

UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 18, 2025
FACULTY SENATE

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

Approved @ FS on 12/02/2025

Summary of Discussion

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

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Good afternoon. I am going to start. Do you hear us online?

Senator Coulter-Harris: There is an echo.

FS President Avidor Reiss: Okay, I call this meeting to order. Right now, I'm going to ask Secretary Coulter-Harris to call the roll.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Good afternoon, Senators.

Senator Kistner: Deborah, the mic is muted.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Can someone help me, please.

Senator Kistner: We can hear you now.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Thank you.

Roll Call 2025-2026

Present: Allred, Avidor-Reiss, Balthus, Bamber, Barnes, Bellizzi, Benton, Bigioni, Bornak, Brakel, Cheng, Cochrane, Coulter-Harris, Diakonova, Dwyer, Elgafy, Fresenko, Gibbon, Gilstrap, Giovannucci, Glassman, Green, Haller, Hamer, Heberle, Javaid, Kalinoski, Kaw, Khanna, Kistner, Krantz, Kumar, Lapitsky, Lawrence, Lee-Smith, Machalow, Maktabi, Martin, McLoughlin, Miner, Mungo, Nazzal, Osman, Padilla, Pryor, Reinert Koch, Sahloff, Semaan, Sheng, Steven, , W. Taylor, Van Hoy, Wedding, Willey, Yonker

Excused Absence: Assaly, Cooper, Delaney, Duggan, Eichner, Ekwenna, Hamouda, Koch, Moussa, Nazzal, Servick, T. Smith, Stolz

Unexcused Absence: N/A

Senator Coulter-Harris: I believe we have a quorum, President Avidor-Reiss.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Thank you, Deborah.

Senator Coulter-Harris: You are welcome.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: The next item is to adopt the agenda. Again, we are going to vote with general consent. Are there any motions to change the agenda? Anything online? No. So, there is no motions, so the agenda stands approved. *Agenda Approved.*

Then next item is to vote for the Minutes. Again, we're going to vote by general consent. So, are there any corrections for the Minutes? Online? No. Since there are no corrections then the Minutes stands approved.

Minutes Passed.

Next, we are going to go to the ***Executive Committee Report***: Over the last two weeks, Faculty Senate Executive Committee members have met with Provost McKinney.

Faculty Senate President-Elect Renee Heberle met with Provost McKinney to discuss a range of issues.

1. She expressed appreciation for his office's engagement with Faculty Senate committees that have expertise in issues related to academic affairs, and they discussed moving forward with this as part of the process.
2. They discussed the cross-listing of courses, as this is a university-wide practice and requires guidance from the provost's office. Time was short, so two of the issues were saved for a future discussion. These include:
 - a. HB 96, the Budget bill passed in the Summer of '25, includes a provision about the BOT and curriculum approvals. Further discussion is needed to determine whether this represents a change or merely a clarification of existing practices. It is worth noting that SB1 shortened the terms of all BOT members and requires them to attend annual training sessions in Columbus with legislative leaders and other consultants. These shifts in dynamics between BOTs and the legislature also warrant our attention.
 - b. How to engage productively with ICTL curriculum proposals.
3. Regarding the biweekly Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting:
 - c. We discussed the new policies
 - d. Agreed that the practice of cross-listing courses is a University-wide curricular and pedagogical issue and should be discussed in meetings with the provost.
 - e. Now that the CRE designation ad hoc committee has completed its mission, we plan to establish a new ad hoc committee to review the allocation of CRE designations to existing and new courses.
 - f. Ashley Pryor has been working with Cathy Zimmer to make the CIM workflow accommodate CRE designation requests and include the review committee.
3. The FS Executive Secretary, Dr. Deborah Coulter-Harris, informed us of her plans to retire at the end of the fall semester. We will hold an election at our next meeting to replace her as Executive Secretary during the spring semester. We also seek a Chair for the crucial Senate committee on Undergraduate Affairs. We thank Deborah for the outstanding service she has provided in this role in the last 4.5 years.
4. Today's guest speaker is Interim Vice President for Research F. Scott Hall. The next Faculty Senate meeting will feature Sammy Spann, Vice Provost and Dean of Students.

5. To enhance communication with faculty, the Executive Committee reports and the PowerPoints from our meetings will be emailed to all faculty after Senate meetings.

FS President Avidor-Reiss cont'd: That concludes the Executive Committee report. Are there any questions or comments? Yes, Renee?

President-Elect Heberle: I just have a brief report from our meeting about parking we had yesterday. Do I need to stand?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: If you come here, it would help.

President-Elect Heberle: Well, if they can hear me.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes, you might want to come over here.

Past-President Van Joy: Over there by Quinetta, right?

Quinetta Hubbard, Faculty Senate Administrative Secretary: Yes, over here.

President-Elect Heberle: Hi everybody. So brief update. Matt Schroeder, Claire Dial, and Brian Kupa (Brian is the Director of Auxiliary Services) met with faculty representatives, Ammon Allred, Missco Joel Boston, myself yesterday for an hour regarding Park UToledo policies and arrangements. Mr. Schroeder convened the meeting. Parking is apparently part of Auxiliary Services. Brian Kupa reports directly to Matt Schroeder, so when Park UToledo action policy, just FYI, Mr. Kupa has the power of working with Claire Dow, who is the Executive Director of Park UToledo and who in turn works for Diogenes Capital. So, all of that will be clear as mud because I just raised through it but hang in there.

A few policy clarifications: If a family has more than one vehicle on a permit, the ticket will be now split or is now split between the vehicles so you're not paying a full ticket price if you have more than two vehicles on campus within three hours of each other. We will be trying to have this policy change back to one hour, etc. Semester passes are available for faculty. That was another question that came up that we got an answer to. If you're parking on the Health Science Campus for medical or pharmacy visits and you receive a ticket, email the word 'patient' in response to the citation and will be waived. Only a license plate is necessary to be permitted in advance to park on the health science campus.

Other things we learned in the big picture in 2021, as you know, each Toledo contracted with Park UToledo, which in turn is managed by Diogenes Capital, a company that specializes in creating parking contracts like ours with universities suffering budget shortfalls. OSU and Akron have such contracts. Dayton and Youngstown may be close to signing on. OSU attempted to cancel their contract; it was not serving them well but was not ultimately able to do so. I don't want to go on about their contract, but ours is different. We used a non-profit as a mediator between Diogenes Capital and UToledo. We didn't get financials because we had very short time and we had the very pressing kinds of concerns that we receive from faculty about holding events on campus and how parking has become an obstacle, a barrier to engaging with our community.

One other big picture is that Mr. Schroeder confirmed or asserted that the debt service timeline of 35 years cannot be adjusted, but the contract can be amended. It is that threesome, Claire Dowe, Brian Copa, and Matt Schroeder in our understanding, the folks that were there when we talked afterwards, that they can amend the contract with Parking UToledo. And in fact, policies have been changed.

In response to meetings with the student committee, the Student Government has had a committee that has met with this group. But faculty have never been addressed by this group or asked to participate in any kind of parking policy, so that's going to change today.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Excuse me, Renee? I just want to remind everyone that we did a huge report on parking on behalf of Student Government.

President-Elect Heberle: Yes, absolutely.

Senator Coulter-Harris: I met with them twice.

President-Elect Heberle: Yes. According to Matt Schroeder, the \$52 million raised by selling boss by Diogenes Capital, that was a service that they offered is on the UToledo balance sheet to be used for capital improvements and there is a board of trustees resolution from the fall of 25, saying that \$40 million is on that budget sheet for capital investment and for leverage for debt in the future. So that \$52 million that we've been wondering where that is based on the balance sheets, is all I can say. And it's four years later and I don't know what that means.

After discussing a multitude of issues with event parking and access for the community raised in your communications with this as a committee, we identified next steps. This is where the next steps will come in. If we all agree, Senate and Graduate Council, and I spoke to the chair of Graduate Council today and he agreed to bring this to the Council, will ask for at least four faculty volunteers to ensure proper representation across campuses and colleges. This group will meet monthly starting in January with Brian Copa and Claire Dow. This working group will develop a systematic need by which faculty and programs organizing events can guarantee affordability for their guests and community members who come to UToledo to serve our students who work with faculty. Right now, if you call the right person and talk to the right person, you might get a donation of parking space for an event if they approve that. We pushed back on that language of donation. Park UToledo is not a 'philanthropy' and we are not an entity in need of philanthropy. We are a public university with 11,000 parking spaces and we should have access to them as conveniently and as easily as possible. It is literally our front door to this university.

