

Minutes of the Meeting
Inter-University Council of Ohio
10 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio
January 14, 2024

Attendees: Rodney Rogers, Bowling Green State University; Ted Carter, Ohio State University; John Langell, Northeast Ohio Medical University; Morakinyo A.O. Kuti, Central State University; Todd Diacon, Kent State University; Laura Bloomberg, Cleveland State University; Robert J. Nemer, University of Akron; Lori Gonzalez, Ohio University; Matt Schroeder, University of Toledo; Bill Johnson, Youngstown State University; Laura Lanese, Mike Suver, Kate Mowry, IUC

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:02 a.m.

2. Report of the Chair

The December 10, 2024 meeting minutes were approved without objection.

The agenda for the January 14, 2025 meeting was reviewed. A motion made and seconded to add a report on the IUC-Purchasing Group and the media campaign to the IUC Update. The motion was approved without objection.

3. IUC Update

IUC President Laura Lanese reported that IUC VP of Government Relations Nick Derksen had taken a new position as the Deputy Finance and Budget Director for the Ohio House of Representatives Majority Caucus. She stated that the position at the IUC would remain vacant for the next six months and that a methodical search would be conducted for an individual to fill the role after the conclusion of work on the state operating budget. She informed the Council that in the meantime, the plan would be to hire a firm to fill the role for the six-month period ending June 30. She stated that there would be coverage internally, as well, through existing IUC staff. She shared the advantages of this approach with the Council. Members noted that turnover was challenging and discussed other factors that should be considered when replacing staff in this position. The Council discussed whether staff in this position was even needed and what it would look like to not replace staff. The Council agreed that IUC President Lanese should be the point of contact on behalf of the IUC with the Legislature and that the Government Relations Representatives should be included as part of a more intentional strategy. IUC President Lanese agreed to make the GRRs a stronger group so that they could be more involved. She also indicated that she had spoken with the other higher education associations that also use contracted firms for advocacy. The Council ultimately agreed that having a dedicated IUC staff person for government relations was preferred but that the plan for now was appropriate and made sense. IUC President Lanese informed the Council she would proceed accordingly.

IUC President Lanese then reported that the IUC Purchasing Group had received a request from a public university in the state of New Mexico to use an IUC contract for goods or services and that the IUC-PG Executive Director would like to move forward with an offer as a pilot project. A precedent was previously set with the Tenable project, which was a collaboration with the Ohio Department of Higher Education that offered IUC-PG contracted goods and services beyond just members of the Purchasing Group to other public entities across the state. The Tenable project would serve as a model for the New Mexico opportunity. There was no objection from the Council to moving forward with an offer on the New Mexico project.

IUC President Lanese then briefed the Council on the status of the IUC media campaign. She reported that the media firm would soon be reaching out to campuses to begin gathering information and materials,

including video, to be used in the campaign. The IUC Media Relations Committee was actively engaged in developing the scope of work. She reported that Ohio's campaign would be tied to the national campaign which could begin as soon as February of 2025. The state campaign was anticipated to start later in the year, but prior to summer of 2025. The Big Ten, along with American Council on Education and other national organizations, would be participating in the national campaign.

IUC President Lanese then referred the Council to a list of legislative and other achievements of the Purchasing Group, Risk Management Insurance Consortium, IUC staff, and IUC standing committees, that were accomplished during the 135th General Assembly.

The Council then discussed the recent meeting between representatives of the IUC, Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC), and Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio (AICUO) that was hosted by the Ohio Business Roundtable (OBRT). At the meeting, the OBRT emphasized the importance of collaboration across the three higher education sector associations and announced its intent to engage with the Business First Caucus of the Ohio General Assembly on behalf of higher education and in support of the IUC and its state operating budget priorities. The work of the three sectors was acknowledged as were certain common positions shared by the IUC, OACC, and AICUO on the value of higher education. It was also noted, however, that Ohio's public universities have a different mission than the other two sectors and have been subject to a higher level of regulation and oversight by the state than the private institutions.

IUC President Lanese provided the Council with an overview of the 136th General Assembly, including committee chairs that have been named, membership of both House and Senate committees, and higher education related legislation that was anticipated. She informed the Council that the strike provisions that were removed from Senate Bill 83, as well as significant DEI changes, would be included in any new version of the bill, which has not yet been introduced.

IUC President Lanese concluded the IUC update by identifying upcoming events. The IUC Day at the Statehouse would be held on Tuesday, March 11. She stated that a briefing would be held for participants, as has been past practice, on the afternoon of Monday, March 10. Speaker Huffman has been invited to the briefing to speak with those in attendance. The IUC's second annual military connected student symposium would be held on February 11 in the Statehouse Atrium and followed by a reception that evening. She then reported that she was planning a Business Partnership Day in collaboration with the Ohio Life Science Association. She described the day as an opportunity for Ohio's public universities and their life sciences business partners to meet jointly with members of the Legislature to share more information about these collaborations and for the businesses to showcase the importance and value of public universities to the work they do. She asked the Council to identify related companies with which the university may be doing business to participate in the day.

4. Operating Budget Discussion

The Presidents' Council discussed its priorities for the upcoming FY26-27 State Operating Budget. IUC President Lanese provided some background information based on previous communications with the Chancellor about what had been driving the decisions made by the Administration relative to the guidance it issued for the budget. She also reported that the OACC had indicated to her that it was not going to ask for an increase in state share of instruction (SSI) funding but that it would request a \$10 per credit hour tuition increase for its students.

