

**UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO**  
**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 07, 2026**  
**FACULTY SENATE**

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

Approved @ FS on 05/21/2026

---

---

**Summary of Discussion**

---

---

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

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Hello, everybody. Good afternoon. We are going to start with roll call. Raghav is going to do the roll call.

**Senator Khanna:** Good afternoon, everybody. I'll take roll now.

**Roll Call 2025-2026**

**Present:** Allred, Andreanna (proxy for T. Bigioni), Avidor-Reiss, Balthus, Barnes, Bellizzi, Benton, Bornak, Cheng, Cochrane, Compora (proxy or T. Brakel), Duggan, Dwyer, Eichner, Ekwenwa, Elgafy, Fresenko, Giovannucci, Glassman, Haller, Hamer, Harmych (proxy for. B. Bamber), Heberle, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Khanna, Kistner, Krantz, Kumar, Lapitsky, Lawrence, Lee-Smith, Maktabi, Malathy...Martin, McLoughlin, Miner, Mungo, Osman, Padilla, Pryor, Reinert, Sahloff, Semaan, Sheng, S. Smith, T. Smith, Steven, Stoltz, W. Taylor, Van Hoy, Wedding, Yonker

**Excused Absence:** Gibbon, Green, Machalow, Willey

**Unexcused Absence:** Assaly, Cooper, Gilstrap, Hamouda, Moussa, Nazzal

**Senator Khanna:** We have a quorum.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** I am going to go to the next item, which is adopting the agenda. Are there any motions to change the agenda? Online? Anything online, Quinetta?

**Quinetta Hubbard, Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary:** No.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** That stands approved. *Adoption of Agenda Passed.* The next item are the Minutes. Again, we are voting by general consent. Are there any corrections to the Minutes? Online? If there are no corrections, then the Minutes stand approved. *Motion Passed.*

The next item is the Executive Committee report: On March 27, members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee held a biweekly executive meeting, and on April 3, Renne and I met with the UToledo president.

**1. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee discussed the following:**

- a. We met with Margaret Hoogland, chair of the FS budget committee, to clarify the committee's mission, including the budgets for both academic and non-academic areas, as they influence each other and cannot be discussed separately.
- b. We discussed reforming the FS meeting minutes and asked the FS office to send relevant material to all faculty.

- c. We discussed the need to add a creative and innovation (CRE) FS ad hoc committee next year and asked the current CREE desegregation ad Hoc committee to make recommendations on the subject.
- d. We reviewed the next FS meeting agenda and moved the enrollment VP meeting to April 21
- e. **Renee and I met with the UToledo president:**
- f. The president informs us about leadership searches and interim coverage. Interim appointments are planned for the Athletic Director (AD) and Vice President for Marketing and Communications (MarCom) until the new hires are in place.
- g. We talked about the faculty hiring plan and long-term enrollment targets. Provost Mitchell is focusing on both replacing key staff and making strategic new hires; he's working with Vice President for Research Grace Bohenic on the Rocket Research Acceleration Program to ensure strategic faculty hires support research growth.
- h. We discussed Parking operations, customer service, and governance. Matt Schroeder, Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration and Chief Financial Officer, is considering the following operational changes: allow residential-permit students to park near Engineering; adjust striping and the allocation of “yellow” and “white” spaces to improve convenience; and create a fund enabling departments to pay for event parking.
- i. Regarding Summer teaching, Renne cited unclear summer budgeting, early cancellations, and high caps that impede offering needed courses. The president acknowledged the importance of summer for recruitment and timely graduation and highlighted the need for better communication. He updated us that 102 days from the summer census, summer enrollment is up overall.

**President Avior-Reiss cont'd:** Any additional statements from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee? Any other comments from members of the Faculty Senate?

**President-Elect Heberle:** We did also discuss that in the contract about the parking conceptions that there is a university parking advisory committee that is just on the contract, so we also address that with the president.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes, I forgot to mention that there is supposedly an advisory committee acting.

**President-Elect Heberle:** But it is still not active?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** It is still not active. Hopefully it will be one day. So next, I'm going to take this opportunity to invite Nate Boley. He is going to say a few things. He is our student Board of Trustees representative.

**Nate Boley, The Board of Trustees Student Representative:** My name is Nate Boley. I'm one of the two student Trustees at the University of Toledo on the Board. I graduate in less than a month, May 2nd. I wanted to come to a Faculty Senate meeting, and I wanted to come last year, but as Dr. Van Hoy know,

we were going on a president's search, so that took a lot of our time. So, I just wanted to stop by before I graduated and say, thank you to the faculty as a whole and the Faculty Senate for all you guys do for the students and for the whole university. So, thank you guys. Thank you.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** So, we are having a busy agenda today, so we're going to start with the provost's report and then I don't see Matt here, maybe he's going to join. Oh, he's here, great. And then after that we are going to move to discussion.

**Provost McKinney:** Thank you, Tomer. Thank you, thank you. So, congratulations Nate. Yes, it is hard to believe we've got two weeks of the semester, one week of finals and then commencement. Wow. Counting down the days.

I've got a few announcements to share with you to encourage. I know this is the time of the semester when the pace quickens and there is so much going on, but there are things that I would encourage you to take note of and participate in. First, is to encourage your graduating undergraduates, seniors, to participate in the first destination survey. Now, I know multiple emails have gone out and graduating students have been alerted. Those of you department chairs, those of you faculty that perhaps... courses of where you're interacting with graduating seniors, remind them and encourage them to complete this very short survey. We're going to put a link in the Chat. This is where we gather the employment data, the graduate school admission data for our graduating seniors off to careers, to jobs, or to graduate school. It helps us to complete the information that we submit in terms of national rankings, in terms of our accreditation and certification. I've got the number somewhere. I'll fudge it here. But our completion of the first destination survey, I believe, as I recall, is around the 60 % level and we would like to get it to the 80-90 % level so we know where our outstanding graduates are going in terms of employment and graduate school. So, that's the first reminder. Again, as I said, a number of things that are happening. As the pace quickens, this is the time when we start to see a number of lectures, and events, and activities happening on the campus.

Yesterday we had the kickoff of the 'what were you wearing installation?' This is sponsored by our Title IV Office. I understand that this is now returning again this year after nine, tell, eleven years. This exhibit that is happening on campus is to really confront and challenge the myths surrounding sexual assault. April is Sexual Assault Awareness Month. The installation will be in Carlson Library through the rest of this week, actually until Thursday, each day from 10-4 pm, and then it comes to the Health Sciences Campus next week, Monday through Thursday in the Mulford Library. Again, I would encourage you to stop by to see this installation. The clothing, the outfits and the narratives of those survivors of sexual assault, it it's quite powerful. I had a chance to go over, and so I would encourage you to do that. Now, Thursday evening on my calendar, I would encourage you to perhaps if you can put it on yours, this year's dormant lecture NSM. It is sponsoring Dr. Logan S. McCarty, Associate Dean of Science for Undergraduate Education at Harvard University. What students should learn in the age of AI? What students should learn in the age of AI, Thursday evening, 6pM. So that's occurring Thursday evening. What else?

Well, before you become inundated with students' papers and grading, this is Rocket Fest week. And so have some fun with our students. Tomorrow is Student's Appreciation Day, Centennial Mall from 11 to 2

pm. Let's hope it warms up a bit. It is going to be free food, food trucks, t shirts. You really want to have fun with our students on Thursday evening from 7 to 10, Bands at the Bond Fire and the Flatlands. And then Friday Earthfest, Centennial Mall from 11 to 2 pm., where there's a number of booths about local environmental related organizations and initiatives. That will be followed by Holi, ancient Hindu Festival of Color at Centennial Mall, 3 to 7 pm. So, that's a time to perhaps relax a bit with our students before we really get into the stacks of papers, and grading and everything is to come.

Now, the last part of our announcements and I asked, I think I seen Alana getting up. No? We'll say a few words about the Simple Syllabus. And Jean, I was among the 165 or so folks. I was so impressed earlier this afternoon. And also, as I sat there thinking about I got to post my syllabus for my fellow class, quite honestly, I came away thinking I can do this. I can do this. So, you'll [Jeanne] give us reminders on what's going to happen for the rest of the month so all of our faculty can be trained and informed on what needs to happen with Simple Syllabus.

**Dr. Jeanne Kusina:** Okay, thank you and thank you to everybody that was able to make today. If you were not able to make it today, we will be sending out that recording to everyone who's a registered instructor. And if you're not a registered instructor at the moment and you still need a copy, feel free to reach out to the Center for Excellence of Teaching and Learning, we'll be happy to send that to you. We're looking at scheduling additional trainings and maybe some drop-in hours for these kinds of things. But if you do have any questions, again, you're welcome to reach out to the Teaching Center. Keep in mind that Simple Syllabus also comes with its own sort of handy-andy toll-free number that they call. They have a six-to-10-minute response time or something like that will handle a lot of smaller calls, those kinds of things.

I want to give a big shout-out for it getting launched and for those of you who might not know, it is now up live and operational. So, if you go to your Blackboard shells for fall, they will be there. They're not going to run for summer, but they're going to be there for undergraduate courses for fall. We're going to start working them and rolling out graduate courses later, but the undergraduate ones are the ones that have to be completed by day one of fall semester. So, we need a hundred percent compliance on that. That's by law. That's not by suggestion. So, we're really working on that.

I will say that we have to give some big, big thank you to people because this was not a project that we thought was going to be able to complete with the vendor before the end of this semester, but thanks to Tomer and Faculty Senate who said we really want to get this up and running before faculty leave for the summer... And so, that would not have happened with us not for things like our IT Department, UT Online, Registrar's Office, people with the Provost Office, working, you know, Blackboard. You have folks really, really, really pulling together, working late at night sometimes on their days off, those kinds of things. Thank you to everybody who worked on that to get this up and running. We are probably, I would say even though we're completely live for most in for all the courses, we are approximately, I'd say 95 % of where we need to be in some of the problem solving. This won't affect most people, most people's classes will be fine, but there are a few bumps that we're working out with some of these more unusual classes. We'll be giving you some more communication on that in the upcoming days. Things like independent Studies, things that don't necessarily have unchanging slos, for example special topics courses, we're going to come up with some language and some strategies for those of you. I have a

meeting with some other universities just trying to see how are we all going to do this? What I really wanted to do is find out what they were doing and do that, but it turns out we're ahead of most. So, we're ahead. We're kind of leading the pack.

