interesting point in our history to where the hospital through the efforts of Rick Swain and his team have begun to stabilize. Are they in the home stretch? Absolutely not. But they have been able to stabilize the supplemental payment that we announced back in the winter - tied to our payer mix is a positive, but going forward as we look to stabilize the overall University. Then I want to go back to a comment that Don made.

Without a doubt, some of the comments that I've made today are intentionally meant to be provocative to start having the conversation. Like, I knew when I said 300 faculty, I don't know where they are. I knew that was going to get a reaction, right? But, I'm not going to show up and not say that just because again, we all have to be vulnerable and start having these conversations. But Don is absolutely correct. We're not going to solve this just with looking at faculty, or just the academic side of the house, or just SLT and the operation side of the house. It's everything. And so, with the clinical side, I think what you'll see in this five-year financial forecasting is as clinical stabilizes— and knock on wood – and they continue to stabilize, you are going to see, in the near term, more support coming from the clinical to help the non-clinical side. Which is going against what I would say the norm was, maybe back in 2015-2016ish, where if everyone remembers some of the financial reports at that time before I was in this role, the academic side was supporting the clinical side. So I think roles are starting to change here on a temporary basis going forward.

All right. Gary, I'm going to try and pick up my cadence. I know you sort of leaning back and holding on. So, up in front of you is our income statement through the first quarter. This is combined or consolidated as we call it. This looks at the academic side of the house, the auxiliary side of the house, the clinical side of the house, and then also rolled up in there, and this is a category that we haven't talked about in the last,

I don't know, six, seven, eight years, research awards. Calzonetti always reports out on the research awards. But when those awards come in, they come in through restricted accounts. When you look at this in the Board packet, you'll see: consolidated, general fund, auxiliaries, clinical, UTMC, and now you see an 'other' tab. That other tab is really giving everybody a line of sight as it relates to some of the restricted accounts that are out there that are truly pass throughs, but they do show up on our income statement. Depending on how they flow in, and the snapshot and time on the balance sheet, they would appear on the balance sheet as well.

So just a few highlights as it relates to our performance through Q1. I'm just going to focus on for today's conversation the second column from the left. I just want to call out a few things. So when we're comparing actuals to budgets. Couple of points. Number one, this is our quote unquote queerly budget. A few footnotes on quarterly budget. The academic side, as I think all know, the academic side does not budget on a quarterly basis. Does not budget on a monthly basis. We budget on an annual basis for the academic side of the house. However, the Board wants to understand, how are we performing to budget? And so what we did here is we've made some reasonable assumptions based on historical timing. So we have a good sense of when, you know, obviously tuition and fees are easy with the three infusions of cash. And then we have a good understanding of capital, whether it's our nine-month faculty, 12-month faculty or professional staff. So, some of this could play out based on timing. But again, we've tried to do a really, really nice job comparing actuals to budget.

So, a few highlights. The first row at the top: hospital, patient service, and revenue. Slightly unfavorable to budget, but what I do want to call out on hospital, patient service and revenue. If you go all the way over to the right hand side, second column from the right. The year over year variance, which is favorable by \$8.5M. It is that year over year variance that has really helped... the clinical side of the house forward. A good driver of that variance, again is the supplemental payment that was introduced over fiscal 22. Student tuition and fees. Slightly favorable to budget by just under \$1M. With tuition and fees, [they] fall even in the declining enrollment environment when you compare fall to spring and spring to summer. We always receive more tuition and fee revenue in the fall than we do any other semester. Important point as it relates to tuition and fees and this touches a little to the balance sheet, which I am not spend time on today just given where we are with time. Important point as it relates to tuition and fees. This touches a little bit to the balance sheet, which I'm not going to spend time on today, just given where we are in the evening. This fall, we made changes to the student payment process, which I know has been talked about at Faculty Senate over the last few years. And what we did with the changes to the student payment process, we moved up the payment due date to earlier in August and built in an amount of time, I think it was two or three weeks before students moved in to really flush out 'ghost' students, and also to flush out students that just were not ready financially to make the commitment to the University of Toledo for the fall semester. How is that different than previous years? In previous years we wouldn't identify 'ghost' students until probably halfway through the semester. And then students that were not prepared to honor their financial obligation to the University of Toledo, we really didn't address until the end of the semester, thus putting them into financial jail with either our collections team or the AG's office in worst case scenario. So, we addressed all of that on the front end. I'll tell you from a student AR standpoint, as we sit here, as of yesterday, we have about 5% of our students' stimulus money. Okay, 5%, what does that mean? Same time last year it was 15%. So those changes which align with best practices, I know a

few years ago were controversial, but really helped us and more importantly, helped the students to get them out of collections and get them out of a place financially that they may not have been prepared for.