After the discussion, the Council determined that it would prioritize both SSI funding and the Ohio Tuition Guarantee Program. With respect to SSI funding, the Council agreed and directed IUC staff to request a 2% increase in funding over the current FY25 appropriation level for each year of the biennium. There was agreement that such a request was a reasonable position to take considering the financial needs of the university, the state's desire to restrain spending given the current fiscal environment, and that it was still less than the rate of inflation. The Council also agreed that the IUC would seek to maintain the original intent of the Tuition Guarantee Program but would not actively engage on that issue unless either the

Administration or Legislature acted to alter the original intent of the program. IUC staff was directed to monitor that section of the Ohio Revised Code after the bill's introduction and engage if and when necessary.

IUC President Lanese asked the Council if there would be interest among members in testifying on the state's higher education budget proposal and IUC's position on it before the finance committees in the House and Senate. Several institutions indicated an interest and a willingness to testify. IUC President Lanese stated she would coordinate that effort.

5. Other Topics

The Council discussed the reintroduction of Senate Bill 83 and the IUC's response to the new version, which was anticipated to be Senate Bill 1 when introduced. The Council reached consensus that IUC would not take a formal position, that it would not actively engage publicly on the bill, that communication would be through the IUC President to individual members of the Legislature, and that any request for public comment on provisions in the bill should be used as an opportunity to refocus the conversation on what the IUC and Ohio's public universities do support – access, affordability, and workforce, among others – and the many positive things Ohio's public universities do and do well, both regionally and for the state.

A final point was raised for further discussion at a future meeting and that was the persistence of students who start at a community college and then move on to a four-year institution and whether that model was as cost-effective, efficient, and successful as has been indicated by some.

6. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned without objection at 12:00 p.m.

From: [Tammy Ewin](#)
To: [R.J. Nemer](#)
Cc: [Sarah Kelly](#)
Subject: Chronicle story
Date: Thursday, January 30, 2025 5:55:24 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good morning,

Here is the Chronicle story we are quoted in (highlighted below). Pretty benign. I've already shared it with Gwen, Matt Akers and Mark S.

Thanks,
Tammy

A Sweeping Effort to Reshape Ohio's Colleges Has Stalled for Years. Now It's Back, and Even Broader.

By [Maya Stahl](#) January 29, 2025

An Ohio bill banning diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at public colleges is back and more expansive than ever. The Ohio Legislature began hearings on Wednesday for [Senate Bill 1](#), the "Advance Ohio Higher Education Act," which revives the widely criticized [Senate Bill 83](#) that failed to pass the House last year.

The new bill proposes to overhaul Ohio's public higher-education institutions, granting greater governmental oversight over colleges and threatening their funding if they don't comply. In particular, it takes aim at what happens in the classroom.

One such provision concerns "controversial beliefs or policies." Institutions would be required to assure that faculty and staff members will "allow and encourage students to reach their own conclusions" on such matters and "not seek to indoctrinate any social, political, or religious point of view."

The bill gives examples of some of the subjects it deems controversial: climate policies, electoral politics, foreign policy, diversity, equity, and inclusion programs, immigration policy, marriage, and abortion.

Faculty members would also be expected to commit to expressing intellectual diversity, and to allow it to be expressed by others. Intellectual diversity is defined as “multiple, divergent, and varied perspectives on an extensive range of public policy issues.”

Of particular concern to faculty members is the bill’s granting of greater governmental oversight over administrations and departments. While both the previous version of the bill and the new one would require public colleges to publish each course’s syllabus online, the new bill goes a step further and calls for including the instructor’s qualifications, contact information, and course schedule in public materials.

Sara Kilpatrick, executive director of the Ohio Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), said in an interview that the requirement to publish detailed course syllabi could lead to intellectual-property issues and “invite faculty harassment.”

Pranav Jani, an associate professor of English at Ohio State University and president of the Ohio State chapter of the AAUP, said political motivations by politicians seek “to establish conservative ideas” in the classroom.

“[Conservatives] are actually afraid of the spectrum of ideas that are OK to talk about in university settings. If they weren’t afraid of those things, they wouldn’t try to limit them, which is what they’re doing,” Jani said. “So how can you say, on the one hand, that we want intellectual diversity and all ideas to be given a clear hearing, and on the other hand, say we’re going to ban DEI programs and we’re going to put so-called controversial topics under our microscope?”

“It’s a fundamental contradiction,” he added.

The bill would also require public institutions to develop a course about American civic literacy. Colleges would be obligated to require students to read the U.S. Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, at least five essays from the Federalist Papers, the Emancipation Proclamation, the Gettysburg Address, “Letter from a Birmingham Jail” by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith. [SB 83](#) called for a similar reading list to be part of a mandated three-credit course in American government or American history.

Similar, but Different

SB 1 was introduced last week by Sen. Jerry Cirino, a Republican who first introduced SB 83 in March 2023. Cirino has been outspoken against DEI, describing it as “indoctrination.”

Though the bill appears to be a top priority for Ohio lawmakers, Kilpatrick said she doesn’t think this is what constituents want.

“It’s mind-boggling that this is Senate Bill 1,” Kilpatrick said, adding that people in Ohio are worried about food costs and property-tax increases. “And instead, the Senate majority in Ohio has said, ‘We want to play culture-war education politics again, because we couldn’t get it done last time.’”

Similar to SB 83, the new bill would institute a post-tenure review policy for faculty. The trustees of each public college would be required to enact faculty performance reviews, develop a post-tenure review process, and include a provision to prevent faculty unions from negotiating tenure. The moves would effectively “render tenure meaningless,” Kilpatrick said. Full-time faculty members would also be barred from striking.

“Tenure would still exist on paper, but the bill is worded in such a way that certain administrators could call for post-tenure review at any time and fire faculty, and that’s not real tenure,” Kilpatrick said. “We are worried about how that could be used to invite political interference.”