So, keep that in mind with my next request, and that is please just let me know if you'd like to volunteer as a senator representing Senate on this committee. I know we're all stretched in, but this issue needs our focused attention. We've not been able to crack the parking nut since 2021, in spite of all the amazing work that has been done by students and the Faculty Senate committee on Student Affairs. But I think with persistence and determination and collaboration, some staff we have an opportunity to make a difference. This will not be at the moment a formal committee of the faculty Senate as we still need to work with Graduate Council to see how we can collaborate to get as many points of view in our many different needs met. But we need a list of willing participants to get started on this new initiative. Thank you very much.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Great, thank you Renee. Any other discussion points from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee or faculty?

Senator Semaan: Yes, just clarification. Is this true that semester passes are available for faculty, but it does not allow them to do payroll deduction - they have to pay out of pocket immediately?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yeah, I remember that they---

President-Elect Heberle: Can you clarify?

Senator Semaan: Semester passes are available, but to pay for the semester pass, payroll deduction is not available.

President-Elect Heberle: That's good to know. This is the kind of thing we, the committee, need to know.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, thank you. Any other comments before we move forward? So next, we have our other business and we're going to start with our president if you have few comments to make.

UT President, Dr. James Holloway: Thank you, Tomer. Thank you for taking some time to hear from me. I'll make a few remarks, updating you on a few things, a few things happening in the world. I also want to make sure I leave time for some quick questions as well. Of the three topics, one is just a quick recap of major initiatives we're launching. Then I'll share information on some metrics that we are trying to put together for the Board of Trustees. And then finally a kind of a DC report and some things that are happening in Washington that are relevant to us.

First, many of you were at the inauguration that we did. I have no intention of repeating the 23 minutes speech that we gave there. But I did want to hit the three major items that I did talk about there, the three major initiatives. The first of which was called **Advanced Toledo**, and that's really about making sure that every undergraduate student has a developmental activity to develop their professional selves for success post-graduation. These are typically experiential education opportunities: co-ops, internships, doing research in our labs or our field sites, education abroad, and those kinds of experiences. We're already well on our way there. Many of our students already have these experiences. So, we really want to formalize that so every student is going to have that kind of experience that prepares them for success after they graduate. Provost McKinney is on-point in making that happen. A key piece of that is actually just developing a really good system for tracking what we already do because we already know that the number of students who graduate have those experiences.

And then the second item was called **Innovate Toledo**. It's really first and foremost about increasing our capacity to do research, especially by developing faculty as teams to work on questions, opportunities, and problems that are inspired by the questions and opportunities of our region. Doesn't mean those couldn't have global impact or broader, but really to look for those research questions that come from the opportunities and challenges of Northwest Ohio. I use the algae bloom as an example, but that's just one example. Those kinds of things we can use to grow a bigger research impact inspired by region. It brings us together across the institution and so really, interdisciplinary work in those spaces with the goal. Seating teams of faculty to develop work with the goal of going after significant larger grants, and this will be the purview of our new vice president for research who we are very close to bringing on board.

The third major area was what we call **Healthy Toledo**. That's really recognizing that the University is unique in the region in educating, the health care workforce, having a clinical platform that provides health care and being able to do work that takes a public health lens to the health challenges of the region. We want to use that platform to try and really advance the health of Lucas County in Northwest Ohio. And that's under the leadership of Charles Callahan, our EVP for health. So, those are kind of the three major thrusts going forward. There are other pieces I mentioned, but I just wanted to mention those in particular.

I said that I'd say a little bit about something we're trying to put together for the Trustees. One of the things that all Trustees asked for, I've never seen an institution where the trustees don't ask for this, is some set of metrics that they can use to sort of monitor the health of the institution. I heard a really terrifying metaphor today, and that is why the Trustees get so focused on rankings? The metaphor I heard is, "well, they are like the stock price." Trustees understand the stock price. That's a terrifying metaphor because rankings are nothing like a stock price, but it is a good, good reminder that many of our Trustees who come from a different world look for those kinds of measures that they can use to understand what is the health of the enterprise. And so, we are trying to put that together. I'm very interested in suggestions. It's a very tricky thing to do to have a set of metrics and measures that give you a global picture of such a complex organization and that are small enough in number to actually be comprehensible.

My initial list had 20 or 30-some, that's too many. But the kinds of things we're looking at, new undergraduate students each fall, new graduate students each fall, degrees awarded (it's really, if you will an input and an outcome.), percent of bachelor's degree recipients with these professional development experiences (with experiential learning experiences), percent of bachelor's degree recipients employed six months after they graduate, research expenditures (a measure one, one kind of crude proxy of research activity), number of PhD students awarded, a number of PhDs awarded. There are various kinds of fiscal measures we can look at:

- what are the consolidated revenues of the enterprise?
- What are the margins? How closely do we match our budget?
- What's the philanthropic income that we get from the Foundation?
- Patient care measures, what's the size of the University of Toledo physician's patient panel?
- How much should that grow from year-to-year? How many emergency department visits?

So, those are some of the kinds of measures we're looking at and thinking about. And again, I have to find some set of measures that will make sense to our trustees as trustees so that they can see how we're progressing, how we're doing, and yet not be so overwhelming that they really become meaningless. And so again, I'm always happy to hear folks saying, you know, here would be a really good way to do it because I sure don't want to use rankings. Rankings are a terrible measure of everything. I had a word for wonderful provost ones who said, she said, "he who lives by the rankings, dies by the rankings." I think that is true. You know, there's an interesting ranking game some schools play which is you just look around, there are a lot of rankings. So just look around and find a ranking where you look good and then ignore the others. Wow. That doesn't make sense.

Quick update from DC. I just spent some time in Philadelphia at the APLU meeting. The Association Public and Land-grant University is one of the major higher ed. organizations. A few things are going on with relation to our relationship with the federal government. As many of you know, over the last several months,

the NIH, the Department of Energy, the National Science Foundation and the Department of Defense all tried to unilaterally change indirect cost recovery rates to 15 %. All of those actions have been stopped by, through legal action. Those legal actions are taken by AAU, PAPLU, ACE, and a few other organizations. So, I mentioned that in part to say, when folks ask me why don't universities work together on these things - we do, right? And so, the APLU is about 200 or so in public Landgrant universities; the AAU which are the 66-some fancy universities; the ACE, which has another... Those are the groups who are running taking on these lawsuits. So, all of those actions are staying at the moment. Some are under appeal, some are final. The National Science Foundation is done, but the other three are under various levels of appeal. In the meantime, the Office of Management and Budget is still trying to roll ahead with printing out new rules, changing what are direct and indirect costs, and setting a 15 % indirect cost rate. At the same time, there has been a model put forward called the Fair Indirect Cost model. That was put together with input from a number of groups, including universities. It's not a perfect model. None is, but it's better than what OMB is proposing we believe.

There are seven pieces of legislation currently in Congress that in various ways promulgate that as the appropriate model. And so, there is actually a legislative action going on that IRA has been able to be part of and get a proposal for an indirect cost model that may make more sense to us than this 15 % flat across the board. On the negative side of the ledger, if you will, there is some legislation going through. One is a piece that's problematic. One is a piece of legislation that says PIs are not eligible for funding if they have had any relationship with the foreign investigator for the last five years. Needless to say, that's a very problematic piece of legislation.

There's another piece of legislation that says a university employee after they leave cannot have foreign employment for five years if they had defense related funding. So, if a faculty member has defense related funding leaves the university, they cannot be employed by foreign institutions. Needless to say, that's problematic in a number of ways. But just from a practical level, the university somehow is supposed to track that. So, there are things going on that we still need to engage with and try and address. There's also some action, some interests to take away the extra time that students in STEM, who have what's called optional practical training can work for a US job for a period of time after they graduate. A student in STEM gets an extra two years, but there's some effort to take that away. So, some things are happening in DC that are in the sort of on the positive side. We're seeing some reasonable movement on indirect cost legislation. We've managed legally to prevent some things from happening that would have been injurious. And on the kind of the negative side, there's still pieces that we have to continue to work on. So, I wish I could say it was all 'sweetness and light,' but no.

So, I'll stop there with just kind of that brief update and see if folks want to ask questions as long as Tomer wants to have them.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: There's some time, yes.

Senator Machalow: Hi, professor. Sorry, President.

UT President, Dr. Holloway: You can call me professor.

Senator Machalow: Sorry. Hi, I'm Debbie Machalow. I'm an assistant professor at the College of Law. I have two questions. My first one I hope is easier. I hope both are easy. But the first one is, will you please come to speak to us at the College of Law?

UT President, Dr. Holloway: Yes.