But again, at any time, you know, we're willing to work through some special things. I know the College of Medicine is going to be fun when we get down to there because you have a lot of different kinds of courses and that kind of stuff. For most people, I think it's pretty straightforward, but again, we're always here for you. So be watching for more communications and training opportunities.

**Provost McKinney:** Thank you. And thanks to Alana, Jean and also Angela because they know now for the last month or so, I've been asking on a daily basis, where are we, where are we? Is it up and running? Is it up and running? So yesterday it went live in your Blackboard pages and then when I saw the training today, I said, yeah, we can do this. Because I reminded my staff and I turned to the president, by law we're mandated. It is a requirement where we also under the threat of losing SSI funding if we're not in compliance on the first day of the fall semester if 100% of all of our undergraduates don't have the syllabus posted. When I say 100%, that means everyone, every faculty member teaching an undergraduate course on the first day of the fall semester. What I saw today, we will be there. Thank you. Thank you all. Any questions?

**Senator Giovannucci:** [Indecipherable]...

**Dr. Jean Kusina:** We might be a little patient on some, especially graduate programs and professional programs again, they are not under mandates, so we have a little more time to transition...

**Senator Giovannucci:** [Indecipherable]... What is the timeline for graduates?

**Provost McKinney:** Did you say a year?

**Dr. Jean Kusina:** Yes.

**Provost McKinney:** So the following fall.

**Dr. Jeanne Kusina:** So, if we can get things in there so people can use them, sooner the better because we will be phasing out the old template where you can download it. We will not be keeping that anymore...[Indecipherable].

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, thank you. It is glad to hear that we are ahead of other places. Next, we have our Vice Provost for Finance, Matt Schroeder.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President of Finance:** Alright, well, so first and foremost, Tomer I want to thank you for the invitation to be here. Apologies that we had to reschedule due to some issues, obviously we're battling on the third floor of U-Hall. You know, I'm pleased to be back. I think it's been over a year. I'm happy to see that everybody's sitting in the same seats that you were a year-and-a-half ago. I appreciate Nate Bowley being here. You know, the Board of Trustees spends a lot of time talking about our students,

our patients, our faculty and staff, and to see our representation from the Board at the second to last meeting of the year, I think goes a long way. So, Nate, thank you very much for that.

**Senator Khanna:** Hold on a second, VP Schroeder. They can't see the slides in WebEx.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President of Finance:** So, as you're pulling up the slides, you know, we have the opportunity, the Finance team along with Academic Affairs to spend some time with Margaret and the Committee on Budget. I think we met in January and again in March. So, the instructions that were given to me today is to keep it simple, makes sure that folks understand just budget in general, and then speak a little bit tied to fiscal 27. Mitchell and I are co-presenting this. I have an indication or feeling that some of the questions will be really focused on the academic side of the house and those are obviously in the purview of the provost. So, with Mitchell's help, we'll tag-team the presentation. Alright, off we go since Jerry, Jerry, how are you enjoying your year?

**Past-President Van Hoy:** So far, so good.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President of Finance:** All right, so we've broken the presentation down into two pieces. So, the first half of it will be a budget overview, the second half-ish will be on fiscal 27 budget development and where we are right now at a high level. And so, in the spirit of 'keeping it simple' so that we can bring everyone along in the process, whether you're in the B-School, Humanities, Law, Medicine, I'll try to make it as simple as possible today.

So, starting at a very high level, The University of Toledo has one of the largest budgets in the state of Ohio for a public university. We are combined at \$1.1 billion. There are three components that make up an annual operating budget of \$1.1 billion dollars. It is the academic enterprise, the auxiliary enterprise, and clinical enterprise, otherwise known as UT Health. And what makes up clinical would be UTMC, and then also our physician practice plan known as UTP. So those are really the three components that make up our overall budget. For today's presentation— this is a little bit different than when we report out on a monthly and then quarterly basis with the Board— we're going to talk sources and uses. So, sources would be revenues coming into the University of Toledo, and I am, by the way, happy to put this out on the intranets on the MyUToledo page. So, I see a lot of people taking notes, it'll be out there the next day or so. So, we have sources in the form of revenue and then uses in the form of expenses. So, dollars in, dollars out, keeping it super simple. So then beyond sources and uses, we in partnership with Academic Affairs, in partnership with Auxiliaries, in partnership with the Clinical Enterprise, which is led by Chuck Callahan. This is initially very much data driven. Right? We look collaboratively with our partners across the enterprise as it relates to enrollment assumptions or current and future enrollment levels. Clinical volumes, so that really comes down to the care that is being given not only in the hospital itself, but out in our clinics. And then we look at forecasted expenditure requirements which we will talk about here in the detail. Then once everyone is on the same page, we take a balanced budget. The Board and the state of Ohio care about sources equally in uses, so they have to balance. So, we then take a balanced budget to the Board that essentially the three EVPs and the president will sign off on this year. So, Mitchell will sign off on it. Chuck Collingham will sign off on it. James Alloway will sign off on it. Then that'll go to the Board I think in mid-June, and it'll be for a fiscal year of July 1 through June 30. The balanced budget then should reflect the priorities of not only the president, but the priorities of the university.

So, then we move on to try and stay at a high level. I'll give you some concrete examples as it relates to some of those sources on the revenue front. And again, [we're] working off of a \$1.1 billion budget. For this slide, we've really broken it up into two components. We have the University Enterprise, and we have the UToledo Health Enterprise. We've talked about it at Faculty Senate before and other stakeholder groups. There is not a lot of diversity in our revenue stream. It is tuition and fees; it is revenue generated from the auxiliaries and its clinical or as we call it, net patient service revenue. So, just like all of us that

go to our primary care doctors or our specialists, on the clinical side we will bill out or charge-out a gross number. But more often than not, that number is paid at a very significant discount, right? So, you have your tuition and fees under the university enterprise, you have the state share of instruction or state subsidy, which I believe in the next slide we will go a little bit of a deeper dive into state share. The other revenue which are grants, and when I say 'grants,' it is not research awards. Research awards do not appear in any of these numbers and the reason being is that research awards are restricted. And so, when we're taking a budget to the Board, it does not include any type of research award or expenditures that are directly reimbursed out of those grants. Then there are other revenue grants: outside grants, third party grants through the Foundation, as an example, gifts that also move in through the Foundation. Per our investment policy statement, we are allowed to draw down on the Board designated reserves. It's right around four to five percent every year, and so we bring in dollars from the joint investment portfolio to help, I guess underwrite or subsidize some of the budget from a revenue standpoint. Then we also have interest income, dividends, etc.

Sales and service, so the double asterisks at the bottom on both columns is, and this is where things get a little bit different because we have the College of Medicine, you have resident reimbursement. So, what does that mean? So, as we sit here today, there's about 380 residents and fellows tucked up underneath the College of Medicine, tied to graduate medical education. The vast majority of those resident fellows, whether you're at the Hospital, UTMC, Mercy, etc., are reimbursed. And so even though they are considered, I'll call them, 'partial employees' on the University's side, the College of Medicine is reimbursed for the cost of those residents, plus fringe. Whether it is again, through UTMC, ProMedica, Mercy, etc. You also have the Academic Affiliation agreement with ProMedica and the College of Medicine. There are roughly 200 residents and fellows over at Toledo Hospital. That's about \$30 million a year that comes into the College of Medicine through the Academic Affiliation Agreement. On the UToledo Health side, and we'll talk about this a little bit further into the presentation, the University of Toledo Health is in a very unique position tied to our payer mix. And so, these are individuals that seek care at the hospital and our clinics. Are they private pay, meaning they're paying on their own dime? Are they commercial paying through like, the Blue Cross Blue Shield, Aetna, United HealthCare, etc.? Or are they fixed pay through CMS, Medicare/ Medicaid? Over 75 % of the individuals or payers that I guess financially contribute from a net patient service revenue from a claim payment standpoint are fixed at the University of Toledo Health. And so, what does that mean if Tomer comes in and sees me for a procedure, which I hope you don't? I'm probably going to get paid \$0.21 cents on the dollar for whatever care I provide to Tomer. And so, if any of us were going to open up a business, we are going to make \$0.21 cents on the dollar, [and so that's] probably not be the business that we [want to] go into. But we do receive some subsidies, some support through Ohio Department of Medicaid along with the FEDS for, I guess, serving the underserved and those subsidies or those payments come in both on the facility side and then also on the practice client side. Do you want to go to the next slide. Yes sir?

**Senator Khanna:** I didn't quite understand why FNA from research awards would count towards the revenues. I know you said it's restricted, but I'm not exactly sure why FNA.

**Matt Schroeder, VP for Finance:** Yes, so in-directs, so the way in-directs play out, (and that's a great question because as awards have gone up incrementally over the last few years, we're able to from an indirect cost recovery; now, it depends on what the feds are going to do, right? And pending lawsuits or whatever those stand) what that allows us to do is I think the easiest and simplest way which is cost avoidance. So, if we get indirect cost recovery, which is great, 50-53 cents on the dollar, right? We're also moving more and more expenses onto grants. And so, if you were to look at our financials through February, (and I'm trying to remember what line it shows up in) you'll see a favorable variance to budget. It is because of the awards and the timing of the awards playing out so that we're assigning some expenses over to the restricted side of the house. But when FNA does come in, and this is, you know, I wouldn't say controversial, but it's a conversation that happens almost every year at this time, 70% lands central.

Central's not like 'aha, I got 70 %.' That 70 % is assumed in all of our budget assumptions and it goes to support Grace and the research program. Then you've got the 30%, I think is it 20 % to the department and 10% to the college that also gets pushed out. Now, the College of Medicine is different, they get a hundred percent of it, right? But because they get a hundred percent of it, it is a hundred percent on them to handle all the faculty startup costs. Does that answer your question? So, we do get indirect cost recovering it.

**Senator Khanna:** Thank you.

**Matt Schroeder, VP for Finance:** All right, state share of instructions, so I am not an SSI expert, but we've got T Romer in the back of the room who is one of, I call, two 'SSI gurus' in the state. Kate Down in Ohio State is the second one. SSI is a very complicated funding model. Every year as folks in Columbus begin to 'tweak' on the SSI model, it doesn't get any clearer. In fact, it gets a lot muddier. And so, when we look at SSI, again, this is a snapshot based on fiscal 26 budget, it does not include any of the state's support that we get on the clinical side of the house. So, this is just based on the performance of the academic side-- and I shouldn't say 'side.' You guys corrected me over a year, so I'm not saying 'side' anymore. Ignore that. So, on the academic or within the academic enterprise, there's about a hundred million that comes in from state share of instruction. Now, if you go back in time, it wasn't too long ago where the academic enterprise was bringing in about \$112 to \$114 million. Actually, I'm going to modify that: \$108 to \$110 million, and then layer on the clinical on top of that by the state share of instruction. But because it's a zero-sum gain, the \$1.6 billion pie may or may not increase every bianium or so, we compete for those dollars. This is how it is broke-out: so, residents, meaning residents of the state of Ohio, degrees that are produced - so of the hundred million, just over \$36 million is awarded to us through degree production for residents of the state of Ohio. Completed FTEs, another \$25.6 million of that hundred million, MED model two. So, within the SSI formula, you got MED one, which is essentially Ohio State and maybe podiatry slipped into med one, I think.