SB 1 would also ban diversity, equity, and inclusion orientation and training programs, and eliminate new and existing DEI offices. In sweeping yet unspecific language, the law would also forbid referencing DEI in job descriptions, and bar establishing new institutional scholarships that “use diversity, equity, and inclusion in any manner.” Existing scholarships would be required to eliminate DEI requirements.

Unlike many similar bills, the Ohio legislation explicitly tries to prevent colleges from trying to move DEI efforts into different offices with different names. SB 1 would ban colleges from replacing an orientation, training, office, or position “under a different designation that serves the

same or similar purposes, or that uses the same or similar means.”

Institutions would also be banned from contracting with third-party consultants for hiring processes “whose role is or would be to promote admissions, hiring, or promotion on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.”

The Hearing, and Protests

At the Senate hearing of the Higher Education Committee on Wednesday, legislators listened to testimony in favor of advancing SB 1 while dozens of student protesters sat in the audience. Cirino was the first legislator to testify in favor. Sen. Casey Weinstein, a Democrat, raised concerns about how the bill “dilutes the truth.” When questioned by Weinstein, Cirino said the bill “relates more to institutional neutrality.” (The bill states that institutions will declare that they won’t endorse or oppose “any controversial belief or policy, except on matters that directly impact the institution’s funding or mission.”)

Cirino characterized DEI as “institutionalized discrimination,” which the bill intends to correct, he said.

Sen. Catherine Ingram, a Democrat, questioned Cirino about the costs the bill would impose on universities, including new training for boards of trustees and the civic-education course requirement.

“Think about it for a second. Ohio State spends \$14 million-plus a year on DEI. They never came to us for an appropriation for that. They just found the money to do it,” Cirino responded. “Well, if there’s an incremental cost associated with being a better university, I’m sure they will find the money we don’t have to appropriate.”

The Chronicle reached out to 10 public universities about preparations for complying with the bill.

“We are reviewing the legislation. As always, we look forward to working with elected officials on both sides of the aisle to advance Ohio State and ensure our students, faculty and staff have the resources and support needed to succeed,” Benjamin Johnson, an Ohio State spokesperson, wrote to *The*

Chronicle.

Some universities are already reviewing ways to reform their campuses should the bill come to pass. The University of Akron is “currently conducting a holistic review of campus to identify areas that may require adjustments should the bill pass,” according to Tammy Ewin, the university’s spokesperson.

Students and faculty members spent months protesting SB 83 and negotiated with lawmakers to limit the restrictions the bill sought to enact. Now, similar groups are organizing to protest SB 1.

Sydney Ball, a senior at Ohio State and president of the Ohio Student Association, described the bill as “an attack on higher education.”

“Because it really is just limiting and controlling the language we can use in the classroom,” Ball said, “when these are spaces that should be able to dive deeper.”

Tammy Ewin
Vice President
Chief Communication and Marketing Officer
The University of Akron
Buchtel Hall 53
Akron, Ohio 44325

Office: 330-972-5766

Mobile: [REDACTED]

Email: tewin@uakron.edu



This email and any attachments thereto are intended only for the use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify me by any contact information provided above and permanently delete the original. Thank you.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Interested Parties
FROM: Inter-University Council of Ohio
DATE: Wednesday, February 12, 2025
SUBJECT: Summary of Recent Senate Higher Education Committee Action

The purpose of this document is to summarize action taken by the Senate Higher Education committee during the week of February 10, 2025. The committee's agenda for the week was as follows:

- February 11, 2025: A substitute bill was introduced and accepted. The committee held a second hearing on Senate Bill 1 with a total of 841 witnesses providing opponent/interested party testimony. A complete list of witnesses and their testimony can be viewed [here](#).
- February 12, 2025: SB 1 was heard for the third time and was voted out of committee with a 5-2 vote along party lines. Ranking Member Ingram and Senator Weinstein offered several amendments that were all tabled with 5-2 votes along party lines.

SUMMARY OF SUBSTITUTE BILL CHANGES

The substitute bill introduced and accepted by the committee included the following changes:

- Delays requirements for publicly posting course syllabi until the beginning of the 2026-2027 academic year. (Sec. 3345.029(B))
- Adds “*with regard to those individuals' race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression*” to the institution’s “duty to treat all faculty, staff, and students as individuals, to hold them to equal standards, and to provide them equality of opportunity”. (Sec. 3345.0216 (A)(5))
- Clarifies where each institution shall include a statement of commitment to include “*on its publicly accessible web site and alongside the state institution's mission statement in any place in which the mission statement appears, including when it is published or posted.*”

Each institution shall include the statement of commitment in any solicitations and offers of admission to students and any offers of employment to faculty”. (Sec. 3345.0216(B))

- Changes “faculty members remain committed to expressing intellectual diversity and allowing intellectual diversity to be expressed” to “*faculty members allow students to express intellectual diversity*”. (Sec. 3345.0217 (D))
- Adds exemptions to the American civic course requirement for students that have completed a comparable College Credit Plus or Advanced Placement program. (Sec. 3345.382 (D))
- Requires universities presidents to testify in appropriate hearings if requested by a relevant committee chair. (Sec. 3345.80 (F))

SUMMARY OF OPPONENT TESTIMONY

A total of 837 opponents presented oral and/or written testimony. While many of the witnesses testified as individuals, several organizations offered opponent testimony including the Ohio Counseling Association, Ohio Federation of Teachers, National Association of Social Workers, Ohio Student Association, Ohio Faculty Council, CAIR, Undergraduate Student Governments of Ohio, Ohio Education Association, and the AFL-CIO. Key points from their testimony included:

- Concern that the DEI provisions would risk the ability to meet professional accreditation standards.
- Dissatisfaction over the DEI provisions with fear that they will harm academic freedom.
- Concern that the provisions in SB 1 create a bureaucratic nightmare due to the number of unfunded mandates.
- Concern that it will be more difficult to recruit and retain talented students and faculty.
- Concern regarding university neutrality on controversial policies and the effect it would have on the student population.
- Questions on how the policies in SB 1 would affect academic programs designed for women, minority, and veteran students.
- Concern over the collective bargaining and strike provisions in SB 1.