Senator Machalow: Thank you. My second question is why is the master plan moving forward?

UT President, Dr. Holloway: So, when you say 'the master plan,' can you be more specific?

Senator Machalow: Yes, of course I can. We're talking about the proposed move of the Communications Department into the College of Law building. The 'poor' provost had a question like this at the last Faculty Senate meeting, so I won't repeat everything I said there. But the College of Law is a growing college. We had year over year: last year, this year, and it seems this year also, increases in application volume, 26 %, two years ago, 20% last year. This year we are already up 10% over last year. We had approximately 130 students come in this year and 145 last year. We're growing; we need the space. We had the second highest bar passage in the state of Ohio at 86 %. We're really proud of that. For the metrics, kind of like what you were just talking about, things that we're excited about, we have I believe the 13th lowest debt for our law graduates in the nation. We are tied for 27 for the most graduates to go into public interest. I mean, we need the space. Putting Communications into our building would really harm what we are doing, make it harder for us to recruit new students, new faculty. And I mean, various versions of this plan have been put forward. It's hard enough for us to schedule classes and fit all of our students with what we have. So why is this going forward? And again, please come speak to us because we hope we will convince you not to go forward.

President-Elect Heberle: Someone has their hand raised.

Senator Lawrence: Point of order.

UT President, Dr. Holloway: Can I address the question first?

Senator Lawrence: I raised point of order to the chair of the meeting.

Senator Allred: That's right, sorry, the point of order would have to take precedent.

Senator Lawrence: I would like to ask, this is Senator Lawrence, may I be recognized?

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes, please.

Senator Lawrence: I just would like to suggest that we move on from this question. This has been raised before. This is the third Faculty Senate meeting where it has been raised by our representative from the faculty of Law. I don't think it's the forum to continue that discussion. There are avenues that have been indicated by the Provost at previous meetings, to follow up with the Dean of Law to have this addressed. So, I'm asking you to strike the question and we move on to any other questions because this matter has already been addressed.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Yes---

Senator Lawrence: I have the floor by the way, so you have to respond to my inquiry.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Deborah, do you want to comment?

Senator Machalow: Yes, this is a forum for faculty to raise things of concern. I am here to represent the College of Law, and this is something that we are very, very concerned about. This is the forum where we have the president who is kind enough to come and speak to us. This is where I get the opportunity to ask the question that every member of the College of Law wants answered.

Senator Lawrence: My question isn't addressed to you. Procedurally, my question is as a point of order to the Chair.

Senator Allred: I'm sorry. Also just to back what Patrick was saying, Senate does not take up every matter of the University. Senate has to deal with faculty concerns related to curriculum, programming etc. This is out of order in the context. This is now the third time without Communications having a chance to respond. This is very prejudicial and it's entirely out of order.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Rob, are you online?

Senator Steven: Yes, I am.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: So, what is the policy?

Senator Steven: It is now your decision whether the point of order is valid or not. It is your decision.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Since the President is here and they asked the question, he can answer it and we will move from that.

Senator Machalow: Thank you.

UT President, Dr. Holloway: Again, happy to come and learn more about the College of Law. I've visited some other faculties as well and this would be a great opportunity to learn more about the programs that are going on there. What I will say about the particular issue of space in the Law Center building is there actually is no decision made yet. There are still options being looked at. The other thing I will say, though, is we do of course have to acknowledge that our colleagues in the Department of Communications need to have a good place to be and so, there are multiple constituents here who we have to think about. So, thank you.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, any other questions?

Senator Lawrence: Yes, if I can follow up on that? I appreciate your comments President Holloway, but there is another academic unit at this University that's involved in these conversations. And I do represent faculty, in my case in the College of Arts and Letters, including my colleagues in the Department of Communication, the faculty and their students. I think it is worth noting for Faculty Senate for the record that they are faced with an unfortunate situation where Rocket Hall is presumably scheduled to be removed.

They were not one to advocate to be moved into another location, including the current building in the Law School. They were presented from Auxiliary Services and administration an option to consider expensive renovations, an investment in renewal of that space for the Department of Communication to serve their 200 majors and number of faculty. They have needs in terms of equipment and studio that are also properly tied to the ESPN contract, but they're in need of space. So, I think in this conversation among the Faculty Senate, it should also be noted that we have another group of students and faculty who are represented who have had conversations with Facilities and the administration and have welcomed the opportunity to talk to their colleagues in the College of Law about this. And again, they are not driving this process. They are part of the conversation. So, I think the record should show that we have another academic unit, faculty, and students at this University who are part of the discussion and should be recognized for such. Thank you.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, now we can move on.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: There is a question in the Chat. It is a question about the classification of professional programs and Graduate Plus loans.

Senator Fresenko: I'm happy to clarify anything too. I just put it in the Chat just for time's sake. I was just curious, I'm part of the physical therapy program and this would really impact our students if this passes. I know our national organization is trying to pass this, but I just didn't know from a university level if anything was being discussed or talked about to address this because it sounds like it's an urgent matter that they're going to vote on this pretty early in 2026.

UT President, Dr. Holloway: Thanks for the question. The question really revolves around changes to the graduate plus loans that have been proposed changes to definitions of what are professional programs. This is actually part of the work that we're engaged in in DC, in particular through APLU. And so, there is still a lot of advocacy going on in DC around this issue of what constitutes professional programs. I would say considerable congressional uncertainty about how things landed, where they landed. So, my sense is for the most part, legislators in DC do not want to disadvantage some of these very important professional programs which include, for example, MDs as well as physical therapists and some others. So, thanks for flagging it, but this is a place where there's active advocacy going on in DC.

Senator Barnes: Sharon Barnes, Department of Women's and Gender Studies. Long ago here at UT we had Board of Trustees members visiting the university, the campus, sitting in on classes, getting to know faculty. I think it's a really useful opportunity for them to interface with us directly. In a less long-ago time that was removed as a possibility. I would just suggest that I think it might provide an opportunity for Board members to get a better sense of how hard we work, the kind of work we do, the ways we engage with our students and how that process is really rich and meaningful in ways that they may not see just looking at a set of metrics. It might be useful.

UT President, Dr. Holloway: Yeah, I appreciate that suggestion that was not aware that was a previous practice. I wasn't aware that that was a previous practice, but that's not a bad one.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, we will move on. If there are more questions, send them to the Faculty Senate Office and we will forward them to the President.

UT President, Dr. Holloway: Or send them to me.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Exactly. Next is our Provost.

Provost McKinney: Thanks, Tomer.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Sure.

Provost McKinney: Just a few updates and reminders, and I'll see if I can get us back on track. So, first is a thank you and a reminder, a thanks to the faculty. I've been noting earlier today the very constructive feedback sessions that we have had, two thus far on the events Ohio Higher Education Act policies that we sent out two or three weeks ago. We started feedback sessions on the 12th. Yesterday we were at the Health Science Campus with our second feedback session and then next Monday, back in Stranahan Hall from 12-1:30 p.m. I invite you to join us on the draft policies that we shared. We have received numerous comments, input that has already led in terms of the growing list that we have of changes, edits that we will make to those policies. So, I encourage you to please participate in the third and final session that will take place next week.

As Renee indicated earlier, the work that we have been doing now with Faculty Senate committees and I believe Renee, this was the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee where the policies that we shared have been drafted, syllabi statements - one statement on mutual respect, a statement of electronic recording of classroom activities, a state statements on the use student use of artificial intelligence in the classroom that it's my understanding now that all of these policies have been finalized, vetted, particularly the statement on electronic recording of classroom activities through General Council and are ready to disseminate. So, we will be doing that in posting and disseminating to the faculty and so be on the lookout for those.

Let me encourage you, I'm bringing this as a reminder announcement to participate, this is International Education week. And yesterday I had a very good meeting with the Council General Keisha Murray of the consulate of Japan in Detroit who was here. I was unable to go to the lecture, but in that meeting in the afternoon, they reported standing room only, a hundred and nearly 30-40 folks participating as part of that lecture. All throughout this week—and I've got a couple of links that I think Scott's going to put in in the Chat—all throughout the week a number of activities relating to International Education Week, I encourage you to participate.

