

Chair Cirino, Vice Chair Rulli, Ranking Member Ingram and other honorable members of this committee,

My name is Megan Anderson, and I am once again testifying in opposition to this SB117. I will not restate my previous testimony but will instead focus on clarifying my opposition and adding additional relevant information.

First, I believe that my point about Toledo Law's lack of resources was misunderstood. I understand that the issue of funding is one to be addressed by the Board of Trustees and not something to be brought to the legislature. My point instead was that the main priority of students at Toledo law is to get more resources allocated to the school. Some of my fellow students are under the incorrect assumption that the \$3 million dollars in this bill are being given to the school of law, which they are not. If someone approached you and told you that they were starving and instead of feeding them you gave them a brand-new car and \$10,000 that could only be spent on using and maintaining that car you would not be addressing the pressing issue at hand. You're just going to have someone driving around in a nice car still starving. Continuing that metaphor once the \$10,000 runs out the maintenance costs, insurance costs, and money for gas would fall on an already struggling person. It seems unfair to me.

Next, I want to reiterate what was said by some of my fellow students. There is not a liberal bias at the University of Toledo College of Law. The majority of speakers that came to speak at Toledo Law in the last year were conservative speakers funded by the Federalist Society. Our local Federalist Society chapter receives funding from the national organization to keep a steady flow of conservative speakers in our auditorium almost monthly. This funding is unmatched by other organizations at the law school who do not have ties to large money donors, or a billionaire funded national organization. How can other organizations compete when The Federalist Society is paying for flights, hotel stays, and speaking fees? They can't. If there were a bias at the University of Toledo College of Law it would be a conservative one. The creation of this institute would further exacerbate that bias to the point where liberal students would no longer consider bringing themselves or their tax dollars to Ohio.

To address another point that was mentioned during my testimony I am not suggesting that organizations that I am not a part of should not be allowed to bring in speakers that I do not agree with. Our 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights allow all groups to bring in speakers. Conversely students who disagree with speakers have the to protest these speakers. Contrary to Chair Cirino's statement that the students at Stanford Law School forgot about 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights, it is important to remember included in that amendment is the right to peaceably assemble. Those who are assembled still maintain their 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment rights to free speech in order to voice their concerns. It strikes me as odd that when liberal students spoke up to protest a conservative speaker brought in to Stanford law School Chair Cirino did not consider this intellectual diversity, but instead students stepping out of line.

Finally, after hearing testimony from professors at The Ohio State University and speaking with faculty at the University of Toledo I have growing concerns about the language in the bill that seeks to upset institutional norms in place at universities for decades. Why does this institute deserve special treatment? Why can't it be treated like all other institutes that exist at these universities? Will this set up be the norm moving forward regardless of whether or not it is successful? While my understanding of how some aspects of university norms work is limited I have heard enough to be deeply concerned that these institute could step on the toes of the professors currently at these universities working hard and following the existing norms. I do not see any reason why these institutes deserve special treatment.

Thank you again for taking the time to consider my testimony on this issue that threatens to have a huge impact on my education. I ask that you consider pushing back voting on this bill until school is back in session and more students and faculty can be made aware of its existence so that they can also engage in the political process.