SUMMARY OF INTERESTED PARTY TESTIMONY

A total of four interested parties presented oral and/or written testimony. Key points from their testimony included:

- Concern from the Ohio School Psychologists Association that the DEI requirements in SB 1 would jeopardize professional program accreditation.
- Concern that the prohibition of discussing controversial topics amounts to a “regressive lunge backwards”.

- The Buckeye Institute, a conservative think tank, submitted interested party testimony that was largely complimentary of many provisions in SB 1 including faculty review, and the prohibition of mandatory DEI related trainings.

WHAT'S NEXT

SB 1 will now head to the Senate floor where it is expected to pass later today. Following passage in the Senate, the bill will head to the House where it is expected to receive fast-tracked treatment from leadership. The House will be out of session the week of February 17, meaning the earliest first action will take place in the House will be the week of February 24, 2025.



Government Relations Representatives Recommended Legislative Changes to Senate Bill 1

The government relations representatives have identified and recommended the following legislative changes to Senate Bill 1. The intent of these recommendations, listed in order of appearance in SB 1, is not to change the bill but rather improve its implementation mechanisms.

1. Delay the requirement for course syllabi to be published online until the spring semester of the 2025-2026 academic year. This change will allow institutions sufficient time to ensure the requirements can be properly met. This can be accomplished by inserting “beginning on or after January 1, 2026” to line 546. The recommended language would read:

Each state institution shall make a syllabus available in accordance with division (B) of this section not later than the first day of classes for the semester or academic term beginning on or after January 1, 2026 in which the course is offered.

2. Clarify intent of “equal standards”. SB 1 requires that our institutions treat all faculty, staff, and students as individuals, and that we hold them to “equal standards”. While there are no concerns with the general premise, universities have different categorizations of staff (i.e. civil service vs. at-will; part-time vs. full-time, etc) and faculty (i.e. fulltime professor vs. adjunct) that requires different standards, expectations, pay, leave accrual, etc. The language recommended to be inserted at the end of line 594 would likely better reflect the real intent of the sponsor and mirror language found on lines 1207-1209. This recommended language would read:

The institution declares that its duty is to treat all faculty, staff, and students as individuals, to hold them to equal standards, and to provide them equality of opportunity with regard to those individuals' race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

3. Remove the requirement to post a statement of commitment on “all official institution documents”. SB 1 does not define “official institution documents” which opens the interpretation to include hard copy documents, electronic documents, letterhead, diplomas, etc. An institution’s statement of commitment will simply be too long to include on all university documents. The recommended language, found on lines 595-598, would read:

Each state institution of higher education shall prominently post the statement on its publicly accessible web site. ~~include the statement of commitment developed under this section on all official institution documents and~~

4. Clarify the prohibition of certain activities on campus related to DEI. The prohibition as written is overly vague and could be construed to prohibit activities that are directly responsible for student success, including veterans' services, disability services, or financial aid. This amendment would clarify that the other prohibitions do not include such activities which are directly related to student success. The proposed language would be inserted in line 663:

(e) Nothing in Division (B) of this section shall be construed to prohibit activities solely and directly related to student success or as required by state and federal law such as disability services and financial aid.

5. Change the word "course" to "coursework" throughout Section 3345.382 (lines 795-834). In doing so, institutions will have the flexibility to design three hours of coursework as they see fit to ensure students can complete the three hours of material and pass the final examination. The change does not alter the requirement that students pass the cumulative final examination. Not all students are on the same academic path, and some majors have very prescriptive course schedules. By not micro-managing the course, institutions can best ensure students gain the knowledge that the bill intends. The impacted portion of Section 3345.382 would be recommended to read:

(B) Each state institution shall develop ~~a course~~ coursework with not fewer than three credit hours in the subject area of American civic literacy. The ~~course~~ coursework shall include a study of the American economic system and capitalism. The ~~course~~ coursework shall comply with the criteria, policies, and procedures established under section 3333.16 of the Revised Code. The ~~course~~ coursework may be offered under the college credit plus program established under Chapter 3365. of the Revised Code. The ~~course~~ coursework shall, at a minimum, require each student to read all the following:

- (1) The entire Constitution of the United States;*
- (2) The entire Declaration of Independence;*
- (3) A minimum of five essays in their entirety from the Federalist Papers. The essays shall be selected by the department chair.*
- (4) The entire Emancipation Proclamation;*
- (5) The entire Gettysburg Address;*
- (6) The entire Letter from Birmingham Jail written by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.*

(7) The writings of Adam Smith, including a study of the principles written in The Wealth of Nations.

Any student who takes the ~~course~~ coursework shall be required to pass a cumulative final examination at the conclusion ~~of the course~~ that assesses student proficiency about the documents described in divisions (B)(1) to (7) of this section.

(C) Beginning with students who graduate from a state institution of higher education in the spring semester, or equivalent quarter, of the 2029-2030 academic year, no state institution of higher education shall grant a bachelor's degree to any student unless the student completes ~~a course~~ the coursework described in division (B) of this section. A state institution may require students to complete the ~~course~~ coursework as part of the institution's general education courses of study.