**Senator Hefzy:** Matt, I have a very simple question. *[Indecipherable]*...

**Senator Gilstrap:** He said, do we have a deficit for \$13.29M?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** That is a year over year variance. So, that is looking again at a snapshot of time at the end of the first quarter compared to where we were last year at the same period. So, Mohamed, that is comparing fiscal 23 actual column to fiscal 22 actual, and the year over year variance. We are down from a net position standpoint of \$13.3M over same time, which would be 3Q1 through last year.

**Senator Hefzy:** That include everything, including expenses?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Yes, that looks at everything sir. So again, this is our income statement it is looking at. This is consolidated. It is looking at everything else: academic, auxiliary, clinical. It's all bundled into one.

**Senator Hefzy:** So this means, again, I'm trying to paraphrase. Does this mean that...*[Garbled]*

**Senator Gilstrap:** Dr. Hefzy asks, "Was \$13.3M worst off than last year?"

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Actuals to actuals, yes. Actual to budget, no. Mohamed, that's a really good question because we tend to get caught up comparing actuals to budget. But the year-over-year erosion, due to declining the enrollment and other factors. And again, we talked about 35% student FTEs. We talk about the \$111M. Actuals to actuals, year-over-year is, in my opinion, from a finance standpoint, more important, in terms of trying to quantify the materiality in terms of change vs. budget. You know, budget is great, but I care about the actual performance at the end of the day.

**Senator Hefzy:** And, we hope one day the number will become positive.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Not hope. But one day we will plan for an implement that that budget, that initial step would be to plateau so that it would be flat year over year, but then have a growth plan in place to where, yes, that year over year variance. And Q1, this is the other point. Just to be probably too casual with this group. I really don't care about Q1. It's very difficult from a central finance standpoint to see any type of trends coming out of Q1. It's not until after the first of the calendar year where we really start to see trends emerge. So, Q1 is great. Great to say, oh, look at the margin. But we know the margin will continue to erode. We know that when we built this budget, we assumed just over a 3% margin. You know, what is the 3% margin mean? It's essentially break even. From a margin standpoint, and this would be as relates to operating revenues and expenses to items that we can control. So think of a hurdle rate, or a benchmark in the eyes of the rating agencies. They want to see a margin of 8% or higher. And so 3% margin from a budget, because we have to have a balanced budget. It's

essentially breakeven, but where we need to go, again it's focusing on discipline around growing our margins. The other point I want to make and Don, I'm thinking more about your statement. I really don't want this group to walk out of here thinking the only solution is to cut, cut, cut, cut. We've cut for 12 years, right? Yes, there are some things that we can still do to be more efficient as a university. I think we could all agree to that. You know, what does that look like? Again, to be determined? More important than cutting, and we're getting ready to send out a template to all of the deans, but we really need to understand from a forecasting standpoint are where are the areas of growth? Where are the programs within the B school? Within NSM? Within Arts and Letters? We either already have a commanding market share or presence, but because we've tried to be everything to everyone, we've just, you know, maybe spread the peanut butter too thin, or we haven't dedicated or prioritize the appropriate resources. That's where selfishly from my perspective, I really want to see where the opportunities lie. Is [it] within those colleges and within those programs? Because I have to believe not only are there programs that are either still in the development stages, or even maybe in a faculty member's mind. But also given the depth and breadth of our current offerings, we know there are programs out there that have a commanding market share or have a market that's saying we want more of these degrees. I think the deans and the department chairs have probably been under resourced over the years, and so how do we move resources around to give those programs the opportunities to expand and grow? I think that is right now more important than anything, because we will not cut our way to success. We're not going to grow our way out of it overnight. But what can we start investing in? I think is probably the most important question that we need to ask all ourselves.