Under the category of supporting our students, I bring these reminders and announcements. One, there will be a link of, I hope you'll join me and I'm encouraging others to participate in the Eberly Center's Toy Drive for our students' parents and their children that we can support throughout this holiday season. You can find the information there. I'm passing this information along to all of the folks and audiences that I'm in front of as it relates. Here I don't have a link, but I'm going to find the information. I was in a meeting earlier today with our Student Government leaders, and they shared with me the Student Government's plan for food drive food assistance for our students over the winter break that will remain on campus in the resident's halls, many of these are international students, during a period where dining services is not available or is closed on campus. Student Government will continue to lead the effort of collecting food assistance, food items to provide to our students who are in the residence halls during the winter break where on campus there will be no food services available. And so, I will follow up and make sure we get the week where we can all participate in that effort to support our students. So, a number of initiatives of ongoing and I look forward to your participation from where I tried to get us back on track as much as possible.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Just two brief things. One is, will Auxiliary Services be making sure that students are cared for if they're staying in the dorms during the break? And secondly, maybe that's a question for Matt Schroeder so I don't know if that's something you would know.

Provost McKinney: So, on that front, I did ask the question, will Auxiliary Services in the residents' hall be staffed? Yes, it will be open. And so, my question was now, will our students need to relocate to a certain area or wing? And according to Student Government, no. They will be able to stay in their current housing. So, my assumption is that Auxiliary Services will remain available except for the dining services.

President-Elect Heberle: Okay I just wanted to raise the question, and we can follow up with Matt. But the other thing was just to clarify for our colleagues that the statements that Provost McKinney is referring to are optional. The whole initiative began because in the early town hall that we held, faculty were raising concerns about what they were able to put, legally put on their syllabi under the terms that SB 1. So, none of these are required. There's no vote required. There's just, these are statements that would be available on the provost website, like they always have been, but they were so sorely out of date that we decided we would go ahead and do this. Senate just facilitated the communication between the players.

Provost McKinney: Well, thanks to the members of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee who really did great work on this.

Senator Heberle: Yes, they did a lot of work.

Provost McKinney: I saw another hand.

Senator Lawrence: This is in regard to your ongoing forums and feedback on the policies related to SB 1. Can you update us then on the timeline? We're in an open 30-day comment period. To my understanding, the Board will meet on December 17th. They have their obligation to report to the state that you passed these bills. If there are modifications that you're mentioning, will that change that timeline? Will those modify policies then be made hopefully available so people can see the changes that were made in advance of them being approved?

Provost McKinney: So, in terms of our work with Faculty Senate, I sent a message earlier today, an email to the Chair of the Policy Committee that yes, we will make those edits and changes and then send it back to the Chair of the Policy Committee.

President-Elect Heberle: Academic Regulations.

Provost McKinney: Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Any other questions?

Senator Barnes: Yes. Is it possible to require a dining hall to stay open for all of our students who are staying on campus during the winter break? I mean, you wouldn't have to have every dining hall on campus open, but one so that they can have a place to eat.

Provost McKinney: Sharon, that's a good question. When this was brought to me by student leaders today, my line of questioning was, okay, what can we do? How can we support these students? I think that would be the type of question that we certainly will raise in terms of going forward. And quite honestly, I asked that question. However, I don't want to, at this point, press to the point of well, if we can't have the dining services available, then one route would be to then close the residents' halls. So, that's not an option. We will find ways to provide food assistance for those students. But I think that's an excellent question.

Senator Barnes: I think it's great that Student Government is doing what they're doing and I'm happy to support that effort, but this just doesn't feel like something other students should be doing alone. It feels like something we should do as well.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: My recollection is that this is an ongoing issue. This has happened for several years. It is usually international students that remain. But my recollection is that there are some accommodations made to make sure that these students have access to food. Perhaps the food drive is to provide an alternative to walking all the way across campus when there's inclement weather. I don't believe there is 'no food' on campus for students.

President-Elect Heberle: So, we are just supplementing some available...?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes. Again, this has been happening for years. This is not new.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Yes.

Senator Barnes: I think walking across campus is different than---

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Right. And I believe there is some service provided.

Senator Barnes: Thank you for that.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: That's my understanding.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, thank you. Next, we have the Chair of the Committee of Academic Regulations, James Oberlander. He has a quick report.

Chairman James (Jim) Oberlander: Hello, everybody. My name is Jim Oberlander. I am the Chair of the Academic Regulations Committee this academic year. So, I don't really have much of a report at this point. Most of the policies that came forward had to do with SB 1. Our committee reviewed them and individuals were encouraged to go to the forum, share feedback. We shared feedback, but in terms of my role as the chair, we cannot at this time recommend the policies as written. That was our stance. Can you elaborate a little bit more on the question that was posed as to the timeline once the recommendations, feedback, edits, modifications have been made? What the process then is going to be for faculty and then for the Academic Regulations Committee.

Provost McKinney: So, you and your committee will receive the revised versions of the policies once the comment period is closed and you're able to complete the revision process.

Chairman James (Jim) Oberlander: Okay.

Senator Wedding: Will it be available for everybody on campus? Will it be just to that committee?

Chairman James (Jim) Oberlander: Do you have to go back through a 30-day period again or anything like that?

UT President, Dr. Holloway: So let me explain. So, there won't be another 30-day period. The trustees will consider the policies on the 17th. So, when they are revised, come back to you, they are at that point public, anyone can see them. But any additional revisions would have to be made quite rapidly.

Past-President Van Hoy: When does the 30-day comment period end?

Provost McKinney: The 3rd of December, I believe it's the 3rd. It was posted on the 3rd of November.

Past-President Van Hoy: So, the committee can expect to get revised policies on the 7th?

Provost McKinney: I would say sometime very quickly after the 3rd.

Past-President Van Hoy: Oh, okay, because they are being worked on now?

Provost McKinney: Yes.

Past-President Van Hoy: Okay. But still, it is going to be a tight window.

Provost McKinney: Yes.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: So, basically around December 3rd or 4th, you will send it to the committee and then the committee can send it to faculty and everybody else stating 'you must reply immediately if you have additional concerns because there is no more time.'

Senator Machalow: Sorry, so I just want to make sure I'm following. So, the revised policies will be made public shortly after December 3rd? And if for example, the committee had further thoughts, what would be the process or could other people have further thoughts? What is the process, write to the Board of Trustees and be like, hey, please change this before you approve it or?

Provost McKinney: I would think if the committee has further thoughts at that point then they could share with us with respect. But as we said, it would be very quickly, as in about a week or so we'll be sending them to the Board to review.

Past-President Van Hoy: And any faculty who want to, you know, who see them and want to participate should then maybe send their comments to the committee, right? Then you get one set of comments.

President-Elect Heberle: Right.

Chairman James (Jim) Oberlander: Since they are public we can share them with faculty just to remind them that these are public, these are the modifications, share with the committee any questions you have immediately. Sounds good. Anything else?

President-Elect Heberle: Thank you, James.

Chairman James (Jim) Oberlander: Thanks.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, our own Vice President of Research is next.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Thank you for the invitation to speak today. I am Scott Hall. I am the Interim Vice President for Research, apparently for about two more months. See how that goes. I joined the Research Office in January 2025, perfect timing. So, it's been an eventful year: Federal executive orders, threatened cuts to federal funding for research, threatened cuts to indirect cost recovery which was already mentioned, grant reviewed delays, funding delays, the longest federal government shutdown in U.S. history which recently just ended for now, changing grant requirements and increased regulatory requirements. I'm going to talk about a little bit. Most of those don't have to do with the new administration. A lot of those were things we were already dealing with. They're ongoing, but they are gaining extra impetus. So why do we care so much about the federal government? Most of our research funding comes from the federal government. And this has been consistent over a long period of time, about 80 %. It is unlikely that that is going to change. There has been some discussion about a vast sum of money that some people believe exists in industry that we can tap into. I believe certainly we could have stronger relationships with certain industries in a variety of ways, and we should do that, but it will not replace federal money. Federal money primarily pays for basic scientific research, which is the majority of our research portfolio like most universities and so, there isn't an easy replacement for that. We could expand other areas of research that are more applied, certainly. I think that's something we should do, but we're not going to be able to replace that federal funding.

So, threat and cuts to federal funding. This happened about the quote unquote “big, beautiful bill” was being passed. This was a tax bill. It was not actually a funding bill, but in order to sell the tax cuts, they said that they would later cut funding. One of the things they emphasized was cutting funding to these agencies. Those are some of the percentages that were suggested which caused panic in the scientific community. There were editorials in most of the scientific journals at the time saying how deleterious this would be to research, to education, and to our economy. It did not materialize in the budget bills. This is not the first time that it has been suggested that this should happen by certain forces within our governments; but whenever it comes to actually making the budgets, most senators and most congressman don't actually agree with cutting scientific research that much, either out of self-interest because they look at how much their own states are getting from this or simply out of knowledge of what scientific research brings to us. However, it remains to be seen what will happen and whether there will be more cuts. There have been a variety of cuts for other reasons. They haven't focused upon certain areas or certain funding agencies.