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** Yes.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance cont'd:** Thank you, TR. But Med two, which is the rest of the medical schools. And so there's a set-aside for the performance of our medical students in the SSI model. There's also a doctoral set aside which is right around eight-and-a-half million that come in, or is planned to budget to come in this year tied to the performance of our doctoral students in the model, non-resident degree production. PSEO, what is PSEO? Mitchell alluded to, you know, with SB1 and a potential hold back of SSI funding, and I can't remember if they set aside \$75 or a hundred million, it's a big number. What they've also done, and they do this every couple of years, is they continue to 'tweak' the SSI model. And so, this is ODHE working in consultation with an SSI working group that TR is usually on. But then ultimately, you know, the university presidents, the 14 in the state of Ohio will sign off. So PSEO, post-secondary employment outcomes, this is a major change to the model. It aligns with a narrative and talking points, and honestly, I think House Bill. I'm trying to remember if it's in House Bill 96 or it was alluded to, but this is post-employment outcomes. So, the University of Toledo right out of the gate does quite well in this space because of our professional programs. The PSEO model, though, right now is still a little bit of 'to be determined' as it relates to it because initially, they wanted to exclude law and medicine, right? Anything else or was just law and medicine?

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** Any professional degrees? So not just law and medicine, but that's the predominant. I think DMPs and some others are out there.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Okay, so those listening online, medicine, law, DMP, a lot of the professional programs that we produce; not only graduates-in but graduates that go out and immediately find a job and from a social mobility, immediately find that social mobility index often better

than what mom and dad were able to do. And right now why I say it, 'should be determined' is we with TR's help, our Government Relations teams' help, we've made some solid progress in Columbus to 'knock on wood,' get medicine, get law, and get some of the professional programs back in, which will have a favorable swing for us. It's an unfavorable swing for others because it's a zero-sum gain. But my crystal ball tells me that there will continue to be more and more changes to the SSI model. And more and more of those changes will be outcome based, performance based. So, this PSEO allocation is simply a pilot and will most likely become a greater part of the SSI formula. Now with SSI and, you know, those elected leaders in Columbus, they sit back and they see \$1.6 billion, right? They're focused on K through twelve, they're focused on the jails, they're focused on all this other stuff other than higher ed., and they see \$1.6 billion, and depending on what's going on in their district, you know, they look at it as a potential opportunity to reallocate some revenues into initiatives that, for example, may help a southern part, a southwestern part of the state where Wright State may or may not be located. So, we anticipate through a couple other bills that are in the queue that may or may not get traction that there'll be an additional, I guess, push on the reallocation of some of that funding especially around medical schools, but more to be determined there. We have the at risk for resident degrees, we got at risk FTEs, and we got at risk non-resident degrees. As you see from the dollar amounts, the \$3.7 million is material, the others are not so much. Back in the day we used to talk about the at risk students and the importance of seeing those at risk students through to completion, but as the model has evolved over time, the weighting on the at risk student has gone down. Would you agree, TR?

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** Agreed. I think there's been a major kind of push at least to the group, the SSI consultation group, to really call out the fact that the model was initially designed as it stands to focus on improving at risk students and reproduction. But the dollars that are getting allocated are shifting away from the at risk student to bring FTEs into these other areas that are not connected to...

**Senator Wedding:** The Medical set aside, that is the Medical School?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, sir.

**Senator Wedding:** It dropped about a hundred percent? And with respect to the doctoral set aside, is that both STEM and non-stem? Is that all PhD or doctoral degrees?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** I'll let the guru take that.

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** Yes, Don, it's all what they would consider research doctorals. Back in the day, and when I say back in the day, I mean several years ago, they used to kind of weigh the FTEs on STEM vs. non-STEM. I'll use that kind of... It was a little more complex than that in terms of the type of FTEs that were weighed. It is all equal now. The weight is now on the doctoral set aside; it is partially related to the number of degrees you produce, partially related to the number of students that are enrolled, and partially related to your research expenditures as reported on a prior year's, I think it's the Herf survey, or something like that. So even that part of the model where it used to be, hey, if you're doing doctoral education, you could at least get a guaranteed good piece of that set aside; because that has become really convoluted in my own opinion, to the point where it just the fact that not just the University of Toledo but other schools have really kind of lamented that, that it is really hard to predict how you will perform in the SSI model in any given year given due to all of the moving pieces and all of the changes. But yes, to the to your initial question, that is STEM and non-STEM PhDs.

**Senator Wedding:** But it's not degrees, it's ongoing doctoral?

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** It is part of it. So, they'll take the number of students that are graduating at your number of degrees you produce, that's weighed, I want to say that's 50 % of that. Then the number of FTEs that are enrolled, that's 25 and 25 to the research piece. The interesting thing about the research piece is they weigh HHS grants at a lower weight to other grants. So, depending on how you're stacked up on your grant funding, it might not perform the way you would think. We still do pretty strongly in the doctoral set aside relative to other institutions in the state. Don't get me wrong, I think that is a place where we have performed and performed well consistently.

**Matt Schroder, Vice President for Finance:** Are you good?

**Senator Wedding:** Do you have a feel for what percent of our doctoral is STEM and what is not STEM? I'm just curious.

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** I mean, just to be blunt, I say the vast majority anymore is STEM. We are producing most of our doctoral degrees in the College of Medicine, the College Engineering, the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. There is a strong number coming out of, I guess, the JHCASE and the Psychology program but we only have, you know, a couple of people during the year graduating like [with] a history degree or something like that.

**Senator Wedding:** Is the Medical included in this? I thought it was---

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** MV students properly, like the MV program, the one that culminates. So, [it's] somebody who is going and working at UTMC hopefully or with UTP, treating patients at that level is only in the Med-two set aside. Research doctoral programs in the College of Medicine will be included in the regular doctoral sets.

**Senator Wedding:** Thank you.

**Terry Romer, Chief of Strategy and Business Insight:** Yes sir.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** All right, so I'm going to speed it up here a little bit. All right, so we want to go to the next slide because I just want to leave time for some questions.

All right, so now on the sources or the expense side, looking at the enterprise wide. So again, keeping consistent with two buckets, University, UToledo Health: \$406 million vs. just under \$688 million. So, you know, as we've talked about, we are very much a people organization. The simple math on comp: on the University side, I think it's about 75-76% people and on the clinical side, it's about 50-50.5% of people. In terms of other operating expenses, I tried to put a footnote of that at the bottom - it's software licenses, software maintenance, software subscriptions. You'll see us going more to a subscription-based model on different acquisitions, whether software or hardware. To avoid that initial capital outlay, costs of goods sold, insurance advertising, travel, bad debt, etc. makeup that. Under utilities, and I wanted to flag occupancy and really call out utilities. You know, there are a lot of things outside of our control right now, one of which is what's happening abroad. You know, we're in the market this month as it relates to energy

or electricity, and we've got to make a decision there by the end of April. It'll be probably a multi-year deal and our current price for kilowatt hours is probably not sustainable, and so that's quickly becoming budget assumption for fiscal 27.

So, taking the uses, I think this is probably a slide that folks are very interested in seeing. It just takes that \$1.1 billion and it breaks it down in order or in descending order with obviously UTMC at the top followed by Academic Affairs, UT physicians. That again is our practice plan. So, you have finance, athletics, enrollment management all the way down to government relations at about \$400K there.

If we want to go to the next slide, I just titled this one 'Complexities.' We often talk about at a high level, 'well, you know, the University of Toledo is different.' Well, why is the University of Toledo different? Why is the University of Toledo different than Cleveland State, Bowling Green, Kent and some of the other regional publics? The first few, all of us are going through right now in the state of Ohio and that is, and it's a great program for our undergraduate students, tuition guarantee. So, this coming fall will be our ninth tuition guarantee cohort. But that gives us some, I guess, pricing challenges, if you will, for undergraduate students. Meaning, how we price is essentially outside of our control, and the state of Ohio tells us in the current bionium hospital 96, the most you can go up for the next inbound cohort is 3 %. Inflation, 5 %, but the most you can go up is 3 %. And so, there's some challenges there now. Not so much on the graduate side, which we'll talk about in a little bit. Fee increases, there have been limitations over the years on fee increases. ODHE has made some changes there that we're working with the provost and his team on along with department chairs and deans around some fee increases or opportunities. We talked about the changes or the challenges within stage share of instruction. The clinical payer mix, again, I foreshadowed this a little bit earlier. You know, clinically speaking, we're fixed and also given the size of our hospital and the size of our overall practice plan and the fact that we're independent in a crowded marketplace is very difficult to go out and negotiate favorable commercial contracts. We do our best, but the heavy reliance on fixed pay, the Medicare/Medicaid clinical support. This is complex, and so if you were to look at our budget from fiscal 26 that we took to the Board, we do have a line item, and it appears on the clinical side, we call it clinical support. We do move some resources from the clinical enterprise into the academic enterprise. This really comes down to the complexities around what I often call sort of this tripartite model or mission where you've got the College of Medicine, the practice plan and UTMC really all working together at the undergraduate medical education level and the graduate medical education level. And so, how the funds flow between those three entities is depending on what we're talking about on any given day can be pretty complicated, and so in this current budget we have \$6 million that flows into the academic enterprise from the clinical enterprise.

Research, as I alluded to in one of my answers, incrementally year over year, you know, based on the NSF Heard data etc., awards are up. I think maybe \$78 million, which is fantastic. And again, a shout out to all of our faculty, our faculty researchers for the work that they're doing in a very interesting time in DC. But for doing \$78 almost \$80 million with aspirations to get to a hundred million, you know, the desires by the research team to grow faculty, to grow research is quite challenging in an environment where undergraduate enrollment is struggling, right? We need strong undergraduate enrollment growth to feed the research enterprise or the research component.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Just to clarify, because you're speaking about the research here and the reason for us to grow in the University. But you said before that actually the research money does not count to the budget. It's not part of the budget, but it's an indifferent goal for us to do.