All right, so, Gary, I'm going to pick up the cadence here. Oh, it's 630. I'm really going to pick up the cadence. All right, so the takeaway on the income statement is and again, we'll get this deck to you. Actually, we will just put it out on MyUToledo as I said. The takeaway: Q1 financial performance. You really can't take a lot from Q1. The good thing is though, right now student tuition and fees are slightly better than budget. Student aid is down, or is favorable to budget. The only reason student is down, is because enrollment is down. We do need to have more sophistication around our age strategies. I'm optimistic given some of the preliminary conversations I've had with enrollment management and academic affairs, I think there are possibilities there. I know the President has talked about that with the Board as well. State Share of Instruction as I alluded to, is slightly better than budget. And that's just based on some increases in the pool, but also some tweaks to the model.

Jumping down on the expense side. Again, this is looking at everything. Compensation is in line with budget currently. And total operating expenses are outperforming budget currently. Timing issues throughout the expense side along with the revenue side. So, you know, as we sit here with Q1, we're doing okay. Have me back in January, at the end of January, and we can talk performance through Q2. I think that'll give us a better snapshot of where we are. Do you want to click through a couple?

Let's just go right here, balance sheets. So, our net position from a balance sheet standpoint. We look at it without the pension obligation, and other post-employment benefits. That's Gatsby. 68/75. And so when you look at the net position prior to our pension obligation and post-employment benefits, again, we have continued erosion going on the balance sheet.

If you want to go to the next slide? So real quick. From a headwind standpoint, here is what we know as we sit here today. This is a slide that we shared with SLT, the deans, and the Board. These are some of the headwinds that we know are upon us for a fiscal 24 budget development. The good thing with IBB, is that you're always in budget development mode, whether you're dean, or central finance, or the provost. You're always thinking about the next year's budget. And now, for us thinking about fiscal 24 being the first year of the five-year financial plan, things like the structural deficit. What we mean by that was building this current year's budget, we had an 18 point \$2M structural deficit. That flex a little bit higher. You know, Don, you've been trying to call out the last minute changes for the central finance standpoint, as it relates to the enrollment assumption, and pushing that the week before the Board meeting in terms of the decrease. But there's still about \$4.3M out there within the colleges that are funded with one-time money. So those colleges need to address that. There are also some legacy one-time commitment requirements. This goes back to, I think it was 2020ish and Provost Bjorkman at the time had the strategic reinvestment pool, and some of those dollars are still hanging out there. In scenarios that really require permanent funding, Academic Affairs has a line of sight on that. It is difficult for Central Finance to quantify, so there's just sort of a plug of axe there.

I'm not going to step in athletics with you, because I don't have a lot of time today. But I'm going to say, auxiliaries need to stand on their own. Asterisks, I'm not talking about athletics, but I'm talking about dining, housing, et cetera. And so auxiliary supporting the general fund that should really stop. Salary recapture. This has been a thing going back to like, the Frank Horton days. However, back in the Frank Horton days, or what I should say, a salary recapture. Essentially, if I were to leave the University of Toledo, my line and the savings from me, not being here 'X' number of pays lands centrally. We use the salary recapture as a contra to help offset our compensation spend. Typically, in a healthy environment, the salary recapture would be used for strategic priorities with the provost, strategic priorities with the president. Not to offset or trying to drive down the compensation spend. When we look at those three items, and I'm not at all suggesting this today, or in the future, but you really have a variance of \$42.5M. I know the President, you know, throw out numbers of '\$50M,' especially as we talk about potential reallocation. But again, these are decisions that the University has made that in a healthy environment we'll need to address over time. Collin, do you want to go to the next slide?

**Senator Hefzy:** I have a question regarding a slide, can you please go back? Thank you for your time. From this slide, can I make...*[Indecipherable]*...?

**Senator Gilsrap:** Mohamed, we can't understand you. Go ahead, Mohamed. Mohamed, can you repeat yourself, I think we fixed it on my end?

**Senator Hefzy:** Can we conclude from the previous slide, there's a percentage related to enrollment to the total shortfall, is it about 80%, \$8M over \$42.5M that is a contribution of enrollment? Is that the correct conclusion?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Mohamed, I would look at the \$8M as, you know, what percentage of that is it of the \$22.5M. The \$42M from my perspective, these are items that we're going to have to phase in over time. The immediate need or pressing issue is really the items that aggregate up to the \$22.5M. So, I would divide the \$8M by the \$22.5M to get the percentage.

**Senator Hefzy:** Thank you.

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Gary, am I okay?