Of greater impact at UT, you can see where the funding delays at the beginning of the year, and these largely happened because of a series of executive orders. What they did was say that certain types of research should not be funded, and not just not funded going forward, but they started to look at all

current grants and started canceling grants. The graph below actually came from again, tutorial in nature about this. In the last two lower bars sort of show what happened at the beginning of the year. In particular there was a decrease in renewals and grants. To a certain extent this was a delay. By the end of the fiscal year, for instance, NIH had largely caught up with spending all of their budgeted amounts. We are still struggling to recover from that. So, a lot of universities experienced grant cancellations or simply the administration said they could no longer receive money from the federal government and started negotiating with them terms under which they would get their federal funding back.

The University of Toledo was not substantially affected by this. We did have four grants canceled. Our T32 training grant in the College of Medicine and Life Sciences was terminated, quite unfortunately. The deans of the colleges associated with those students stepped up and they were all taken care of. This probably meant that other money that might have gone to new PhD students did not occur. However, we appeal that. We generally appeal all grant cancellations. We wrote a letter to the agency, and in this case, it was NIH. According to them, grants can only be canceled under two conditions, neither of which was meant by the cancellation. That was my argument in the letter. The appeal comes from the Institutional Official. Which you should remind everybody that the Institutional Official is the VPR for research that's delegated from the president. Other people occasionally sign for things and that's actually not allowed. It's something we found.... But in any case, the appeal was denied. No explanation whatsoever. But we will fight for everything we can.

There were four major agencies that announced a cut to 15 % overall. NIH, DOE, NSF and DOD, the leading collegiate organizations including APLU, AU, and so forth, banded together and launched suits against all of these. Our interim president, at that time Matt Schroeder, provided letters to go along with this and I provided information to support the case and the lawsuits. We were stating how the reduction and indirect rates would affect the University of Toledo. A large number of universities did this to go along with the lawsuits. We had to demonstrate an actual financial impact that was deleterious to the university. So, as the president mentioned, all those suits have been highly successful resulting in initial restraining orders and then injunctions. One of them went to completion and was permanently vacated. All of the hearings have shown that the judges are kind of mystified by the government's position, nonetheless, there are appeals moving forward in the other three cases. Presumably they will all be successful. However, that does not end things. As the president mentioned, there are legislators that are seeking to change. That's interesting. Institutions of higher education are getting these reductions. Private organizations are not. They are excluded and they generally have much higher indirect cost rates.

So, there's a variety of suggestions. One has been the fair model. It was actually put together by the Joint Associations group as they call themselves Academics from a number of universities were actually led by somebody from, I don't remember which university, but he is former scientific advisor to Donald Trump during the first Trump administration which may say something about the model. It defines costs within grants as three elements: (1.) standard PI costs in doing research, (2.) what they termed essential research support (which basically means things that were previously considered to be indirect costs have now become direct costs) and general research operations. The reason why a lot of legislators have not liked the way we do indirect costs and FNA charges is that it is not a very transparent system. The problem is, to make it a very transparent system requires an awful lot of cost. A lot of accounting becomes horribly cumbersome and expensive. It takes away money from actually doing research. So instead, we go through this complicated process every five years; I believe we negotiate with federal governments and we come up with an indirect cost rate based upon what it actually costs to do research aside from the money that

they're paying for research. People do want something a little bit more transparent, but that transparency will come at a massive cost.

My opinion of the fair model is that it's not very good. It is not very transparent. However, it may be the best thing that we can get. We'll have to see what happens going forward. There is a lot of impotence behind this. There will still be a certain amount of indirect cost recovery that ends up being about 15 %. The advantage of this one is that certain indirect costs are allowed to be moved into the grant as direct costs. Now the problem with that is that the amount to the grant does not go up, so that takes away from the money to do research. So, that's one of the problems with it. The overall indirect cost for recovery will be reduced, so we've lost... So, we'll have to see how this moves forward, all of it. There's nothing specific now. All of this is being negotiated behind the scenes in Washington, so we just have to wait and see what happens.

Alright, so this was a slide we made up earlier in the year. I just want to point out- for a lot of the discussions surrounding all these issues, we were trying to give actual numbers to things. If 15 % went through, this would cost the University of Toledo about \$7.4 million a year. Just to give you an idea of what sort of impact that would have.

Alright, we have had a variety of other challenges. I included this one, simply because of its potential impact on research. So, the restriction of H-1B visas happened in September, it was intended largely for high tech companies but there were no exclusions for things like institutes of higher education. There were a variety of exclusions, so if you already had an H-1B visa, you are fine. If you were applying for one from outside the country, it's problematic. One of the exclusions that is potentially nice for us is that if you're already here on a student visa, which is a path to getting an H-1B visa. You don't have to pay the hundred thousand dollars that they were talking about. Now, for us in research, one of the problems with that large fee, which remains to be seen. They haven't clarified it, nobody's said anything, but presumably we would have to pay it if we hired a post doc from another country or a faculty member from another country. So, this could be very expensive, potentially for the university. Those issues have not been clarified. There are quote unquote exemptions for a US worker not being available or it being in the national interest. Generally, when you have a highly specialized research scientist, you would argue that that would come under that. I'm not certain that will be considered to be a valid argument. So, it remains to be seen how this will end up impacting.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Is this already active?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Yes, as of September 21, this is already active. So we are basically seeing, I don't know if Scott wants to comment on that. I mean, he said to deal with that a little bit more, I think.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: We've been communicating with Maryam Sedique in CISP, and she pointed out the exception for candidates who are already here during faculty searches. And these visas do not apply to students so far. So, that's all we know.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Good. Thank you, Scott. All right, the federal government shutdown came to an end. I will skip over a lot of that. We didn't end up getting affected that much despite the length of the shutdown. We were kind of lucky. The big problem would have been for grants to expire during the shutdown because there was nobody there to renew them. So, the question

becomes what do you do during that gap period? So, we had been in discussions about that, but we did not have any substantial problems. It was one grant in Pharmacy, and I spoke to the Dean, and she very kindly took care of the situation for us, but then the shutdown ended. Just because of timing, we tend to have a lot of grants that happen on certain dates. There are a lot that end on December 31, a lot on March 31, a lot on June 30. So, if it happened at one of those times it would have been far worse for us, so in that respect, we're a little bit lucky. We were planning ahead to see how this would affect us if it continued to go on. One of the things to keep in mind is this is not entirely over. For most of the funding of the government, it's by continuing resolution that goes till January 30, right? The question is what happens at that point and the Democrats have already given up most of their leverage? We don't know how that's going to impact us. We don't know what the new budgets for these agencies are going to be like. A couple of them were funded throughout the year. The Department of Agriculture and the FDA are funded for the whole fiscal year, but all the rest remains to be seen. So, like everything else we'll just kind of keep an eye on it and we'll do what we can.

Alright, so residual effects of the government shutdown: So, the government was shut down for a long time. This is kind of potentially similar to what happened in the spring, where the agencies became very dysfunctional for a period of time. So during the shutdown, there were no study sections meeting, there were no decisions being made, there were no letters going out. Now they're back and they're playing catch up and it's almost the holidays, and then on top of that, January 30th is coming up. So, we potentially have a situation that maybe a little bit like spring. So, an example of what happened in the spring is the graph I made there. This is by quarter; you can see in the light blue there is for fiscal year 2024. And the up and up and downs of the quarters, by the way, are very typical; that's when the sort of funding decisions are being made by NIH, and NSF, and the other major agencies. So, the first quarter and the last quarter are usually quite high. In the middle, particularly quarter two, the holidays slow down everything. There are fewer deadlines, fewer decisions being made, then it picks up in the spring, and then there's a lot in the fourth quarter. So, you can see there that in the first and second quarters of 2025, we were right on track to do as well as the previous year. We were looking at another \$72 million. Third quarter starts to drop off, so that's January, February, and March. And then in quarter four, you can see there's a substantial problem. So that was what our last fiscal year has been. It has been a little bit slow, but I think it is acceptable under certain circumstances for 2026 so far.