**Matt Schroder, Vice President for Finance:** It is part of the budget, though, because and we'll use you as an example, right? The great research you're doing, how many grants did you submit that it took 'X' number of submittals to finally hit on one, right? And so research and underwriting, some of that, whether it's the faculty startup or the time that you're putting in at the bench before you hit on a major award is part of the budget. But when the awards themselves come in, you're absolutely correct, it is completely separate and restricted.

Inflationary pressures: when I say operating margin, this is essentially revenue expenses that we can control on the operating side, making sure that there's enough favorable spreads so that we can reinvest back into our labs, our classrooms, our facilities. That investment takes the form of capital investment to address deferred maintenance needs etc. So, similar in some ways to the regional publics in Ohio but also very different and similar to more of a Cincinnati and Ohio State tied to some of the clinical pressures that we face. So fiscal 27, go ahead sir.

**Senator Khanna:** Sorry to interrupt you again, but there's some questions in the Chat that, you know, I want to make sure they get---

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Hammered down. I've got till 5:20 pm?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** We can extend it.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** We can extend, okay. Get ready. Pay attention.

**Senator Khanna:** Ahmad Javaid wrote in the Chat, "Follow-up question regarding the F&A – I understand that indirects are split 70-30 between college and University. However, doesn't that 70% go to the University operations? Or is that 70% further split? Irrespective, being finance expert, shouldn't the office of VP for Finance have a concrete idea on what exact percentage of the overall indirect (70% or lower) goes to the University as revenue? It is quite interesting that the office of Finance has wither no idea where that money goes or intentionally wants to 'hide' these numbers." Maybe a little bit more, I think there's some confusion as to what happens to that 70 %. Perhaps a little more illumination from your end. I know you tried explaining it to me earlier, but it sounds like others were not fully clear on how that's split down.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah.

**Senator Khanna:** If you want to try again or maybe give more of an explanation---

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** I will. I will try again and I'm going to phone my friend right back there, Lena Carroll who's responsible for budget planning for the University. So just to start and Gordan, you can chime in as well. So, 70/30 split at a high level, right? Thirty percent department

college, 20/30. Seventy percent land central. When we forecast during budget development, and we use a plug number of \$500,000, we know, let's just say \$500,000 is in land central. We look at that and then we determine if that is incrementally an increase over the previous year this landing central. More often than not, we will use that to increase the research budget for the year. Help me out, what did I miss?

**Lena Carroll, Associate VP for Financial Planning and Budget:** That is correct. And then also I want to add that, that is a base budget assumption and at the end of the year, and Brenda maybe you can add, but C indexes were created a couple years ago out where the grant is actually generated from. So, at the end of the year, we actually push out from central the benefit back out to the areas that the grant originated.

**Brenda Grant, Vice Provost for Academic Finance and Planning:** Right, college by college basis.

**Lena Carroll, Associate VP for Financial Planning and Budget:** Correct. So, tagging on to Matt's example of \$500,000, say \$600,000 comes in, so it's more, and then they didn't up the university budget, right? So, \$500,000 was budgeted, 600,000 came in. That benefit then based on college, based on PI, is driven back out to the colleges in a special index. It's a very special index; it's not an expendable index in general, right? You can't spend from the index. But what we can do is use those dollars to help us offset faculty startups. So, we have to look at various sources of funds within our colleges in order to cover the faculty startup spend for the year because that's not a hard budget because it changes year-to-year by faculty member, by faculty hired, by the cadence of their offer letter. That spend is just so variable by college, we don't want to tie up permanent budget by budgeting faculty startup funds. So, we use these one-time sources of funds and that 70 %, which has been a great benefit for it going up the last three years to help us offset startup funds and needs within the colleges. So that's a good thing.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** And then at the end of fiscal 25, I'm going to maybe tag on just to demonstrate supportive research. We went back to allowing carry forward to play out as well?

**Lena Carroll, Associate VP for Financial Planning and Budget:** Yes, tied to the overhead indexes. So, the 20% and 10%, that goes out to the colleges and the departments. If there's a carry-forward in that overhead account generated from the indirects from the grants, that year-end balance is allowed to carry-forward based on the standard operating procedure that was developed.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Keep going, sir.

**Senator Khanna:** The final comment here in the Chat is that it is a little bit off-putting; I think that the RSP budget is shown as \$5.4 million, but still the slides don't say anything about indirects.

**Senator Javaid:** If I may? Hello, everyone, this is Ahamad Javaid from ECSL. I just wanted to kind of add to that, that again, I understand all the discussion that just took place regarding where all that money goes, right? But my biggest concern is why cannot we just know one single number representing either 100% or 70 % of you know, that indirects, right? So, Matt again, you know, you mentioned that \$70 million or something came in last year or whatever was spent. I don't know those [exact] numbers, but whatever was spent must have generated a fixed amount of indirects, right? Whether it is \$500, or whether it is \$500,000 or whether it is like 20 million. I don't know, right? So, it would be actually good

for all the faculty to know what the actual amount of indirects is coming to the University, whether you want to put that number at one hundred percent, which is basically 1/3 typically of, based on 53 % indirects rate. Again, I'm expecting that the Office of Finance should have those numbers, right? Irrespective of where it goes, how it is used, whether it goes back to the college and all those details, at least from my perspective, are not relevant. The relevant point is that can we actually get one number of the indirects that comes to the University as a whole?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, absolutely. Easy to do. I'm going to throw an asterisk on it though, and the researchers know this, timing is everything, right? So, we hit on \$78 million in awards, but the indirects will be based on the timing that it is spent. So, we can absolutely do a multi-year look back and Tomer will send it to you, maybe the last five years of indirects in the aggregate- not 70/30, but in the aggregate, this is what came in.

**Senator Khanna:** That would be great.

**Senator Javaid:** Yes, that would be great. Thank you, thank you very much.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Don?

**Senator Wedding:** Before you go to the next budget, can you jump through the expenses of that slide we didn't spend a lot of time at? We could have, if we've seen it perhaps calculated for ourselves, take the expenses and move them over to the two areas, particularly academic and the UTMC. The bottom line is a question.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah?

**Senator Wedding:** What is the, shall we say, surplus being generated by the academics, which is the \$400 million and also by the other half which is the UTMC. I've heard it said that UTMC is growing, is the fastest growing revenue generator on campus, but generating revenue is not the same as generating surplus. And I'd like to know, do we have surpluses in the Medical enterprise area? We have had surpluses in the academic enterprise by that \$400 million all the way back to 2012. We have never had a deficit in the academic enterprise on this campus. The Huron report substantiates that and I've seen the financials, but not in the last year or two because they've been harder to get. But certainly, I'd like to see the comparison of the two, not revenue. But had you set aside a hundred and make it, you went too fast for me, I didn't get it written down but what are those numbers?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, so I'll speak at a high level. I'll use last year's as an example, fiscal 25 is a great example. So, Don, to your point, you know, the University as a whole had the ability working with our Board of Trustees to request, I think it was around \$22 million be carried forward or set aside for capital. What made up that \$22 million? You're absolutely correct, some of that was academic, some of it was clinical. I can get you those numbers, not---

**Senator Wedding:** I meant operating, not capital investment.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** No, so what I'm talking about is, you know, up here operating---

**Senator Wedding:** Right.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance cont'd:** And then you have non-operating, right?

**Senator Wedding:** Okay.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Then the total change in that position last year, the University as a whole, auxiliaries was more of a downer, unfavorable; but with general fund or academic and clinical combined, it had put us in a position to request \$22 million to be invested in capital. And so, to your point, both clinical and academic is around \$25 million.

**Senator Wedding:** Okay.

**Senator Wedding:** So, we had a surplus or positive margin of \$22 million last year or more than that?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It would have been a little bit more than that. We did not zero it out completely, but we felt comfortable setting \$22 million aside for capital improvements: research labs, classrooms, and clinical— we split it because then we used \$8 million from the Foundation, so it was 15/15. We split it equally and we felt comfortable that we were in a position---

**Senator Wedding:** On the \$400 million in operating, which is a number that is pretty constant or has been in the last few years, there is a surplus in the \$400 million for academics. We do generate a surplus.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So looking at this slide and I'm not getting 'cagey' with you, but just looking. So, all these slides are budget, right? So when we bring the budget to the Board in June, we're pushing for a balanced budget.

**Senator Wedding:** Sure.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** You're absolutely, totally correct. There have been years, 25 is the most recent example, that as we work through the academic year -- easy example is we have a whopping \$5 million in contingency in the general fund, right? Not a lot of money when we're dealing with the numbers that we're dealing with. We are very disciplined around some of our contingency. Then you also have within the compensation line, you have a salary recapture, knowing that lines are going to come open and it is going to take time to fill. So last year we had a favorable variance tied to salary recapture which feeds all of that. There are some units on the academic side that will absolutely drop money to the bottom, meaning the bottom line for the academic side of the house. More often than not, when you're out in the field, though, or in the trenches, most of the units are spending what has been budgeted for them. It's the discipline working with the 'Mitchells' of the world where we can manage salary recapture, and we can manage some of the contingency.

**Senator Wedding:** But you're not giving me numbers.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Well, I don't have the numbers, but I can give you the numbers.

**Senator Wedding:** Well, I would like to know particularly what the \$600 million side of the house, what are they generating in terms of surplus or deficit? Is there a surplus or deficit for the \$600 million that's running the UTMC and the doctors?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** They have to budget for a surplus, otherwise the Board wouldn't approve it.

**Senator Wedding:** But their budgeting only the actuals.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, and I can get you last year's numbers. And actually, all of our audited financials are on the website, but I'll send you a note with everything, but they absolutely ran a surplus last year. Otherwise, we could not have asked for that \$22 million.

**Senator Wedding:** But \$22 million out of a billion is not a pot full of money.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It's not a 'pot full of money,' and I appreciate you recognizing that because, you know, when we're talking a million here a million there, those aren't material numbers. There are material numbers for units, but in the big picture when we sit back on a \$1.1 billion budget, it's not material. And so, when we're talking about \$5 million in contingency, \$22 million in carry forward for capital investments, it goes a long way when we haven't been doing that consistently. But it's not a lot of money especially when you have \$540,000,000 in deferred maintenance.

**Senator Wedding:** Well, there's still a piggy bank we haven't talked about and that's the Foundation. A lot of the assets in the app Foundation are not committed. There are many of them are, but a large number of them are not committed and can be or free to be used for whatever the University wants, and that's not in your budget. Your Foundation is separate.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So yes, let me explain.