6. Reinsert previous exceptions into the American civil literacy course outlined in Section 3345.382. The exceptions previously outlined in the House committee passed version of SB 83 are recommended to be inserted at line 835 and read:

(D) The president of a state institution, or the president's designee, may exempt a student from the requirement to complete a course described in division (B) of this section if the president or designee determines that the student has either:

- (1) Completed at least three credit hours, or the equivalent, in a course in the subject area of American history or American government;*
- (2) Passed an examination, developed by the chancellor, that assesses the student's competence in the documents and concepts described in division (B) of this section.*

7. Remove Section 3345.454 (C) (lines 1037-1052) and add to existing language in Section 3345.35. The language in Section 3345.454 (C) could have unintended consequences for high-need areas for Ohio's workforce and add burdensome workload for faculty and staff who must justify and seek a waiver each year. Some degrees exist that, if eliminated, would not reduce the number of faculty or the number of courses offered, but would reduce the number of students. Science education degrees (ones that lead to licensure to teach science) could fall into this category. The recommended changes to Section 3345.35 would read:

Not later than September 1, 2022, and by the first day of September of every third year thereafter, the board of trustees of each state institution of higher education, as defined in section 3345.011 of the Revised Code, shall evaluate all programs on the number of degrees awarded, all courses and programs the institution offers

based on enrollment, and duplication of its courses and programs with those of other state institutions of higher education within a geographic region, as determined by the chancellor of higher education. For programs with few degrees conferred and courses and programs with low enrollment, as defined by the chancellor, the board of trustees shall provide a summary of recommended actions, including consideration of collaboration with other state institutions of higher education. For duplicative programs, as defined by the chancellor, the board of trustees shall evaluate the benefits of collaboration with other institutions of higher education to deliver the program.

Each board of trustees shall submit its findings under this section to the chancellor not later than thirty days after the completion of the evaluations or as part of submitting the annual efficiency report required pursuant to section 3333.95 of the Revised Code.

8. Remove Section 3345.456 (lines 1064-1084). This section states that a state institution of higher education shall only continue to bargain over retrenchment policies for a new or renewed collective bargaining agreement with respect to faculty that have between 30-35 years of service in one of the state's retirement systems. This section was added to the House committee passed of SB 83 but was not in the Senate passed version of SB 83. Tracking faculty that have between 30-35 years of service would be an administrative burden to institutions.

SB1 Summary

Background of SB83 and SB1

The Advance Ohio Higher Education Act (Senate Bill 1) was introduced by Senator Jerry Cirino and Senator Kristina Roegner on January 22, 2025. Representative Tom Young introduced HB6, a companion bill in the House. The legislation is largely modeled after Senate Bill 83, which was introduced in the previous General Assembly. SB 83 passed through the Senate and House Higher Education committee. Then-Speaker Stephens would not bring it to a floor vote in the House, but Speaker Matt Huffman is a close ally of Senator Cirino, and he will likely bring it to a floor vote in the House once it clears the Senate and the House Higher Education Committee. SB1's sponsors plan to fast-track the bill through the Senate. Note that Senator Cirino is also chair of finance. Also, Republicans enjoy a super-majority in both House and Senate, and both House and Senate Republicans are working well together in this GA.

Additional cosponsors of SB1 in the Senate include Andrew Brenner, Brian Chavez, Al Cutrona, Terry Johnson, Kyle Koehler, George Lang, Susan Manchester, Sanda O'Brien, Bill Reineke, Mark Romanchuk, Tim Schaffer, and Shane Wilkin.

Current State of SB1

- Jan. 22: Introduced in Senate
- Jan. 29: Committee Hearing in Senate—proponent testimony (see summary)
 - *Note: Senator Cirino held extensive hearings in the last GA on SB83. With SB1, he does not see the need for extensive hearings given the time that was spent on SB83.*
- March/April: Will likely pass out of both houses and head to the Governor to sign

IUC Activities:

Note: Inter-University Council is the collective voice of the 14 public institutions of higher education in Ohio.

- Both the Presidents Council and the Government Relations have met several times about SB1. While the Government Relations council made 8 recommendations for changes to the bill, the Presidents Council decided not to take action and remain neutral on SB1. We requested multiple changes to SB83—some of which were made—but the concern is that we will push our luck by requesting a new round of changes to SB1, especially given the likelihood of the bill passing as is.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Inter-University Council of Ohio
FROM: Tyler Duvelius, Swing State Strategies
DATE: Wednesday, January 22, 2025
SUBJECT: Senate Bill 1 Analysis

The Advance Ohio Higher Education Act (Senate Bill 1) was introduced by Senator Jerry Cirinio and Senator Kristina Roegner on January 22, 2025. Representative Tom Young announced that he will be introducing a companion bill in the House. The legislation is largely modeled after Senate Bill 83, which was introduced in the last General Assembly. SB 83 passed through the Senate and House Higher Education committee. The bill's sponsors expressed at the press conference a desire to fast-track the bill through the Senate.

Additional cosponsors of the bill in the Senate include Andrew Brenner, Brian Chavez, Al Cutrona, Terry Johnson, Kyle Koehler, George Lang, Susan Manchester, Sanda O'Brien, Bill Reineke, Mark Romanchuk, Tim Schaffer, and Shane Wilkin.

This memorandum will detail key takeaways from the press conference, a comparative analysis of SB 1 to SB 83, and recommended next steps.

PRESS CONFERENCE KEY TAKEAWAYS

- Senator Roegner shared that higher education is important to economic growth. She said she wants Ohio's state institutions of higher education to be focused on "education, not indoctrination" and "academic excellence".
- Senator Cirino began by saying he wants Ohio's public universities to have the "best quality" and be "the most affordable and most accessible". He believes this is done by empowering boards of trustees and having "students come first". He noted that Ohio is currently 13th in the nation in student debt default.
- Senators Cirino and Roegner both noted that they want to fast-track this legislation in the Senate and are looking to begin committee hearings as early as next week.
- On the connection between this bill and the budget, Senator Cirino noted that the General Assembly holds the power of the purse, and that compliance will be looked at during

Thanks,

Matt

IUC Government Relations Committee Meeting

2-4-25

S Swing State Strategies

- a. Swing State Strategies (S3) is the new government relations firm that IUC hired following Nick Derksen's departure to House staff. Tyler M. Duvelius, Vice President of Government & Corporate Affairs, is the main contact now for IUC Government Affairs.