There are a couple of other things I want to mention. We've had a variety of challenges in relation to new grants for terms and conditions. There are always lots and lots of terms and conditions: 'Don't use the money for lobby.' 'Don't steal evident money.' All sorts of standards, different things like reporting. But we're getting other things done. So, things like 'no DEI,' a lot of those were following up on executive orders, but also other things. One of them that came through—this was for NASA, but I'm expecting it from some of the other agencies—is approval of media statements by sponsor. Now in terms of a scientific publication, you're fine, that is perfectly fine. But if you're talking to a newspaper, if you're taking a picture of your student's poster supported by the work and putting it on social media all of these things require approval. Now one of the first people affected by this, I had a discussion with him about it and said, how do you feel about this? I mean, our only choice here really is to turn down the award. He said, "Well, obviously we don't want to do that." But he also said something to me. He said that "this is actually the agency trying to protect itself." So, the people in the permanent federal government that run the agencies are trying to keep the research dollars flowing. They're trying to get it right now. Now, it is a very difficult gray area, it's a difficult line to walk. I think every time we get something like this, I'm

going to talk to the individual PI and say how do you feel about this? Because at some point somebody might say that I can't do this under these conditions. But I think it has to be the choice of that individual about what to do about this award. I don't think we can do a blanket across. But so far, it's only happened a couple of times for NASA awards, so we'll see how this happens going forward. This also emphasizes something else that I happened a little bit later is we need to be very careful about reading the terms and conditions of our grants. I don't think we always do. I think we skim those contracts; we look for the stuff that's important to us. The rest kind of goes by. Particularly those links to websites that list even more terms and conditions, which is something... So, I think we have to be very careful about this going forward.

Okay, this is another thing that came up, everything is about AI this year, so obviously your research has to be about AI. But we have something specific. So, people were starting to use AI to write grants. In one grant cycle, somebody submitted 60 grants – in one grant cycle. So, NFH decided to do something about it. They said, first of all, no AI and grant writing at all. They have AI detectors, so if anybody cheats, you will not get funding obviously. I've considered trying to get one for research and sponsor programs, so we can just double check, but we're just going to leave it up to the PI's and hopefully nobody runs into trouble. The other consequence of this is that they (NIH) also decided to limit six submissions per PI, per year as PI. You'd have more than six submissions, but only six as PI. So that's two per cycle at NIH, which some of our more successful researchers with bigger research programs could run over. Now there are always alternatives to that because everybody is collaborators. People with big labs like that have senior postdoctoral fellows that should be transitioning into independents. There are potentially workarounds, but people really need to be careful about it and plan for their submissions because you're going to get six. If you want more than six for the group, then you have to figure out ways to. So, we pointed this out. Now, in addition to that limitation, the fact the prohibition on AI, if you get caught using AI in a grant submission, it will be considered potentially research misconduct. So, there could be very serious penalties including not being able to apply for grants in the future. Now, in their description, they did not say that there would be penalties to the institution; it would be to the individual, but we probably have to look for that going forward. If they have more problems, they will hold us accountable.

Alright, additional training, I'm going to go through this quickly. People are not filling out their other support disclosure very well. They were leaving things out. It seemed to happen all the time. We had this with the PI recently, we asked them about a conference in China and they said, 'oh, no, no, no, they didn't give me any money at all - well, they paid for my travel, it was like four grand.' Like, ok, well, that counts, you have to disclose that. That's why they pushed training. The training was put into the research security training module which not everybody has had to take in the past, but most of the agencies are now requiring everybody to take. We're going to start with that; an announcement will be going out saying everybody has to do the research security training. It's required, the DOE. NIH put off the requirement for a little bit, but I think it's coming in January. It's going to be the majority of our grants, so at that point we're just going to say everybody needs to do it. It'll be good for them too, to be honest. The training course is like three hours long. We have increased export-controlled issues. The university has just hired an export control officer that will help deal with some of those issues. And responsible, conductive research for graduate students we do very well there. We have lots of in-person training. We do not have in-person training for PIs, and that's now a requirement at most agencies, so we're going to be working on instituting to fulfill that. All right, research numbers.

All right, fun stuff. First of all, despite all that horrible news, I feel like every time I speak to people, I do nothing but tell them bad things. We became an R1 university only in February. That feels like it was years ago at this point, but that was not that long ago. That is a great achievement for the university and that was judged based upon numbers from fiscal year 2021 to 2023. You have to get above \$50 million in research on average during that period, you have to give away at least 70 PhDs. We were well above all those numbers. Our 2024 numbers were way above that. Despite being off in 2025, we were still way above those numbers. The next time we were assessed is in 2028, and almost no matter what happens the rest of the year and next year, we should be perfectly fine. So, we will be able to continue that. And to be honest, the year is not going too hard. So here's some numbers. These are research expenditures. The box is what we are judged on for the R1 classification and doctoral degrees granted. We had a slight reduction last year, but really the number we've given away for like ten years has bounced around between like a hundred and a hundred and 20 or so. Before 2021, actually the next slide I think shows us research expenditures: the box is what we're judged on for the R one classification and doctoral degrees granted. So, you see there we had a slight reduction last year, but really the number we've given away for like ten years has bounced around 100-120 or so. There was actually a nice rise during that period. Although if you go back another ten years, we have another \$72 million here. It kind of went down for a little bit and then we've been going up—other than last year—for about the past five or six years.

Alright, these are new grant awards. You can see that slight rise over this period. The new grant awards never quite line up exactly with the expenditures, which may be an issue. We don't always spend all the money on our grants. We need to be careful about that. People hold stuff back. People don't always use all the salary on grants. It's something they've been trying to investigate to find out why we're doing things like this. Sometimes it takes a little while to get going or other things or people want to hold money over for the NCE. We need to use every dollar. So, you see, last year was down a little bit, but it was still not entirely a bad year. We are also down in PhDs granted—wait, that is misleading. This isn't total number of PhD students; this number is the number of new PhD students. The actual number of PhD students is 500 to 600. So you can see a couple years ago we had kind of a...year; we had 120 new PhD students which has gone down a little bit, and it's been bouncing around between about 90 and 120 for a long time. If you go far back enough, there was an increase at a certain point. I'm not sure that's reflecting a downward trend, but it's something to be concerned about. One of the things we need to consider is how we fund PhD students because there's been a long-term trend over about the last ten or 15 years. The university used to support a lot of PhD students and now we really need to be supporting them off grants. People don't always add students on grants because it takes away from the money that could potentially be used on themselves. For small grants, it's hard to do. It is something that we are going to have to discuss and consider in the long term, how do we do this? One of the things I mentioned at the end is ---

FS President Avidor-Reiss: I think we should really go back to the policy that we had in the past that PhD students are not on the grant and then you're going to see more PhD students.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Well, I think it's a matter of debate. For whatever you do, the money has to come from somewhere. I've had somebody ask me for money every single day I've been in this job. I cannot say yes to all of them.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: We are not asking for money, we are asking you not to take the money that we are trying to get from the university.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Well, there's that question of how much is its real money because it is kind of moved from one place to the other in the university, but that's a different matter. I kind of think we should be putting more students on big grants and we should be getting bigger grants that can support students as well. I'll come back to that in a few minutes.

President-Elect Heberle: Just quick. How much do you think this is going to be impacted by international student attendance because PhD students, I feel like they're potentially going to be impacted?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Potentially, yes. We saw that a little bit with international undergraduate students this year - people just had a difficult time getting into country. I mean, people will adapt to it. They will start to leave a longer period of time, but it depends on what happens with immigration, but potentially, it can absolutely affect us. Now, we can try and get more students from the United States. But you know, most of the people in the world are not in the United States. Most of the smart people in the world are not in the United States.

Senator Coulter-Harris: That's not nice.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Well, the world is a big place.

Senator Lawrence: Yes, I just want to follow up on that as a department chair who has a PhD program in which we do get a significant amount of international applicants. Currently, 48 % of my graduate students are international. This year we didn't see the effect because most of them were able to get into the..., although we had two students deferred to January. But that is not unique in past years with enrollment. I think the problem, though, is potentially we're facing the issue in terms of them coming here on a student visa, many of whom, and I have had many alumni all over the US who did this, to migrate to the H1-B1 here in the United States. So as long as we continue to have some uncertainty about issuing H1-Bs from students who are already here, that's going to create a situation where there may be fewer international students willing in coming over to my program or programs in the US, because of the level of uncertainty that they will be able to stay here, seek employment, especially if OPTs and CPT are also impacted. Our students take advantage of that and are very successful with getting professional careers including here in the Toledo community, by the way, in Northwest Ohio. I got a fair number of alumni in my graduate program... working here as part of our engagement with the community. It is potentially a problem; it is not an easy one that can be replaced...It is very competitive across the United States. We have track records and pipelines of international students. The students who come here are very good. They do great research. They do great work in terms of securing their PhDs and become very well-trained valuable professionals working in key positions here in the United States. That could really be impacted.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Well, one of the exclusions seems to be if they graduate from US program, then they can get an H1-B visa. I was almost wondering whether we should advertise that in terms of a path to an H1-B visa. I'm not sure what people would think of that, but we will have to keep an eye on that. So far, I don't think it is too much of an issue. Alright, there's one other

thing we should mention here in terms of the rise in research funding: In the blue there you can see the rise since fiscal year 2019. So, before that it sort of bottomed out there for a little bit under 50 million. It was about 70 million about 15 years ago. It kind of went down and now it's gone up. Obviously, we want to maintain that trajectory as well too. But one of the ways we should really present these numbers is not the amount of money we make, but the amount of money we make per faculty member. So FTT is full time tenured and tenured track. So you can see that yellow line going down. So obviously we're making more money off of fewer people.