Just for those listening at home, so what Don's referring to, over at the Foundation—I guess the simplest way to explain it—there is a joint investment portfolio. It's about \$850 million last flash report I looked at. Of that \$850 million, I'm just going to round, \$300 million-ish is for our Board designated reserves. The Board designated reserves, to Don's point, had originally come over from the university, I think in 2011. Some of it came from the hospital, some of it came from the academics. The reason that those monies moved to the Foundation was at that time in 2011, I believe that was the 'Jacobian era.' Does it sound familiar, 'Jacobian era?' I got one laugh. We moved it because we decided that all the fundraising was going to be through the Foundation, all of alumni were going to be through the Foundation. And so, the administrative fee that is charged on those funds, the fundraising alumni and development operations. But you're absolutely correct, there is that money, plus roughly \$50 million from the parking, which we'll talk about here in a minute, I'm sure, that sits at the Foundation. In the last year we earned 13.8 % on it,

right? But in order to call upon those dollars, we have to go to the Board of Trustees with a plan on what is that going to do for the University. Now, as I alluded to, what is in the budget and it's tied to our investment policy statement, depends on the year. It could be \$8 million or \$9 million of what we call our spending plan that we're allowed to move over as part of that investment policy.

**Senator Wedding:** Well, if the hospital needs a new piece of medical equipment that costs \$10 million and they don't have it. Would the Foundation be the obvious place for them to get that money?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, I mean they could do---

**Senator Wedding:** And it would have to be approved by the Board of Trustees at the Foundation.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It would actually (because of that the threshold) require multiple approvals. So, goods and services, I think greater than \$1.5 million has to go to the Board [and] construction, \$3 million has to go to the Board. Now, what UTMC would do is[ask] do they lease it? Do they buy it outright? Do they finance it through a Siemens or something like that? Or, is there an intercompany loan where the Foundation would be sort of the bank, right? I mean, there are multiple options there. I think what you would see currently from our clinical leadership team in this example would most likely come up with a model where they would avoid a large cash outlay on the front end. And so, obviously a lot of these medical companies are very creative on how they can come up with financing. So, alright, Tomer, you good?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Do you have more presentation?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, I have more presentation. All right, this is where Mitchell gets warmed up and gets ready for questions. All right, budget development. So we kicked off in October. We then, this year, made our way through two rounds of budget conferences on the academic side of the house. Mitchell is doing his own set of budget conferences with the colleges. So, let me real quick because I jumped over to December. So, [again] we kick off in October. Every November the business insights team will look at the 15th day enrollment numbers and will start in late October, early November in making assumptions around revenue type of budget. December this year budget conferences kicked off. January, we put out a memo. I think it was January-ish, we started the foreshadow at University Leadership Council. I think in March we put out a memo with some budget guidelines. And so, where we find ourselves right now in early or almost mid-April is I think pretty much all of second round of budget conferences are finished up. The budget development tool, I know Lena's been working with IT and that's about ready to go. We will be working with the provost, the president, and the CEO of UToledo Health to really lock in all of the budget guidelines and assumptions associated with that.

So, if you want to go to the next slide, which gets a little bit further into detail. So, you know, in the memo that I alluded to, we sent it out to cabinets, and you heard it at the inauguration. President Holloway has his three priorities: Advantage Toledo, Innovate Toledo, and Healthy UToledo. We've asked areas whether your academic support units etc., that as you're thinking about budget priorities, budget assumptions, it's important to align around the president's initiatives. Obviously on the non-clinical enterprise, enrollment

growth and student success, meaning retention are the utmost critical items for the University. Anything that we can do to retain students, enroll students is critically important.

Revenue drivers, so, you know, net tuition revenue, this is the net number that the student pays after merit or need base aid continue to really focus on net tuition revenue, auxiliary performance, clinical alignment. And so, what we're doing on the clinical side, over the last year we've been moving around our clinics from UTP owned to UTMC owned to take advantage of some of those incentives that we talked about and continuing to invest in and grow research activity. We have been emphasizing with the president's help, the provost's help, looking at opportunities for strategic reallocations. And I think any year, any organization, always looking at others, some structural costs that we can reduce.

If you want to go to the next slide. So preliminary budget assumptions as we know them today is subject to change. Student tuition and fees, we know when we go to the Board, the increase for incoming undergraduate cohort number nine, we most likely will be asking the Board to go to the highest percentage permitted by law because at the end of the day this is about one/four of the overall student undergraduate population. Mitchell and his team have been working with all of the colleges. The colleges have put forward on average, and some are zero, most are averaging right around 2 % increase tied to graduate tuition or professional program tuition. And then some differential increases tied to select grant professional programs. State share of instruction will be getting preliminary numbers from ODHE in the coming weeks so we will lock in our SSI assumptions. The reality is, we'll probably continue to lose some market share around SSI, meaning SSI most likely will go down. The dividend and interest income, you know, we are very conservative in this line item because this is non-operating. It's something we can't control. Then under the sales service line item, we took in March to our Board increases as it relates to room and board with housing going up on average 2.85 %. Having met with the IUC a few weeks ago, that is probably the lowest increase in the state of Ohio. We're sensitive there as we look to rebuild or increase occupancy. Then on the meal plan side, 3.17 % on average.

Next slide. Compensation, again, we are a people's organization. We obviously have all of our contractual obligations throughout the seven collective bargaining units and then professional staff as well. So, we've made some assumptions around compensation there. Then from an operating expense standpoint, and I think Mitchell and I have a meeting on Friday of this week [regarding] the strategic alignment of resources. Again, to support the president's initiative, to grow enrollment, to continue to grow, to grow the 'power to do' marketing campaign, to grow our social media presence so that when enrollment does hit. And in a lot of this investment, you won't see the outcome until fall of 27. Fall of 26 is pretty much approaching the finish line with May 1<sup>st</sup> being a big milestone as many of you know coming up. I referenced the utility expense, and then the debt service. And so, those of you that follow the Board meeting, I just want to call on the debt service piece. So earlier this year, this calendar year, I think it was in February, we went out and we did a direct placement with Huntington Bank for \$40 million. This is tied to our capital plan that we've worked with over the years with the Board. It also ties back into our multiple campus master plan. And so, we went out for \$40 million. I foreshadowed, you know, the \$50-ish million in parking proceeds. We did not call it on the parking proceeds because as Don and I were discussing, we're making 13.8 % over the last year in the joint investment portfolio. Our cost of capital for the direct placement of \$40 million right now based on today's raise is 3.51 %. And so that spread is so healthy that it was easier and more logical. I shouldn't say easier, it's never easy. But it was just more straightforward to leverage the capital markets, Huntington Bank on a short term \$40 million note with the plan that in the coming years,

going back to the Board, updating the capital plan, working with the provost, working with the president to continue to invest in our classrooms, our labs, our general circulation space, and then also in the clinical enterprise itself. So those are just high-level assumptions right now. They're intentionally and thoughtfully high level, knowing that we still have to get alignment with the provost, with CEO of UToledo Health and most importantly, the president. So let me pause for any questions and Tomer, I did pretty well, I think.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Much better.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Thank you. Any questions? Yes sir?

**Senator Semaan:** Yeah, you did mention that we have three components, UT Health, University, and auxiliary. Then you broke it down into a couple of components: The University and UT Health. Why didn't you break it into three, which is my first question. My second question is we've heard through the grapevine that there will be a request for 9 % budget cuts next year. Can you speak to that, please?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Okay. Yes, so the first part of your question, the auxiliaries—and Lena, give me a head nod—was tucked up underneath [the] University. So, it was two buckets, but really three components, [a] two in one type of a thing. So, in my budget memo that I sent out to Cabinet and what the provost does, and I'll let Mitchell talk, is just simply reference modeling. And so, the way that I think Mitchell describes it, it's really six different exercises. So, we've asked everyone including the clinical side, model a reallocation to grow enrollment, grow in student success, you know, those three pillars, model of 579 tied to reallocation. Also model of a 579 percentage of reduction. Like, what are some of the areas, which I am the first one to admit that we are cut to the bone? But if you had to cut to either help with the structural deficit or to help with the reallocation, as an example on the academic side of the house, what would that look like? And if you can't do it, why? And also tell us, and now I'm speaking just for the supporting, I'm not speaking for Mitchell now.

So, like I said to my team, if you can't do it, why? And if you can do it, tell me what is the impact on the student experience, the prospective student experience or the patient experience? So, the great finds are a little bit off there, but there's definitely six different scenarios that folks are working through. Mitchell, you want to speak to the academic side at all?

**Provost McKinney:** So, yes. You know Matt as you said, I've started using the language of, well this is asking us to develop six different budgets and I've said this to deans, and I'm sure it's to the chairs, and the faculty. What I've said at this point is that, okay, until we know more. As Matt said, we've got a meeting on Friday; we've got meetings next week where I started, I guess a month or two ago saying okay, expenses are going up, revenues are going down, and we have a projected deficit. So, taking those assumptions, when I say revenues are going down, we will have an overall continued decline in FTE headcount overall this fall. So, projecting that, and I keep saying we're going to see, I think, I'm very confident we're going to see some increases in new students, but we will not be able to have enough increase. We would have to have a 8% to 10 % increase in new students to just edge up the overall numbers. And we will not have 10 %. We can see 2 %, 3 %. But as the Board said in its last meeting last week, if we can have just one additional new student so we can say yes, we had an increase. So, then that affects, if you saw on the academic side overall decreases in tuition and fees and also SSI, which are our two big drivers. Then you

overlay on all of this in terms of okay, expenses going on, revenue's coming down. Then this was asked earlier in terms of the research side, where can we invest on Advantage Toledo, Innovate Toledo, on Healthy Toledo? Where can we make investments? Now doing all of that at the same time of where we're expecting a deficit, and then how do we address that? And so, as I've sat down with our budget team and I've talked to these and I said to Brenda, okay, let's go in and start working these scenarios. On the reallocation front, we figured out all sorts of scenarios where we can reallocate. We're already doing it and the colleges are already doing that in terms of their personnel, their lines of okay, we've had a separation of retirement over here in this department, [so] we're going to hire over here because we've got in this department some enrollment increases or we've got other factors going on. So, on the reallocation front, we're addressing. We've got scenarios of how we're doing that and we will continue to do it. Then we get to the cuts, you know, rumors of a 9 % cut. I've already previewed with Matt where he said, you know, come in and show us how you can't do that or what it would mean. We met, I think it was earlier this week or maybe it was last week, and I said if we go to the 9 %, that means a hundred percent of (well, I'm saying it in public), a hiring freeze completely of faculty. That would mean 100% of a decrease in terms of all part-time faculty. That would mean no summer salary. But then I said, and we can't do that, can we? Because that's where we start to shoot ourselves in the foot. Then we come back to the 7 % and I said, oh my goodness, no, that's also existential. Then we come back to the 5% and then we start saying, well, where would we -- and I said, "Well, first, we're not going to cut in terms of graduate teaching assistance, tuition remission." "We're not going to do anything in scholarships." "We're not going to do anything that would affect the ability to bring more students to this campus." What else did I take off? I said cuts on staff, I said, "We're not going to do anything there." You know, Brenda pointed out, she said, well, you keep taking off all the things off the table that we're not going to touch, so how would we get to --. So that's where we are right now, [we're] trying to figure out if we go to one of those scenarios which will be very difficult. Now, what we're also trying to do is, we do have it on the table, well, we're going to invest in Advantage Toledo. We're going to invest in Innovate Toledo where we can have some funding for new research, hires, and then startups that would come with those hires. We're going to invest. I say we're going to, [but honestly] we've got to. We've got to find ways to invest in those priorities. So that's probably a much longer answer in terms of, oh, the rumors are going to 9 % cuts. I have not said that. What I've said is we can't make a 9 % cut. So, that's where we are on the activity side. That's probably much more than maybe Matt wanted me to say.