**President Insch:** Can you do five minutes?

**Matt Schroeder, VP of Finance Administration:** Rapid fire. This gets back to one of my earlier talking points about the University of Toledo. If we look at the average tuition column to the left of the little red box, this is the data that I referenced with Toledo being down at the bottom, or in the cellar with Shawnee State. Then also the discount rate over to the right of us, having the second highest discount rate as it relates to IPED's data. This is not the University of Toledo just making up numbers. This is being driven by IPEDs. Collin, do you want to go to the next slide? Next slide. Next slide. So, general comments real quick of what I alluded to. When we look at how we're evaluated, and again, this is pure finance, I don't really think many, maybe within the B-school, but outside the B-school really care about the rating agencies. But when the rating agencies look at the University of Toledo, and they evaluate performance. They're going concerns for us are our margins, are variable enrollment and the fact we are in two sectors that if you are Moody's and S&P, those are the two rating agencies that evaluate us. They are not really excited about higher ed. right now, nor are they really excited about clinical, given the beat down clinical experienced tied to COVID, and the suspension of elected procedures. So we are in two sectors that from a rating agency standpoint, or either on a negative outlook, or they just in general don't have a lot of good things to say about us. So, for us moving forward, we are going to have to, as I say in the first bullet point, has sustained operating performance. This is where the five-year financial forecast is going to be so important. We're not going to get there in year one. We're probably not going to get there by year-five. But hopefully, by year-five we're well on our way to start making some sizeable change. Collin, do you want to go to the next slide?

All right. So real quick, five-year financial forecast and then we are done, sir. So, as we develop this five-year financial forecast, which will be shared with the Board at the end of December, these are all of the various components or supplemental pieces that are very important for me and my team along with the President in order to have, really, a comprehensive five-year financial forecast. And, you know, we've talked about a few of these today, but, you know, the plan to resolve the structural deficit, that's the \$22.5M that we're currently seeing or forecasting. We know that there's been a lot of effort work on the strategic plan. The strategic enrollment plan, I would prioritize as one of the major or most significant documents that we need. And whether it's their forecasting and or growth plan, both of those will be major influences in our modeling. The margins are the net tuition revenue. I know the provost is identifying the fact that retention is one of the most critical factors here that's within our control. She's created, or is in the process of creating some student's success initiatives. Making sure that we do better than retaining 75%. My commentary, if this is a family business and we had 'x' number of customers that we were doing business with in the fall, and then a year from now, we lose 25% of that customer base. I mean, think about that. I mean, that is that is so difficult to rebuild. So, in many cases, it's much more financially beneficial and overall efficient in general to be able to retain those students that are already here vs. going out and having to spend even more money on recruiting new.

Program prioritization, [It's] outside of my lane. It's a provost conversation. But in addition to program prioritization and the overall academic portfolio assessment, the financial opportunity plans, which I think there is a slide after this one, the athletics plan. But financial opportunities, we'll go ahead and go to this Collin.

So, we are in this together. These are sort of our top 10 opportunities that we've identified. There was a working group about a year ago that we put together as it relates to revenue or savings opportunities outside of, you know, just focusing on program prioritization. So I referenced the health system recovery that's 1,2,3,4 line items down. There's some things we can be doing on procurement, information technology, the research side of the house. But really, the number one priority for the University has been and needs to continue to be, is the overall enrollment plan and the overall enrollment strategy.

So the rest is pretty straightforward. Let's jump two slides, and then Gary, I'm almost done. And so with the five-year financial plan, these are the milestones that I have talked about. Let's go ahead and go to the next one. I'm done.

Gary, thank you. Thank you, Faculty Senate it so, so much. Obviously the vast majority of you participated online. I really, really appreciate all the feedback. Again, many of my comments today were intended to be intentionally provocative just to start having the conversation. I do want to stress, though. There are no predetermined outcomes at this point in time. It is going to take all of us to solve this problem. But before we can solve the problem, we have to start having the conversation. So I appreciate you and Faculty Senate having me today. So thank you.

[Applause]

Thank you very much, Matt. We appreciate all of you that hung out with us. We'll probably invite Matt back in February or so after he's done with the December Board meeting, all of that, so you can give us an update. I'm sure you're be willing to do that and rest by then, hopefully. Are there any other issues or concerns that come before the body of this particular moment?

**Senator Wedding:** I move that we adjourn?

**Senator Rouillard:** Second.

**President Insch:** I think we all are going to vote yes. Meeting adjourned.

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Deborah Coulter-Harris

Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard

Faculty Senate Executive Secretary