Senator Coulter-Harris: That's because you're hiring more lecturers.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Yes, we are certainly hiring more lecturers to keep the academic programs open. That is definitely one part of it and teaching loads in general are going up.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Right.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: But despite that, our dollars were in fact going up. There is another thing there too, which for a number of years we have not been hiring junior professors. So, until this year, every single member of my department was a tenured full professor, aside from some lecturers which are important to our academics. That does not bode well for the future. We have to have those junior faculty coming up. Now, we have hired a junior faculty member in our department, so now we have an assistant professor, but still no associate professor. I think a lot of departments have been in this position for a little while, and that's going to affect...

So, research dollars this year over the first four months were just shy of \$20 million, which under the circumstances, I kind of consider to be a win. We were potentially going to be at least last year depending on what happens with the rest of the year. You can see in fiscal year 2025, we're quite ahead of this at that point. This is the distribution across colleges, which I always point out. So, the majority of our research funding really comes from three colleges: the College of Medicine and Life Sciences, NSM and Engineering, although there's contributions from across the campus. One of the things I've been doing is talking to absolutely everybody because even though some of the colleges don't get as large of an amount, it is still very important to their functioning the things that they do. So, we really do want to increase this across the board. You see the gray kind of across the board, the numbers kind of went down last year, fiscal year 2025. I present this like every time I talk to the Research Council. Over the year we watched the numbers for the year to grow, so hopefully they will end up matching.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: This is an impressive cut, but I think it would be very interesting to see if you do it again per number because some of the colleges here may have fewer people than we do.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: That gets to be hard in terms of deciding, oh, who's an active researcher—

FS President Avidor-Reiss: But you can---

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Yes, I'm trying to split the numbers in as many ways as possible to gain understanding.

Senator Coulter-Harris: But on this slide shouldn't Arts and Letters and Education be combined?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Yeah, actually, some of them we have already started to combine. Because this went back years, we have the categories that reflect those colleges.

Senator Coulter-Harris: Oh, okay. Thank you.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Before I go, I want to draw your attention to some things and by this, I mean, draw your researchers' attention to this so please spread the word as much as possible. So grant submissions, please leave extra time. The vast majority of people do things in a very timely manner and get their stuff done, but we spend probably half of our time on that 3% of people who not who get irate the day before the due date. They say, 'I really want to submit this. Why can't you submit this? I have all my stuff done.' Well, you haven't given us enough time to do it. Then they'll say, 'oh, by the way, there's a sub award.' Yes, give us time; especially now because there's a lot of extra stuff going on - there's extra stuff we have to check. So, no sub awards, no other universities involved and give us five-10 business days, please. We have to do some back and forth with the other university to sort out contracts and budgets and things, so it takes a little bit of time. If there are new circumstances- so one of the things we're getting, is I think people are getting concerned about funding. They're searching out alternative mechanisms. We've had applications go out to several international agencies recently. So, if it is a new sponsor or a new type of mechanism, give us a little bit of extra time to figure it out. There may be a completely different submission portal or something else, so we just want to make sure it's right and we have the best shot. And so please give us a little bit of extra time.

Limited submission proposals: So for certain grants, we can only submit one from the university or perhaps one from each campus. So, there's a process for this. If you actually go to our website, it tells you what to do. But when we find out about it, it's not first come, first served. So just because you found it doesn't mean you get to submit. We write to the university, we say, hey, there's this limited submission application. Do you want to apply? We take all the applications, and we get some faculty members together, have them evaluate them and they pick. So if you come across a limited submission tell us as soon as possible because we need to go through this process. We absolutely encourage it. They're a lot we're aware of, but we get about 50 of these a day from different little foundations and things, so, we can't send out announcements about all of them. But if you want to submit one, please contact us as soon as possible.

Something I mentioned before, read the terms and conditions of your grants and contracts. And what you should really do is have everybody working on the project read them as well too. You don't want the graduate students to break the terms and conditions by saying something on social media about your work. Again, this is something that perhaps will be an ongoing debate. Some of these things do go into free speech sort of areas for some of the things I discussed before, but there are lots of other things. We're getting more things with export control and security requirements. Sometimes we need technology control plans. There are all sorts of things that might be needed for grants and might be requirements after the fact

that you have to live up to. So, we need to work this out beforehand and make sure that it's working well after.

Alright, we have a new director of Sponsored Programs, Michelle Shipman-Stoler. So, Kim Thorn left the university after a long time. We were sad to lose her, but apparently, she loved her husband more than us, so she moved to Florida. Kim was fantastic. She helped rebuild Research and Sponsored Programs. After we lost most of our staff to Michigan in Purdue about five or six years ago due to different issues. The provost and the president are in the room, so I might mention that they're underpaid and get paid more someplace else. Michelle was basically the associate director for a long time. We had a full search and everything and she got the position, so congratulations to her.

A couple of announcements. So, we had research mixers. The first few were very, very well attended. We had some really nice discussions. We have a couple more coming up at the beginning of the year. The first one is in January, Scientific Writing. We have an outside individual. They're not coming to Toledo, it's going to be online, but we're gathering everybody in one room so they can listen to the talk and then discuss it.

How should UToledo research move forward? I've been here for nine months listening to everybody, what they need, what their problems are. So, I just wanted to mention a couple of things for going forward. One of the things that we want as part of that R-1 designation is we don't want it to end. We want it to be a launching point. We don't even want to maintain; we want to grow. So, the question here is, how do we really grow? We have a number of challenges, I mentioned a couple of them already, finding numbers of faculty. So hopefully that is reversing itself. As that reverses itself, we need to be very strategic about our hiring, and I think keep in mind what our academic needs are, but at the same time our research needs. How can we do our research? And the research attracts students. It attracts undergraduates, it attracts graduates too, so that's an important part of that too. Our core instrumentation facilities and other centers have not been very well supported. Part of this was that the logic of funding at the university was that they were the college's responsibility mostly. They didn't really receive central support including that FNA that's coming in centrally. Well, I mean some of that goes out to the colleges. But, they have all been struggling and one of the things here is that we need them. They maintain a lot of equipment that people write into their grants, and we need to be kind of truthful about that. When we say there's a mass spec, there kind of needs to be a mass spec. So, I think we need to work on stabilizing them and growing them. And I think that can be part of the growth of the research enterprises. Obviously, there's a PhD student question. We obviously want to maintain and grow that too somehow. So, one of the things is we want to take things to a higher level.

We have lots of people with individual grants that are well supported. The next stage of things is centering project grants where you have groups of individuals-- this can be out of centers or it can be different groups-- training grants, which will help support research but also elevate the number of PhD students. We have a couple of nicely industry supported centers, but I think we should increase that and increase our relationships in the industry. I think this cuts across to academics too. We are providing a workforce. One of the things we find is when we go talk to industry, they say, oh, you know what I need? I need reliability. I go back to Engineering and say, what is it a reliability engineer and do we make those? Basically yeah, they explained it to me. So we start with those discussions and then they often move on to

other things. What else do they need? So those relationships help grow research. I haven't talked at all about clinical research. That is a 50-minute discussion in itself about what has happened in the last ten years. It has been completely reorganized in the last couple of years at the University of Toledo along with major changes at the hospital and a variety of other things. One of the things we really want is increased clinical research at the university. Even when we were doing a little bit better than we are now, I don't think we ever reached the sort of capacity we should.

Other things of relevance are faculty demands. Faculty need time for research and scholarships. Part of that is those declining numbers, teaching load, you have fewer people, but same amount of work and, you know, you have to show up for your classes. So, often it's the other things that fall to the wayside. The other thing we've lost is in cost cutting over the last ten years (since I've been here) is administrative support. I remember being a senator or being here with people saying, 'oh, there's all this administrative bloat,' and now I'm hearing, why isn't there somebody to do this for me? Well, those people actually did something, and those things are important too and they allow you to do other things. So, we need to carefully consider what sort of administrative support will help us grow research. And that's it. Thank you for letting me take so much of your time. We had a few questions, but happy to address anymore because we have a few minutes left.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Anything online?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: There's one right here.