**Senator Wedding:** Where are the numbers to show us this deficit? I mean you're talking about a deficit for the first time. We know that we've had surpluses in the academic budget all the way back to 2012. That's established. Now all of a sudden, we're going over the cliff and having a deficit in the academic budget. Where are those numbers? Today we saw numbers, \$400 million, which has been pretty constant. We don't know what our expenses were because we jumped through that. We don't know what the hospital is doing, we jump through that. So, what are these numbers? We're not getting numbers. We're getting a lot of process that the administrators like to play around with, but we're not getting numbers. We're not getting them. And you can talk about 9 %, 9 % is [a] \$36 million deficit. That's a lot of money. That's a whole college. So where are the numbers? That's what we're not getting. I'm sorry, Matt.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** You're fine.

**Senator Wedding:** We need to go ahead and have a beer, I guess <laughter>.

All we are getting is a big circle, and we're not getting the numbers.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So just at a high level, I'll speak to a few things on where we are. So, [we're] right around a \$16 million structural deficit. What makes up that, what makes up those numbers? So, we know [we're] about right around \$6.7 million right now based on the 15th day for the fall, 15th day for the spring. Seeing what is in the pipeline for graduating students, aging FTEs, we're anticipating tuition and fees being off this year. So, we're comparing year-over-year off by \$6.7 million.

**Senator Wedding:** So that's 6.7 million?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, 6.7.

**Senator Wedding:** Not 36, but 6.7?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Let me go through it. We then have and again, all of this is subject to change, [but I'm] trying to be transparent. Margarete [Hoogland] made it very clear when we met, hey, the more transparency, the better. But again, this is going to be high level subject to change, but this is what we're working off right now, just for the 16. It doesn't include all the other asks that are being made. So then we know SSI as I alluded to, year-over-year, it'll be validated by ODHE in the coming weeks and we're going to probably be off by a million or more on SSI.

**Senator Wedding:** So right now we're at 104 and we'll be down to 102.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, so we budgeted around 104 this year which would have included clinical. The slide that I showed stripped out clinical at a hundred. Clinical is between five-and-a-half and six, which is what we typically layer on top of the hundred. We will be off most likely a million or more on SSI. All right, so you got your two components there. Then when we look at compensation, and when we look at compensation tied to contractual obligations, and when we look at professional staff, and when we look at twelve-month non-bargained for faculty, we're about \$6.8 million on compensation.

**Senator Wedding:** Do you mean down?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** That we need to come up with because of those contractual obligations and, you know, some units are getting two, two-and-a-half, three depending on where they are in the bargaining contracts. We know we'll have again about \$6.8 million, \$6.9 million in comp that we have to cover.

**Senator Wedding:** We've lost in the last four or five years \$125 from the union bargaining.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** We have, we absolutely have. We're down below 500. And we haven't laid off anybody; these are retirements and people are leaving.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** The 6.7-- you got two numbers you gave me, 6.7 and what was that?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Well, I said I'm just doing the math real quick, so just for the sake of you taking notes to be used against me at a future date <laughter>.

**Senator Wedding:** Yes.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It's 6.9.

**Senator Wedding:** So, 6.9 of what?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It is comp and fringe.

**Senator Wedding:** All right, thank you.

**Senator Khanna:** There's a question in the Chat.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, let's take the last question because we need to move on.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So, Don, rest assured we have the numbers. That's a little teaser, but we're very reluctant to share the details of the numbers until the provost, the president, the CEO of UT Health, and the CFO are all on the same page.

**Senator Wedding:** Well, when the man [Provost McKinney] starts talking about deficits for the first time, that would cause a little bit of concern for the faculty.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes. Renee?

**President-Elect Heberle:** There's a question online as well, but just a brief clarifying question for those of us who may not know, what do you mean by structural deficit? What's the difference between that? It is not just a manual, you know, 'oops, we don't have enough money.'

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah, so it goes back to the beginning of my presentation: sources, revenues coming in, and expenses, right? And comps a great one, right? You're going to go up to \$6.9, \$7 million rounding, and that's because of again, professional staff are trying to keep pace with some of the bargaining units, twelve-month faculty and the College of Medicine is trying to keep pace, right? And honestly, you know, what we do, and I think from an overall labor and a labor relation standpoint -- Don, you're not allowed to say anything right now -- but I think the relationships are getting better between those bargaining units and management. I know they're definitely a lot better than they were ten years ago, but there's probably still a lot of work. So, when we say structural, it's just again, it's the basic sources and uses, right? Do I have enough revenue (sources) to cover my expenses, as simple as that?

**President-Elect Heberle:** So it can change from year-to-year what you identify as a structural deficit?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, depending on — so for an example, Tony Borne in fall of 27 just crushes it. Some of his initiatives are working. That will allow us to make some revenue assumptions, right? For example, a major gift comes into the College of Engineering (I'm using Engineering because we're standing here) and Engineering is going to be able to leverage this major gift in lieu of base operating budget. There are so many different things that can go into that. Yes?

**President-Elect Heberle:** So when you're talking about a structural deficit, but the legal imperative would be, do we have a balanced budget?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes.

**President-Elect Heberle:** The structural deficit is what you're handling each year and your budget assumptions that you're presenting to the Board, and that's why we're always undergoing this constant sense of being cut?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, and honestly, I mean, you sit back and you think about it, right? We're in 14 or 15 years of declining enrollment, right? Would I say flat fundraising, right? I mean, we do a nice job fundraising, \$22 to \$28 million. We know that we can do a lot more from a fundraising standpoint as well. And so, as an institution we're trying to pull all these levers, do different things, really juggle to be able to preserve so then that day, that grad enrollment knocks it out of the park, undergrad enrollment, we're ready, right? And we haven't done or made decisions that put us in a terrible position.

**President-Elect Heberle:** What does the \$22 million surplus mean?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah, so what it means last year is that the hiring of personnel, (faculty, staff, employees I should say) there was a favorable timing variance there that allowed money on the comp line to follow the bottom line. There was discipline around contingency that allowed money to fall to the bottom line. Those are some of the main drivers that allowed a favorable performance to budget last year. Then you layer in on top of it -so, you've got all your operating revenues and the expenses up here, then you have non-operating and you have a great performance in the market. I think last year, I'm trying to remember, was it \$25-\$30 million up in investments? All of those come into play to allow us to go back and ask the Board to invest.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** We need to start to move.

**Senator Wedding:** Why should we? This is very important. This is more important than what's going on with this agenda. I think we ought to stay with the finances because this has been very informative. I don't know why we should be shortcutting this; this is the most important thing we've heard here in months.

**President-Elect Heberle:** Well, I'm sorry to keep hammering on this, but I think this is in general part of the confusion in the rumor mill because why is there now a structural deficit if there was a surplus last year? This is very hard for us to understand.

**Past-President Van Hoy:** This is projected.

**President-Elect Heberle:** Yes, it is a projected future thing, but we're always projecting decline and sometimes we get...

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So, let me let me explain it.

**Senator Khanna:** That's a really good question.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah, so I want to be very, very careful on the projections. Terry Romer and I were talking about this. When you look at it, (and it doesn't matter, go back anytime in the last five, six, seven years) as long as I've been CFO, we've avoided any mid-year adjustment, right? Those kill an organization. I think many of you will remember when we would do mid-year adjustments on a regular basis.

**Unknown Speaker:** Yes.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance cont'd:** Why did you do mid-year adjustments? Because, and I'll just say it because I can, the finance team missed it, right? So, we are not overly conservative when it relates to budgeting. And so, in the academic side of the house, all you have to do is go back and compare budget to actual. So, what we budgeted for on tuition and fees, compared to actuals and you will see that gentleman and his team will come within a million and a half to \$2 million or less in any given year. And so unfortunately because of the enrollment challenges, we've gotten really, really good at forecasting. Now, when we look at not only next year, but then we'll look at four more additional years because we do a five-year financial plan, we are absolutely baking in assumptions around enrollment. So what do we know right now tied to enrollment? Currently we are assuming based on numerous conversations with Tony Borne and his team that new student enrollment, we are planning new student undergrad enrollment to be flat. We know that international students because of all the things that I've alluded to in DC that are outside of our control, international students will go down. Transfers, I don't remember what, it doesn't matter, but we're making an assumption around transfers. But as all of you know, as educators, you don't really see a lot of movement in transfers into June, July, and maybe in August. But, you know, Lourdes is a great example right now, the 40 to 50 students or more that are going to potentially come from Lourde's opens up an opportunity for us to always evaluate how do we handle transfer students? And I know Mitchell's team, Mary Humphrey's and others have tried to really eliminate a lot of barriers to transfer students so that they can come in and then you got Owen's Express etc. Go ahead sir.

**Senator Khanna:** There is a question on the screen. It says, "Would the predictive deficit be lower if income from indirects is taken into account as revenue?"

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It wouldn't be material. Again, I'll give you guys the five-year look back. My initial reaction is that it would not be a material number. Do you guys agree?

**Lena Carroll:** Yes...The indirects are actually in contra---

**Senator Wedding:** Too small.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Let me explain that. I'm going to interpret when Lenna says contra. So within one of the expense lines, it is probably 'other' is what I'm going to guess. So, I got three head nods. It is an offset. So, we've got expenses of a dollar and then we assume within that line there's going to be \$0.50 cents of revenue that comes in to offset those expenses or to reimburse those expenses. All right, Don, one more question. We are going to have to go out and have a beer <laughter>. A Bourbon.