Budget: For a good summary of the budget as related to higher ed, please see the attached: "Memo —Blue Book FY26-27-Chancellor"

- a. Note that the Governor's budget does NOT include the proposed 2% increase in SSI as recommended by IUC:
 - i. The proposed budget continues current levels of funding in SSI while reserving \$100M (approximately 5%) of that amount to be based on employment outcomes.
 - ii. We are waiting on more guidance as to how the employment outcomes will be measured.

Legislation

- a. SBI: IUC made a statement (see attached) that they would work with the bill's sponsors. Brief context and background: multiple changes were already requested and made to SB83, of which SB1 is the continuation. This GA has different members and leadership, and SB1 is likely to pass as is. Also, this spring is the FY26-27 operating budget, which includes major funding for public universities, such as SSI. It makes sense to focus advocacy efforts on getting a budget favorable to higher ed priorities passed. For more information on SB1, see the attachments: The

From: [Kristin Brummond](#)
To: [Gwyneth Price](#); [Matthew Akers](#)
Cc: [R.J. Nemer](#); [Patti Huth](#)
Subject: FW: Documents for Our Call Tomorrow
Date: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 8:27:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[SB 1 FAQ \(LL\).docx](#)
[SB1 Senate Timeline.v1.docx](#)
[LSCCompDocSB1.pdf](#)
[GRR Recommended Legislative Changes to SB 1.docx](#)

Good evening,

Sharing for tomorrow morning's virtual meeting at 8 a.m. with the IUC Presidents.

Thank you,
Kristin

From: iuc-assistants <iuc-assistants-bounces+brummon=uakron.edu@lists.osu.edu> **On Behalf Of** Lanese, Laura via iuc-assistants
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 6:39 PM
To: iuc-assistants@lists.service.ohio-state.edu; Hamilton, DiAnn <hamilton.1600@osu.edu>
Subject: FW: Documents for Our Call Tomorrow

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The University of Akron. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Good evening,

I just sent this email to your presidents for their 8 am call tomorrow. I appreciate your assistance in making sure they receive it.

Sincerely,
Laura

From: Lanese, Laura
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 6:36 PM
To: iucpresidents@lists.osu.edu
Subject: Documents for Our Call Tomorrow

Good evening,

I have attached the following four documents for our call tomorrow:

1. FAQs on SB 1.
2. Projected Schedule of SB 1. Additionally, I've also just heard from Chair Young that IUC's House Higher Education Committee budget testimony is scheduled for 2.25.25 at 3:15 pm. However, that could be subject to change.

3. The LSC Comparison document for SB 1.
4. The Government Relations Committee's recommended changes to SB 1.

We may need a vote tomorrow on how to proceed with SB1. We have a few provosts on the call, and they are allowed to vote in place of their president. And as a reminder, our bylaws require unanimity before moving forward.

Sincerely,

Laura





TO: IUC Presidents
FROM: Inter-University Council of Ohio
DATE: Tuesday, January 28, 2025
SUBJECT: Senate Bill 1 Frequently Asked Questions

This document contains frequently asked questions regarding the recently introduced Senate Bill 1. While much of the language from the House committee passed version of Senate Bill 83 has been kept, there have been several significant changes. *We have endeavored to answer as many questions as possible, though some answers will be open to legal interpretation of general counsels and implementation practices by the Ohio Department of Higher Education.*

The most pressing questions can be found immediately below. A more comprehensive list of questions follows and has been broken down into the following categories: diversity, equity, and inclusion (pp. 3-4), curriculum management (p. 5), university governance (pp. 5-6), university employee labor provisions (pp. 5-6), procedural questions (pp. 6-7), and miscellaneous (p. 7).

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

Does SB 1 establish further DEI prohibitions than those found in the House committee passed version of SB 83?

Yes. The House committee passed version of SB 83 prohibited any mandatory orientation or training course regarding DEI with specified exemptions. SB 1 furthers this list of prohibitions by adding the following, with no exceptions:

1. Any orientation or training course regarding DEI;
2. The continuation of existing DEI offices or departments;
3. Establishing new DEI offices or departments;
4. Using DEI in job descriptions;
5. Contracting with consultants or third-parties whose role is or would be to promote admissions, hiring, or promotion on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression; and
6. The establishment of any new institutional scholarships that use DEI in any manner. For any existing institutional scholarships, SB 1 requires a state institution, to the extent possible, to eliminate DEI requirements. If the state institution is unable to do so because of donor requirements, SB 1 permits the institution to continue to offer those scholarships

but prohibits the institution from accepting additional funds for the operation of scholarships with DEI requirements.

SB 1 further prohibits a state institution from replacing any orientation, training, office, or position designated for the purpose of DEI to be repurposed in a way that serves the same or similar purpose.

Does SB 1 provide any waivers to the DEI prohibitions?

SB 1 clarifies this ambiguity from the House committee passed version of SB 83. The prohibitions on DEI and related provisions regarding research grants in SB 1 do not apply to agreements or contracts regarding any research grants entered into prior to the bill's effective date but do apply to any renewals of such agreements or contracts occurring on or after that date.

If the DEI prohibitions were to conflict with the ability to obtain a research grant, SB 1 requires a state institution to submit a written request for exception to the Chancellor. SB 1 requires a state institution to endeavor to comply with the DEI prohibitions to the greatest extent possible while retaining eligibility for the research grant, including consultation with legal counsel. The waiver provision does not apply to renewals of grant requests.

Does SB 1 add protected classes to the list enumerated in SB 83?

Yes. The House committee passed version of SB 83 required each state institution with respect to every position, policy, program, and activity, to:

1. Treat all faculty, staff, and students as individuals, hold every individual to equal standards, and provide individuals with equality of opportunity with regard to race, ethnicity, religion, or sex; and
2. Provide no advantage or disadvantage to faculty, staff, or students on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, or sex in admissions, hiring, promotion, tenuring, or workplace conditions.

SB 1 includes the same language but adds sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression.

Does the prohibition of DEI programs affect programs such as women in STEM initiatives?

Further legal analysis and/or legislative clarification is needed, but if these programs do not exclude members of a protected class the IUC has been told they should not be affected.

Will services to veterans or those with disability be impacted by SB 1?

While further legal analysis and/or legislative clarification is needed, it does not appear that any language added to SB 1 would impact services to veterans or those with disability.

Will student organizations be affected by this legislation?

Further legal analysis and/or legislative clarification is needed. Student organizations funded by the university may be impacted by SB 1. Key concerns include student organization-led events or campaigns related to “controversial beliefs or policies”, inclusion of DEI language in organizational bylaws, and forced elimination of university funding if the organization engages in prohibited activity.

Are public universities permitted to take public stances on DEI and other “controversial beliefs or policies”?

No. SB 1 prohibits higher education institutions from taking positions on any "controversial belief or policy," which includes topics like climate policies, politics, foreign policy, DEI programs, immigration policy, marriage, and abortion. SB 1 adds language that includes an exemption that allows for universities to endorse or oppose a controversial belief or policy “on matters that directly impact the institution’s funding or mission of discovery, improvement, and dissemination of knowledge”.

Does this bill limit the power of public universities to lobby?

Further legal analysis and/or legislative clarification is needed but SB 1 does not explicitly mention limitations on university lobbying efforts. Per previous IUC conversations a, the IUC is under the impression that it is not the intent of this bill to limit the ability of universities to lobby. No language has been added to SB 1 that would further elevate this concern.

How does this bill address student and faculty complaints regarding DEI policy violations?

SB 1 requires that each state university shall respond to complaints from any student, student group, or faculty member about an alleged violation of the bill’s prohibitions and requirements. It requires the board of trustees of each state institution to respond to complaints using the process established under existing law for violations of an institution’s campus free speech policy.

Does the bill threaten to withhold state funding to state institutions of higher education?

SB 1 permits the General Assembly to withhold or reduce any state operating subsidy payments, state capital improvement funds, or other state appropriation to a state institution if the General Assembly determines the institution has failed to comply with the bill's requirements related to DEI programs, intellectual diversity, and other concepts. This is new language that was not included in the House committee passed version of SB 83.

CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT

Does this bill prescribe any courses that must be offered?

Yes. SB 1 mandates that each public university develop, and require students to pass, a three-credit hour, general education course in American government or American history. The course must be approved by the board of trustees and the Chancellor. It also provides a list of required reading for the course.

The House committee passed version of SB 83 originally dictated that the chancellor would develop this course, not the university.

Does this bill mandate that state institutions of higher education publicly post course syllabi?

Yes. Professors would be required to post their syllabi online for students, parents, and the public to review. All syllabi must be accessible from the main page on the university's website by use of not more than three links. It must be searchable by keywords and phrases while being accessible to the public without requiring user registration.

Does this bill require the elimination any degree programs?

Yes. SB 1 mandates the elimination of any undergraduate degree program if the university confers an average of fewer than five degrees in the program annually over a three-year period. An exemption can be pursued from the Chancellor. The House committee passed version of SB 83 did not contain this provision.

UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE

What effect does this bill have on boards of trustee?

Broadly speaking, SB 1 grants public university boards of trustees greater authority over university operations. If the bill were to pass, trustees would have more influence in faculty/personnel

management, curriculum oversight, and university spending than prescribed in the House committee passed version of SB 83.

Does this bill address training for board of trustee members?

Yes. SB 1 mandates specific training programs for board members to be completed within their first two years on the board. The training, created and administered by the Chancellor, will focus on fiduciary duties, legal responsibilities, and best practices in university governance. This is largely the same language from the House committee passed version of SB 83.

Does this bill mandate what public universities include in their mission statements?

The House committee passed version of SB 83 had a mandated list of declarations that were to be included in the university's mission statement. SB 1 moves this list from inclusion in the university's mission statement to incorporation into a publicly available university "statement of commitment".

UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEE LABOR PROVISIONS

Does SB 1 reinstate a prohibition of faculty strikes that had previously been removed in the House committee passed version of SB 83?

Yes. SB 1 reinstates a prohibition of full-time faculty members striking. This was previously removed in the House passed committee version of SB 83. SB 1 requires full-time faculty to submit unresolved collective bargaining disputes to a final offer settlement procedure.

Does this bill require performance reviews for tenured professors?

Yes. SB 1 requires annual performance evaluations for all faculty, including those with tenure. Feedback from students and peers are to be a part of the review process. It also includes an appeals process for both faculty and post-tenure review processes. There is no significant change in language from the House committee passed version of SB 83.

How will faculty workload policies be impacted?

SB 1 would require each state institution to include in its faculty workload policy a teaching workload expectation based on credit hours, a definition of all faculty workload elements in terms of credit hours including a full-time minimum standard established by the board of trustees, justifiable credit hour equivalents, and any administrative action that the state institution may take if a faculty member fails to comply with the policy's requirements. There is no significant change in language from the House committee passed version of SB 83.

How does the bill impact collective bargaining rights for public university employees?

SB 1 would expand the current prohibition against collectively bargaining faculty workload policies, and the requirement that the policies prevail over conflicting collective bargaining agreements, to include all state institutions of higher education. It would also prohibit public university employees from collectively bargaining with the institution regarding faculty evaluation policies and systems, post-tenure review policies, and policies on tenure, and specifies the policies and systems prevail over conflicting collective bargaining agreements.

PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS

Will SB 1 pass?

Highly probable. The bill has received priority attention from leaders in both the House and the Senate and have indicated that they will fast-track the bill.

Is this bill's language the same as Senate Bill 83 that was introduced in 2023?

As noted throughout, SB 1 includes much of the same language of the House committee passed version of SB 83. Additional changes not otherwise addressed in this document include:

- SB 1 does not include a provision in SB 83 that would allow for the termination of an endowment agreement if a restriction were to be violated. (Sec. 1715.551 in SB 83)
- SB 1 expressly allows state institutions of higher education to collect grants from Chinese institutions that are not affiliated with the Chinese government. (Sec. 3345.591)

Who are the main sponsors and cosponsors of this bill?

Senator Jerry Cirino, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is the lead sponsor of SB 1. Representative Tom Young, Chairman of the Workforce and House Higher Education Committee, is the lead sponsor of HB 6—the House's companion bill.

Senators Andrew Brenner, Brian Chavez, Al Cutrona, Terry Johnson, Kyle Koehler, George Lang, Susan Manchester, Sanda O'Brien, Bill Reineke, Kristina Roegner, Mark Romanchuk, Tim Schaffer, and Shane Wilkin are SB 1 cosponsors.

When should we expect action on this bill?

Senate leadership has expressed a desire to move this bill quickly through the Senate. Considering

that it has received priority attention in both chambers, it is possible that the bill will be passed by June 30, 2025.

Will Governor DeWine sign this bill?

Governor DeWine stated in June of 2024 that he would sign SB 83 if it were to “continue to evolve”. Given this statement, the IUC is operating under the assumption that he would sign a passed version SB 1. His exact comments were:

“I think (Senate Bill 83) will continue to evolve and will then be a bill that I would be comfortable signing. I would anticipate signing a bill. But as in all things, I can’t make a final decision until I see the language and the language in this bill, of course, continues to change.”

MISCELLANEOUS

Does this bill mandate that professor’s contact information be made public?

Yes. SB 1 requires that each professor have the following information be publicly available: the instructor’s professional qualifications, the instructor’s contact information, the instructor’s course schedule, and syllabi for each course taught by the instructor. There is no significant change in language from the House committee passed version of SB 83.

Does the bill prescribe where publicly accessible information must be on a university website?

Yes. Much of the information required in SB 1 must be accessible from the main page of the university’s website by use of not more than three links. It must also be searchable by keywords and phrases while being accessible to the public without requiring user registration. There is no significant change in language from the House committee passed version of SB 83.

Does the bill change how public universities report financial information?

SB 1 requires each state institution of higher education, for each biennial main operating appropriations bill and capital appropriations bill, to prepare and submit to the Chancellor a rolling five-year summary of its institutional costs to be considered by the General Assembly when evaluating operating and capital project funding. The Chancellor is required to submit a report to the General Assembly, including each state institution’s five-year institutional cost summary. There is no significant change in language from the House committee passed version of SB 83.

SB 1 Timeline

SB1 Advance Ohio Higher Education Act (Cirino, J)- To enact the Advance Ohio Higher Education Act Regarding the Operation of state institutions of higher education.

Ohio Senate:

Date	Event	Details
January 22nd	Bill Introduced	SB 1 was introduced into the Ohio Senate.
January 29th	First Hearing & Sponsor Testimony	Sponsor testimony presented by Senator Jerry Cirino.
February 12th	Opposition Testimony	Heard in the Senate Higher Education Committee.
February 19th	Voted Out of Committee	Moved to the Senate Floor on the same day.
Late February	Moved to Ohio House	Transitioned to the Ohio House for consideration.
End of April	Target to Pass the Ohio House	Goal to complete passage through the House.

From: [R.J. Nemer](#)
To: [Matthew Akers](#)
Cc: [Kristin Brummond](#)
Subject: Fw: Agenda Documents for Meeting 2.11.25
Date: Thursday, February 6, 2025 9:28:35 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[02.11.25 PRES Meeting Agenda.docx](#)
[2025-01-14 PRES Meeting Minutes.docx](#)
[MediaSurvey.docx](#)
[ATT00001.txt](#)
[Image.jpeg](#)

R.J. Nemer

President | The University of Akron | Phone: 330-972-7869 | Email: president@uakron.edu

signatureImage



Sent from my iPhone.

From: iucpresidents <iucpresidents-bounces@lists.osu.edu> on behalf of Lanese, Laura via iucpresidents <iucpresidents@lists.osu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 6, 2025 9:17:02 AM
To: iucpresidents@lists.osu.edu <iucpresidents@lists.osu.edu>; Hamilton, DiAnn <hamilton.1600@osu.edu>
Subject: [IUC Presidents] Agenda Documents for Meeting 2.11.25

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The University of Akron. Use caution when opening attachments, clicking links or responding to requests for information.

Good morning,

I have attached the documents for our virtual meeting next Tuesday from 10 am to noon. Chair Young will be on the call first thing to discuss the budget and other topics. I've also attached the survey that BVK, our media firm, has asked to be shared on your campuses concerning the six themes that will be part of the campaign. I would like your input on these topics as well. They very closely parallel IUC's 4 themes that we will be discussing in our testimony and in our meetings with legislators. These are: Workforce and Talent Development, Research and Innovation, Economic Competitiveness and National Security, and a Well-educated Citizenry.

Looking forward to seeing everyone online and those who can make it to our Military-Connected Student Symposium from 2-7 pm after our meeting. We currently have over 120 RSVPs to the event.