Senator Lawrence: The restriction of social media was very problematic in many ways. We disseminate research and science, that's a principle... many of these funding agencies. And for me, you know, having a profile where I use social media extensively to recruit the next generation of scholars and researchers and graduate students.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: We publicize the university by showing what we do.

Senator Lawrence: Yes, and, you know, just as an example this week is Natural Geographic Awareness Week across the country, so we have hundreds of institutions and organizations. And I'm using this every day to showcase work by my graduate students, recently on posters, that some of them are federally funded.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Yep.

Senator Lawrence: And that's all the way from LinkedIn, all the platforms. This is problematic because that's how I raise awareness of the program and the opportunities to do research, to study here as a scholar and as a graduate student. It benefits the agency. So, I wonder in your initial conversation where this has come up, potentially you mentioned this impacted the after grant. So, to what extent are they concerned about the agency and why are they pushing this forward? Are there any kind of limits to it, restrictions or?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: It remains to be seen. This is the first time we have seen those conditions. I spoke to the PI, and he was aware of them. He had already spoken to people in NASA about it. I think part of it is creating this discussion back and forth with your program officer. I mean, one of the problems is with social media is—and one of its big advantages—it's immediate. I am right here, right now with my student and this is what we did. Picture. And it's good for the student, it's good for the lab, it's good for the program, and it's good for the sponsors.

Senator Lawrence: Yes.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research cont'd: But in the current political environment, they have concerns over what people will say and they don't want it flashing back on them. So, I don't know what to tell you about that. I think it's going to be a discussion every time we see that condition, but I suspect it's a sign of the future. We saw it in NASA and I'm not going to be too surprised to see it come up in some others as time goes by.

Senator Machalow: Early on in your presentation you said that we're all going to have this mandatory three-hour training---

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Researchers. So not all faculty.

Senator Machalow: Thank you.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Research.

Senator Machalow: You answered my question, yes.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Although it might not be too bad.

Senator Barnes: I just would like to say in terms of the concern about administrative bloat, I think there's a difference between administration and staff. Those complaints were made about administrators, not staff.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: I think the key there whether you're talking about higher level administrators or staff, is that it needs to be thoughtful. We have to have the right people in the right places.

Senator Barnes: I agree.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: We're all aware that in the past the way certain cuts were made was they would kind of do them across the board without any thought to targeting the cuts a little bit more. I wasn't in a high enough position to understand why that was being done, but it never seemed like a very good way to go about it to me. As we go forward, our budget processes have already changed, and I think they're going to change more, so we just have to be very thoughtful now. One of the

advantages of losing people and being in a position of growing is you have got to think about how that growth occurs, so I think I think we're in a position to make some good choices going forward.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: You spoke that we need to think about maintaining grants and such. So, I work with the T-32, and one of the big strategies was actually to get information from the University of Toledo. Those training grants require a lot of reporting on the past and the university does not collect that. So, if the university wants to think about it, then the university needs to start collecting information, so it can be available for the faculty to put in place.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Those are just some things I want to hear. I want to know what information we don't have so we can find it. Yes, and give me more than three days.

Senator Lapitsky: Thank you for the really informative talk. Regarding the new policies about the restrictions and working with researchers from foreign countries that have relationships with us. How does this affect the implications of working with international grad students? For instance, we have a lot of grad students who are from countries that are on that list. If we publish with them, for instance, does that have any consequences for today's climate?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: It remains to be seen how the laws are specifically written going forward. There are several different versions of this. Some of them do not say, well, there are different phrases for this. There are foreign adversary lists of different kinds, right? So, Russia, China, North Korea, and Venezuela kind of lists. But some of them actually say form. I can't believe they would possibly do that. But you know, I've said that several times before, "they can't possibly make it happen" and it's happened. It's difficult to say until we see what gets approved. Either it is legislation or regulation that we have to live up to. We're already dealing with a lot of these things; part of it with SB-1, we have certain reporting requirements there. We have more with grants as well and it's going to be difficult. We're going to have to be very careful with keeping track of students and the particular projects they work on. We're going to have to keep track for the same reason. And another thing is we have to be very careful about travel. We have tried to get people to register their travel, they don't always see the significance of it. The export control officer now is going to help us with those sorts of things and tell people what they need to do and help get the information out. But there are, there are a variety of issues there. It's not even one single thing. So, we'll just have to see how things change going forward. There are several laws that potentially would go before congresses here, so we'll find out later. So, we'll just keep everybody updated and deal with whatever comes up. Were there any online that you wanted to get or?

Senator McLoughlin: The Office of Undergraduate Research, does that fall within your purview? Do you have any information?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: No, the Office of Undergraduate Research does not. I think it is in the Provost Office.

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: It is in the Provost Office.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Grants Accounting is not part of us either. We receive an awful lot of emails, and we just forward them to Grants Accounting, and it takes up a lot of our time. So please let everybody know, financial questions about grants go to Grants Accounting and everything else is us.

Senator McLoughlin: Is there anyone in the Provost Office aware of what's going on with funding for that, the director, the leadership of that office?

Dr. Scott Molitor, Vice Provost: Yes. Dr. McKinney, do you want to answer that question? He is asking about experiential learning, who is the director of that office.

Provost McKinney: So currently, I'm thinking about staffing and supporting that.

Senator McLoughlin: We lost the director and there was a funding cycle that was supposed to have historically gone for spring and that seemed to have gone out to a vacuum. We seem to have lost leadership in that wonderful office for 500 graduates and research opportunities, and no one can seem to answer about funding and leadership.

Past-President Van Hoy: The staff position, Vice Provost Molitor---

Provost McKinney: Yes, we are now getting HR, an announcement just went out to fill that position.

Unknown Speaker: But she left in September.

Provost McKinney: Yes.

Senator McLoughlin: So, we should now be seeing announcements regarding that?

Provost McKinney: Yes.

Senator McLoughlin: Thank you.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: To add to that question, a lot of students were trying to submit for the spring semester funding and then they found out that there was no funding.

Senator McLoughlin: Yes, it was terrible.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay. Thank you, Scott.

Senator Osman: Scott, I have a question.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: Mahasin, go ahead please.

Senator Osman: Hello.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Mahasin, go for it.

Senator Osman: Yes, I have a question about subcontract and consultants from other universities. Apparently, that is a process where if you have a subcontract with another university, they have to be in the system, and if not, there is a big process for that. If you have a consultant also from outside, that also seems to be a process that needs some approvals and things, can you tell us about that and if it can be streamlined?

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: I'm not exactly certain of the situation you're referring to. I mean, generally speaking, when we're dealing with subcontracts, the subcontract goes to another entity, which is an official entity with whatever agency federal agency we're talking about, generally speaking. So we simply negotiate the subcontract with them and the budget with them. So, we're reaching out to another research office, and there is a process that requires a little bit more time. But I'm not certain what you mean about registration here.

Senator Osman: I was told that there was an extra step that we have to go through, that university should be in our system, something. So, I didn't know.

F. Scott Hall, Chair of the Committee on Research: I'm not certain what you mean by our system there. Go ahead, go ahead and write me the details and I'll figure it out.

Senator Osman: Okay, maybe we will talk about that, yes. Thank you.

FS President Avidor-Reiss: Okay, Good. Four minutes to the end. Anything from the floor? Online, any items we need to discuss? If not--- Did you have a question?

President-Elect Heberle: Professor Miner did communicate some questions about adjunct labor on camps and whether or not there's any channels or means by which we might, and I'm bringing it up because I'm also interested in this question, sort of start discussing as the university community to place adjunct labor on campus and the cost and the price -I'm sorry, the minimal amount of money that we are paying for people who do that incredibly essential work. And I know that the numbers have gone down recently deliberately. There's been some – Barbara, do you want to weigh-in?

Senator Miner: You were doing beautifully. Thank you. We can table this for another time. I just have recently had a long term, one of our few remaining part-time instructors ask whether or not there was any kind of increase in compensation for teaching with us. I know other schools have different pay levels, and I didn't know whether or not this was something other departments contend with as they try and maintain a few number of part timers that they have. Thank you.

FS. President Avidor-Reiss: Yes, this is something that we see in many departments. I understand. Okay, any other items? If not, we are adjourned.

IV. Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dr. Deborah Coulter-Harris
Faculty Senate Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Quinetta Hubbard
Faculty Senate Office Administrative Secretary