**Senator Wedding:** A Draft.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** No <laughter>.

**Senator Wedding:** You talked about donations, the money that we raise in donations goes to the Foundation.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding cont'd:** We bring in \$3 million here in donations. Whether it be a big splash from one donor, that goes into the Foundation and it is part of your 13 % growth. A lot of the money is uncommitted, some of it is, but it has nothing to do with this budget. We have not brought the Foundation at all into this budget.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So I'm going to push back a little bit and I'll use the institutional aid as a great example. So, when you look at our budget, you'll see your net patient service revenue, you'll see tuition and fees, you'll see institutional aid. The philanthropic support, so, depending on the year, if you go out and you look at the Foundation's annual report, it's around \$30 million that moves from the Foundation over to the University. Where the Foundation dollars can have a direct impact, though, on our budget as an easy example is through scholar-shiping, and we just talked to Tony Borne about this, the opportunity to potentially reduce some of our university aid spend and leverage more of those Foundation dollars directly. So, how we stack up aid, potentially we use donor dollars in lieu of some of our institutional dollars through a pool and matching type function to forego some of that spend and to reallocate elsewhere. So, and my final comment is also and Don, you're absolutely correct. Some of the dollars or most of the dollars nowadays, because donors are very sophisticated, come in very restricted. Where we have an opportunity, though, especially in...progress funds and in other areas—and Mitchell would have to work with the deans on this because it is outside of my lane—but in lieu of university operating dollars, a provost in theory could go to dean and say, hey, I need you to use some of your progress fund to handle some of your day in and day out operational needs as another example.

**Senator Wedding:** Your \$30 million, as you say, comes out of the Foundation, I don't think that's going to academics. We're running surpluses until next year, I guess, but the \$30 million has been used to pay to help bail out the UT physicians, they were down and they needed money, and there was also some equipment purchases for the hospital. I'm not criticizing you.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** No, you're fine.

**Senator Wedding cont'd:** I'm saying that this is where that money went. It did not come to the academics. I don't know where the \$30 million shows up.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** So, and I'll send you the link to their last annual report because I know there's a nice pie chart in there. A lot of it does go directly to the students, which are through scholarships. I'll send you a pie chart. I know there's a ton that goes to students. Now there's also athletics, which, you know, I'll step on that...

**Senator Wedding:** That's not even part of the \$30 million.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** No, but it is because athletics will pull, especially in May and June, 'X' number of millions from the Foundation to help offset some of their losses.

**Senator Wedding:** We didn't even touch that. I didn't want to get this into a 'trash athletics,' but the athletic budget is around \$33 million although at one point, they may have pushed \$40 million. I'm a donor to the athletic program, a serious donor, but my money that I donate goes into the Foundation. They don't use it. It goes to the Foundation. That's where my tax receipts come from.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes, 100%.

**Senator Wedding cont'd:** And the money that they get back from the Foundation is far in excess. In fact, the Athletic Department is supported by over \$20 million beyond what they actually bring in, in ticket sales and donations. And that's also in the Huron report. That number has actually gone up. And I'm not criticizing---

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** No.

**Senator Wedding cont'd:** I'm just trying to get the numbers out there so people can understand them.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah.

**Senator Wedding cont'd:** And your \$30 million you talked about, there was \$30 million that went through the UT physicians and the hospital. As for scholarships, the scholarship money, in the College of Business we have about \$20 million in the Foundation and we pay out about \$900 million a year in scholarships. We do that. That's not part of our budget. I believe that's not part of our budget or if it is, we can't count that as our budget because we're bringing that in and that's coming from the Foundation to us for money that's been donated.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** And so, I'm going to put a bow on this and I'm going to say to Tomer, you've lost control of your meeting sir <laughter>. Before I go to Renee, I will send you, though, the link of their annual report. I think it is pretty insightful in terms of how those dollars come in.

**Senator Wedding:** Do you mean the Foundation?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** Where?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It is absolutely online, I'll send you the link. I do want to clarify, though, to the best of my knowledge thinking back over the last 15 years or so, I do not recall any large payments from the foundation going to support the practice plan. I absolutely recall in 2018, a funds flow between the practice plan and the hospital. And at that point in time when there were conversations around what does the future of UTMC look like, there was definitely funds flow going on there. I do not recall any payments from the Foundation. I could be wrong, but I just want to throw that out there.

**Senator Wedding:** It was mentioned by the president, I believe earlier this year, and I believe that they had to pay. There was a problem with cash flow in the practice, and they gave them \$10 million. And I'm not criticizing. The president said, we need to have doctors if we're going to have a hospital. That was what he said.

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** Yeah, so just to clarify that and then Renee gets the last question, is what James [Holloway] is referring to is it was really a liquidity event on the UTP side where they moved some money from investments into cash to help with operations. That investment was with the Foundation as part of the joint investment portfolio, but it was UTP money on their balance sheet. Renee, last question.

**President-Elect Heberle:** Well, just because it's my job, I have to say parking because we have so many questions about it. We did this parking concession thing back in 2021, based on some kind of argument about financial exigency and issues around getting that \$50 million into our accounts. So now \$50 million is sitting on the books and apparently is making lots of money, but our parking situation is pretty dreadful right now in terms of the expense to our staff, and faculty units, and to our community. So, that stuff has been discussed and will be formalized in five years. But there's just this thing that you're saying about the \$50 million and the \$22 million sitting on the accounts. Is that just in an account to make lots of money for the markets and where do we invest in capital improvements? Is that what that is being used for? So, the \$50 million, is it all about capital?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** No, absolutely not. So the example that I gave tied to reinvesting just in our facilities in general was in lieu of, because many folks will say, hey, you got \$50 million at the Foundation, why don't you call upon that \$50 million? And that \$50 million is absolutely in play and I think the best way to think about it, it's really from a presidential standpoint; it's a strategic reserve for him to invest in whatever initiatives he wants to invest, right?

**President-Elect Heberle:** So that parking concession money that came in through the box and we're now servicing a deadlock for 35 years is sitting there for---?

**Matt Schroeder, Vice President for Finance:** It is to be called upon, now again, as we talked about the Board of Trustees will have to sign off on anything. But it is absolutely, and the president and I have talked about this, it is absolutely a resource that as we are planning out that he can look to and call upon, right? And he will have to. You know, as part of that, it will align with his strategic priorities. He will bring the Board along in the process. But what I was alluding to earlier with the direct placement, it made more sense instead, you know, you spend that \$50 million, it's gone, right? So, it made more sense to keep that reserved there for president or discretion and to place \$40 million with Huntington because the cost of capital is so affordable. All right, Tomer. Thank you very much. Thanks to Faculty Senate, good seeing everyone.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Matt, thank you. So next we are going to Rob, Constitution and Bylaws, he's online. We schedule the two straight forward. What is it? You can have a longer discussion.

**Unknown Speaker:** Are we just going to do the two straight forward ones first?

**Senator Steven:** Can you hear me?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**Senator Stven:** I don't want to take too much time here because we've already reviewed and gone over this document two weeks ago, and since that time you've had the opportunity to look at the document yourself. Actually, the faculty members of the whole university have received this document, and so you may have received some feedback from faculty members. So, now it's our time to think about these changes and whether or not we want to move forward with these changes. So just in terms of what happened last time, we won't do it as a whole bundle, we'll separate it out. And the last two changes are the most straightforward although they are amendments to the actual Bylaws. They are right here; here's the red line changes where the committee moves that we remove any mention of the faculty senate log and the calendar of questions. That influences this article here, and at the very end, this article on the agenda, instead of having calendar of questions, have old business and new business and what we already have on our agenda is items from the floor, so we're formalizing that, putting that on our agenda as well. So, our committee moves that we remove any mention of the faculty senate log and the calendar of questions and modify our agendas as shown here in this red line amendment of changes.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Is there any discussion about that?

**Senator Allred:** Just a question, is the discussion only of those two items right now then?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**Senator Giovannucci:** We probably want to address the items, make sure we have a quorum.

**Unknown Speaker:** We still do.

**Senator Semaan:** We already called a quorum, right?

**Senator Allred:** The quorum never ends, so you can't do it.

**President-Elect Heberle:** There are people online.

**Senator Khanna:** There are fifty-four online, but how many are from Faculty Senate? Should we do roll call again?

**President-Elect Heberle:** We have 53 participants.

**Senator Khanna:** Yes, but they're not necessarily all Faculty Senate.

**Senator Allred:** How many people are the total Faculty Senate?

**Senator Khanna:** Sixty-four.

**Senator Allred:** So we're probably there.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yeah. Any other discussions on this issue of voting on the motion?

**Senator Wedding:** Did somebody bring a quorum challenge?

**Senator Khanna:** No.

**Quinetta Hubbard, Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary:** We just wanted to make sure.

**Senator Wedding:** Well, it hasn't been brought then I don't know why we're discussing it.

**President-Elect Heberle:** We're done.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay.

**Senator Allred:** Motion to vote on those two items then.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Thank you. But there's no real need for motion, but yes.

**Senator Allred:** I'm sorry.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Then let's vote, please. Then let's vote.

Anyone online in favor, please vote yes, or no, or abstain. Here in the room any votes that are in favor, please say, yes. Any votes against, say no. Any abstentions? [1 opposed vote]. **Motion Passed.** Okay. This was just about the changes to the Constitution that addressed this. It will go to the president and

will go to the Board of Trustees, so there is chain of reaction here. Rob, is there another vote that you want to present?

**Senator Steven:** Yes, so this is just a recommendation. This is not any amendment to any of our documentation. In our documentation there is nothing defining the minutes. It talks about the minutes, but it doesn't say what the minutes are. Here we're just recommending that we take a minutes format that is the standard minutes format that is outlined here where all that you're going to have is essentially a hard summary of what actually happened at the meeting, who was there, approvals, exact motions, who made the motions, who seconded the motions, what the voting results are, what that action is for that motion, and anything that needs to be followed up or any assignments that are made, and then the adjournment. This is not any kind of interpretation or summary, this is exactly what has happened during the meeting, and this is something that I think is absolutely necessary. A lot of times when people are referencing the minutes, they want to see what we were voting on, what motions were made, what actions were taken. So I strongly feel and our committee feels that this is something necessary that we need to do for Senate efficiency, and that's to adopt this format.

**Senator Allred:** So just as a clarification, so at this point because I know there's also discussion of using AI transcripts---

**President Avidor-Reiss:** That is later.

**Senator Allred:** That is later? So right now we're just voting on---

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Just that aspect.

**Senator Steven:** For some reason... [Technical Difficulties]

**Unknown Speaker:** I think we're losing Rob.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Rob, we are losing you. For some reason your sound is broken. So, any additional discussion on this proposal? Basically, we're voting on this proposal. We're basically voting on this internal procedure of us changing the way we do the minutes? Any more discussion online?

**Senator Barnes:** Can you repeat it again?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** We basically want to change the minutes from what is it right now to basically something that summarizes the items that actually taken, important, in order to save the time so the Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary can do help us in other activities.

**Senator Barnes:** I consulted my department about this and they actually like the verbatim minutes; not everyone responded, just so few people did, but I also prefer the verbatim minutes.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes, I know that people mentioned two reasons that they like it for: historical reason and also sometimes people do ask for information. So we need to weigh it basically the pros and cons of the two.

**Senator Wedding:** There are two things going on here. Number one we have the transcripts that will remain. They're not being impacted. We're not going to do away with the transcript.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** What we are proposing is to do away with the transcript. That's the proposal. The proposal here is instead of transcript, have a summary of all the actions that happened.

**Senator Wedding:** The minutes will be as you have laid out there, but that does not do away with the transcript, correct? This transcript is still in play. We still can have the transcript.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** The proposal here is to replace the transcript and replace it by these items.

**Senator Wedding:** Are you saying that we will eliminate the transcript?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**Senator Wedding:** And that would be my concern. My concern there is that the transcript contains valuable information, for example, today we heard Matt Schroeder here to give his report. All of that should be on record. For instance, if the president come, or the provost, the many, many people who give their comments which need to be preserved in the transcript. We cannot just do away with the transcript because there's too much information in there. The minutes is simply a brief outline that we give to the Senate, which is not much different from what we're already getting in the way of the agenda. I mean, I understand, but I don't want to see us eliminate it.

**President-Elect Heberle:** Can we be concise in our comments because it's after six and I think we have to vote to extend the meeting?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** No, but I think this is a good point that was mentioned here is that some people need the transcript for information. But what we are asking here, do we prefer that we have the transcript which requires about 15 hours a week to be done, 30 hours for two weeks, which is half of the time of Quinetta? Or do we prefer to use this time for other activities and then we don't have this information? We're just going to have the decision and the basic activity of Faculty Senate?

**Senator Wedding:** I want both.

**Senator Heberle:** Don, let's allow other people to have a conversation.

**Senator Wedding:** Alright, go ahead. I mean we're voting.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes?

**Senator Allred:** It's been pretty evenly divided between the prefer. Personally, my own preference is minutes without an AI transcript, but I think that is opening a whole can of worms. I think that my personal preference is the minutes, but my faculty is evenly divided. That said and since we're running a long time, I do have a request, and I know that this request -- as Rob pointed out, this is not a bylaw matter, this is a matter of procedure, so would it be impossible given the number of people who have asked to poll the faculty as a whole and simply see what the faculty as a whole say? We can conduct, like an online election on both questions? It was six o'clock when we started the discussion, which is a much larger one. Would it be possible to poll the entire body of the faculty rather than voting in Senate? This is just a request.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** No, no, no. I don't know why do we have a faculty senate if we cannot vote on things like that.

**Senator Allred:** I mean we could. Because it is contentious, it seems like it's something that people have very strong opinions about.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yeah, but we are the University of Toledo Faculty Senate.

**Senator Allred:** We absolutely can do it, but I don't dispute that we don't have the right. It is just a conscious request.

**Senator Khanna:** There's a lot of comments in the Chat.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Go ahead and read them.

**Senator Khanna:** So, Barbara Miner wrote---

**Senator Steven:** Point of order, point of order. We need a motion to extend the meeting or not.

**Senator Wedding:** I move.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, any second?

**Senator Hamer:** I don't think it's correct to vote.

**Senator Allred:** Yeah, how long? We also have to specify how long.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** For another 15 minutes.

**Senator Allred:** For another 15 minutes?

**Senator Wedding:** I move that we extend the meeting by 15 minutes.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, do we have a second? Okay, so now we need to vote for that. So, whoever is in favor of extending the meeting by 15 minutes, please say yes, no, or abstain online. In the room?

**Senator Barnes:** There are several nos in the Chat.

**Senator Khanna:** We have to count.

**Senator Steven:** Yes. While they are considering that vote, I just want to clarify. Tomer, I believe you misspoke where you said that we are replacing the transcript with this new format of minutes? No, our proposal, as you can see on the screen, I hope, is that there are two parts: yes, we're recommending this be the standard minutes format with the items that I've highlighted here, but we're also recommending the audio recording and the automatically generated transcript be posted on the website. So, the transcript will be there. It's just not going to be edited to the extent that it normally is.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** *Motion Passed for Meeting Extension.* Okay, so I just want to correct here. So, the idea is according to the proposal right now is that we have the summary for all the decision and there will be a transcript in the form of recording in two fashions, both the AI and the recording itself.

**Senator Allred:** Those are separate issues. One question should be about minutes, which I have mixed votes for. AI and video, I have had consistent nos, and I, myself have had consistent negative problems with it. It's a serious issue---

**Senator Steven:** Sorry to interrupt again. Just a point of clarification, we're not saying video; we're saying meeting recordings, audio recording. Sorry, not video.

**Senator Allred:** Audio and AI have the same issues, right? Audio has the same data scraping concerns where [we're] at a time when we know that data scraped from university's websites can be weaponized, and AI actually makes it easier to do that. AI doesn't do consistently reliable transcripts nor can't, right? You can't get around the problem with eliminations. I've gotten questions about transcripts that are professionally done, but those are professionally done, right? This opens up a massive can of worms and so there is a huge difference between the two proposals. They should be separated. My faculty and I think, a lot of faculty are sort of divided on the minutes questions which I propose polling people, but they're consistently opposed to AI and audio being posted online.

**Senator Semaan:** May I suggest we table this to another discussion because it's not going to be resolved in 15 minutes honestly, and let's get the others that could be done within the 15 minutes?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, Rob, is it okay if we bring this part and then bring the other two different parts, both for just changing the minutes and then both regarding the AI for the beginning of next meeting, is it possible?

**Senator Steven:** I was already separating it. My first proposal was this one on the top to change the standard minutes format to this. If you want to vote on this---

**Senator Khanna:** Rob, can you reshare your screen, please?

**Senator Allred:** Also, Gabby's asked if we can table it and I agree with the motion, so I'll second that, right, for the next meeting. Because this is a longer conversation as you can see, we are hearing from a lot of people online, and we have few items that are sort of much more time sensitive.

**Senator Steven:** Absolutely. Make the motion.

**Senator Allred:** Gaby has already made the motion and I seconded.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, so let's have a vote now for to table the subject for next meeting. Whoever is in favor of tabling it, please say yes in the room and whoever is against, say no in the room and online. *Motion to Table Passed.* So let's move on then to the next item, which is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

**Senator Padilla:** I will be as fast as the... [Indecipherable].

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Thank you.

**Senator Padilla:** Alright, we met on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, and we went through most of what was in our queue. We intend to complete everything that's in our queue at our last final meeting. So, we have 17 items for you to recommend. We're asking if you guys can, so let me read through them quickly.

- CI 4550 Teaching Problem Solving in Mathematics
- HHS 4910 HHS Honors Thesis Project
- PHIL 1750 American Philosophy and Civic Thought
- PHPR 2040 Introduction
- PHPR 3040 Cosmetic Ingredients
- PHPR 4730 Cosmetic Science I
- PHPR 4750 Cosmetic Science II
- PSC 3550 Human Rights and Humanitarian Law
- PHPR 4760 Cosmetic Science Laboratory II
- RCBS 4990 Independent Study
- RCRT 4740 Assessment and Documentation
- RCRT 4750 Group Dynamics and Recreational Therapy
- RCRT 4950 Recreation Therapy Internship I
- COMM 2600 Public Presentations
- CIEC 4930 Internship/Student Teaching in Primary Education
- SOCW 4980 Special Issues in Social Work
- SPED 4080 Curriculum Adaptions and Strategies In Early Childhood Education

**Senator Padilla cont'd:** So, all of these met our criteria and are well done, so we would ask that Faculty Senate to consider passing these.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Any discussion?

**Senator Padilla:** Yes, any discussion? Do you want to have a vote so Sharon can get up here?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**Senator Padilla:** So please write yes, no or abstain in the Chat. In the room, any 'ayes?' Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none. *Motion Passed.*

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Sharon is next.

**Senator Barnes:** I will also be quick. We met Tuesday, March 31st. That was our last scheduled meeting. If there's anything 'dangling' out there, we might be able to vote online. Two courses from the **Art Department, History of Western Art I and II** were previously in the core. They changed their number and never re-upped their arts and humanities core status, so they are asking for that. The committee recommends approval.

**Anthropology 2100, Human Society Through Film.** They're not changing the course at all. It was in the core. They're just entering their SLOs. We recommend approval.

There are three **Math** courses: **1220, 1750, and 1760** that we previously approved in January. I don't know why they keep coming back up, but I'm imagining it has something to do with the Undergrad Committee, that they are changing SLOs for them, and so it's being kicked back to us.

So, we are recommending approval of all six courses. Any questions or discussion on any of these? Can I ask for a vote? All of those in favor, please say 'aye' or post 'yes' in the Chat. Any nays or abstentions? *Motion Passed.* Okay, thanks a lot. The other thing---

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay,

**Senator Barnes:** I'm sorry, one more thing. The working draft of the revised diversity core shared SLOs. I talked about this last time. There was one suggestion that we change the word 'intersection' because of its potentially politically volatile nature. The committee had an interesting discussion; it was not unanimous, but we are of the opinion as a majority that we should leave that term in and the if the folks in the state want to censor or censure us for that reason, then they need to go on record as censoring us for that word. So that is our recommendation. As much as I would really like to have a vote if folks are comfortable voting to approve these, I think we need more time for feedback from the faculty who teach the courses, and I've only just recently sent it out to the department chairs to share with faculty, so I don't really feel like I should ask for a vote today. So are we good waiting?

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**Senator Barnes:** Okay, thank you for the votes on the courses.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Yes.

**President Avidor-Reiss:** Okay, thank you. Good. Excellent. And the last item, do we have any item from the floor? If not, we are adjourned.

**IV.** Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dr. Raghav Khanna  
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard  
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary