

THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
FACULTY SENATE

Apprv'd @ FS mtg 01/17/06

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

Minutes of the Senate Meeting of December 06, 2005

HIGHLIGHTS

UT/MUO Merger

Note: The remarks of the Senators and others are summarized and not verbatim. The taped recording of this meeting is available in the Faculty Senate office or in the University Archives.

Chair Jorgensen called the meeting to order. **Senator Barbara Floyd**, Member at Large, called the roll.

I. Roll Call –2005-2006 Senators

Present: Ahmed, Barden, Barlowe, Barnes, Barrett, Bischoff, Bopp, Bresnahan, Cluse-Tolar, Edwards (Sullivan), Floyd, Fournier, Fridman, Hoover, Hottell, Hudson, Jorgensen, Kennedy, King, Komuniecki, Kunnathur, Lambert, Lipman, Lipscomb, Lundquist, Olson, Piazza, Poling, Pope, N Reid, Ritchie, Schultz, Sherman, Skeens, Stoudt, Suter, Spongberg, Teclehaimanot, Templin, Thompson-Casado, Tramer, Wilson, Wolff (43)

Excused: Bowyer, Humphrys, Martin, Morrissey, Niamat, Traband (6)

Unexcused: Kozlowski (1)

A quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes–Minutes of the November 22, 2005 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Executive Committee Report by Chair, Andy Jorgensen:

Let me remind you that this afternoon after our meeting we have an open forum on admissions criteria. However, given the importance of our primary agenda topic, we will stay on the agenda topic continuing to consider the merger issue for as long as people are willing to discuss it, until you move to the previous question, or some other disposition. So the Admissions Criteria Forum will begin with Steve LeBlanc taking over for that discussion after we are done with our agenda discussion.

IV. Reports: None

V. Calendar Questions: None

VI. Other Business:

Old Business: UT/MUO Merger Resolution

Chair Jorgensen: At this time I am inviting Vice-Chair Walt Olson to take over the Chairmanship position temporarily while I give my personal thoughts on a potential

merger. I will take the Chairmanship back following my comments and will run the meeting objectively from that point.

Vice-Chair Olson: I recognize Senator Jorgensen.

Chair Jorgensen: I have thought about this carefully for a long time so I wanted to write it down so as not to miss anything, so please forgive me for reading it. Let me start with a little history and first say that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) was not part of any discussions or decisions before the announcement of this potential merger. Two days after the announcement, the EC met with the president for our regular monthly session and the merger was our primary topic. We heard a history of the present proposal as well as the president's experience at two other institutions. Members of the EC did express a generally favorable view toward a merger, especially given the opinion that MUO should have been part of UT since its inception.

We subsequently received the Ryan Beck report and shared it with all senators. Obviously this flawed study did not address many critical aspects of a possible merger from the UT point of view. You offered a number of specific comments and objections, which I summarized and sent to the president. One member of our BOT's requested a copy of this document and I did provide it to him.

In a follow-up message to Dan Johnson, a key paragraph of which I shared with you, I unequivocally stated the Senate's view that faculty must be fully involved in this process. But the usual path of shared governance to study and to plan a major change in the institution was not followed. Collegiality was sacrificed for expediency. That was a serious mistake by this administration. This has led to frustration, anger and a reduced level of trust.

Last week the FSEC met to discuss the possible merger. We all believed that merging with MUO was a positive step for UT for all the obvious reasons – the ability for greater collaboration in what we do educationally and in research, the achievement of a better profile to prospective students of both institutions, and move us in the direction of other major universities in this and other states. A few points on this: we share students with MUO – in nursing, allied health – and medical school after many of our pre-med's graduate - but they are still parts of two distinct universities. In terms of recruiting undergraduates, we all discount magazine ratings, but our prospective students do read them. Nine of the top 10 universities in one such report are major universities with medical schools. In the US, all but 3 public medical schools are part of major universities.

To the FSEC, a merger with MUO was, on the face of it, a desirable development. The details for how to do it, however, were and are far from clear. The challenges will be enormous – financial, legal, and cultural. Therefore, we reformulated the tabled resolution in three ways: removed the reference to the Beck study, changed to propose agreement only “in principal” and to broaden the call for shared governance.

Subsequently we met with our counterparts from the MUO Senate. We extensively discussed many aspects of the merger – tenure, grants, salaries, the hospital, unions and governance structures. The combined EC's decided to propose to each of our senates the formation of a committee, entitled, UT/MUO Faculty Synergies Work Group, to study the impact of a merger on faculty. This will be the subject of a motion later in today's session.

As an aside, some years ago the institution where I earned my Ph.D., University of Illinois at Chicago, merged with the medical school that had been part of the U of I system, but a separate entity while only 1 mile away. As part of my due diligence, I spoke with their vice-chancellor of research who stated that the merger has been a great success, both in terms of research collaboration and for students moving between the two parts of the combined unit. In fact, they advised another institution in Colorado which more recently completed a similar merger. I was also provided with a copy of a report on the UIC merger, which we can mine for useful information.

Yesterday at least 7 members of our Senate were present when MUO's President Jacobs addressed their Senate. I will leave it to them to comment on that presentation. I did arrive at their Senate meeting for part of the discussion regarding their support of the merger "in principle." There was a good interchange with their senators and other faculty, our senators and one member of their board. They approved a modified resolution by a vote of 20 to 2 and I have the text of that resolution here.

Virtually every faculty member I have spoken to at UT has expressed support, at least in principle, for a merger with MUO. Of course they have many concerns, but at the broadest level, the case for it is quite compelling.

In a moment, the revised resolution will be introduced by the FSEC. Although the path to this point has been a very poor model for how we should carry out our affairs, I urge your support for the resolution. And contrary to some of my colleagues, I don't say this primarily because it is inevitable. I say it because unless scores of other institutions are wrong, it is in the best interest of our students and our faculty.

As I stated in an email, of course we retain the right to comment, criticize and propose any and all ideas on the merger now and in the future – we do not under any circumstances give carte blanche to the administration or the board.

Earlier this afternoon I spoke with our president and asked for his commitment regarding faculty participation at the next level. He stated that he fully supports faculty on the Steering Committee for the merger as well as membership on all of the subcommittees of that group which have faculty-related subjects under consideration – and further supports the role of the Faculty Senate in selecting faculty for these appointments. To that end, I invite you to consider who will be the best representatives for the faculty on these groups.

My view of an improved future University of Toledo includes a medical campus. I invite you to consider the same as you vote on the resolution.

Vice Chair Olson: Any comments on Dr. Jorgensen's statements? Hearing none, I relinquish the Chairmanship back to him.

Chair Jorgensen: Let me continue now by presenting the motion from the Exec. Committee, which has only been changed in those three ways mentioned. The paragraph on the Beck study has been removed. The words "in principle" have been added and the partnering with MUO Faculty Senate and administration has been added to the resolution.

MOTION: Resolution of support for the possible merger of the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio

WHEREAS the presidents of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio have begun talks concerning a merger of the two institutions;

AND WHEREAS the positives of a potential merger included: improved prestige, improved political positioning, better public perception, enhanced fundraising capability, and increased state appropriations;

AND WHEREAS a merger would present the possibility for enhanced research funding and collaboration between existing research departments;

AND WHEREAS the merger of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio would produce the third largest public university in Ohio;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of The University of Toledo supports in principle merging the two institutions;

AND, in the longstanding tradition of shared governance, the UT Faculty Senate looks forward to partnering with the MUO Faculty Senate and administrations of both universities as planning for and implementation of such a merger proceed.

The motion from the Executive Committee needs no second. It is now open for discussion for as long as you care to discuss it.

Comments/Questions

Senator Stoudt: I would like to propose an amendment to the resolution on the floor. All of what you read in the resolution remains the same except for the bottom two paragraphs beginning with **THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**. I had something formulated, but found that what the Graduate Council had prepared and passed at their meeting earlier this afternoon was very appropriate to what I wanted to relay to you. I have taken the liberty of taking those words and I am presenting them here.

Motion for Amendment:

WHEREAS the presidents of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio have begun talks concerning a merger of the two institutions;

AND WHEREAS the positives of a potential merger included: improved prestige, improved political positioning, better public perception, enhanced fundraising capability, and increased state appropriations;

AND WHEREAS a merger would present the possibility for enhanced research funding and collaboration between existing research departments;

AND WHEREAS the merger of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio would produce the third largest public university in Ohio;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of The University of Toledo supports continued exploration of the feasibility of merging the institutions;

AND, in the longstanding tradition of shared governance, the UT Faculty Senate looks forward to partnering with the administrations of both universities as these merger discussions proceed.

Chair Jorgensen: So you move an amendment to replace the last two paragraphs of the original resolution. It would need a second and then we would discuss the amendment separate from the primary motion.

Senator Tramer: Seconded.

Comments/Questions on amendment to resolution

Senator Thompson-Casado: Would someone from the Graduate Council speak as to why they decided to do this and what the vote was.

Senator Tom Barden, Chair of Graduate Council: Today the Executive Committee of Graduate Council decided to go with this language because we wanted to support the merger process. But you can't really support something until you have seen it. We haven't seen how this merger is going to play out. We are missing the details. When President Johnson visited Graduate Council he said that this is a political decision. We should ask ourselves if the merger is a good thing to do or not, and then to figure out how to do it. What we drafted therefore, what Senator Stoudt has used here, is language that supports the exploration of this merger idea. It takes the "in principle" phrase out of the resolution. It does not indicate a thumbs-up or thumbs-down vote. The Executive Committee of Graduate Council thought it was the best way to respond to what had been put before us and the full Graduate Council concurred.

Senator Thompson-Casado: What did the Grad. Council Exec. Committee envision in coming out of this statement? Are you envisioning that the University administration will undertake a study of the feasibility of this merger? President Johnson seemed to think there was not going to be a phase 1 of study done.

Senator Barden: I think the decision is going to be made by the joint Boards of the two universities at 4:00 p.m. today. Our vote was passed unanimously.

Chair Jorgensen: Can I clarify that? I have the resolution about the merger that The Board of Trustees is voting on and I will place that on the overhead for you to read.

**RESOLUTIONS APPROVING IN CONCEPT THE COMBINATION OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO AND
THE MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF OHIO AT TOLEDO**

WHEREAS, The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio at Toledo share a common mission to serve the needs and interests of Toledo and Northwest Ohio; and

WHEREAS, the two institutions are located in close physical proximity; and

WHEREAS, the combination of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio at Toledo into a new, single entity will create a stronger institution of higher education with enhanced capacity to recruit students, obtain research funding, recruit and retain quality faculty, eliminate duplicative costs and programs, and realize other benefits, as described in more detail in an analysis prepared by Ryan Beck & Co.; and

WHEREAS, a combination of the two institutions has been strongly encouraged by elected officials and community leaders in Northwest Ohio and also by members of the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio General Assembly; and

WHEREAS, this Board believes the benefits of a combination of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio at Toledo outweigh the operational and logistical challenges of the combination; and

WHEREAS, the President of The University of Toledo, Dr. Daniel M. Johnson, and the President of the Medical University of Ohio at Toledo, Dr. Lloyd Jacobs, have strongly recommended the combination of the two institutions;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. The Board of Trustees of The University of Toledo unanimously approves the goal of combining The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio at Toledo and authorizes and directs the President of The University of Toledo to collaborate with the President of the Medical University of Ohio to develop for the consideration and action of the boards of trustees of the respective universities, appropriate terms and conditions for such a combination in a Memorandum of Understanding.
2. The Board of Trustees directs the President of The University of Toledo and the University's legal counsel to prepare, with the advice of special counsel appointed by the Ohio Attorney General, those documents necessary and appropriate for consideration of the combination by the Ohio Board of Regents and the Ohio General Assembly.
3. The Board of Trustees directs the President of The University of Toledo, University legal counsel, and other appropriate University officials to make accessible to its special counsel appointed by the Ohio Attorney General and to appropriate officials of the Medical University of Ohio at Toledo and its special counsel appointed by the Ohio Attorney General all information necessary to enable both institutions to do the appropriate diligence and documentation to facilitate the implementation of the combination.

Chair Jorgensen: I think the key word is the goal of combining in the wording. This resolution seems to approve the goals rather than the merger. Whether they are considering anything else or not, I don't know. This is the only information I have.

Senator Fournier: If the Board votes on that resolution, shouldn't we really be voting on just to approve the principle like the Board's approving.

Chair Jorgensen: That is a possibility but that's not germane to the motion to amend at the present time.

Senator Stoudt: In an e-mail all Faculty Senators received earlier today, Senator Carter Wilson stated that "the train for the UT /MUO merger has left the station and we have only two choices; to stand in front of the train and be run over or to seek the initiative to guarantee that the faculty drives the train." The point I am trying to make with my proposed amendment is that even though the train has left the station, it doesn't mean that we should just accept the situation. We need to stand up for the fact that it left the station without any faculty, students, or staff on board.

I do not understand how every article that we can see and every motion that has been made refers to the legislature being on board and community leaders being on board. Yet the claim has been made that this proposal was just put together in the last few weeks and nobody knew about it. Of course people must have known about this for months or for a very long time, certainly longer than 2 weeks. I don't believe you can get

everybody from the entire state of Ohio on board without having come out earlier with this information than the weeks we have had to see the report. We seem to be the last to know and one might think this would impact us the most. The people making these decisions, our Board of Trustees, The Ohio Board of Regents, and the legislatures do not live here; we do. To say, “well, we just have to look into these things,” and “it remains to be seen what happens,” isn’t quite good enough.

I don’t think it is even probable that I can slow the train down, but I think that we should at least be more moderate in our motion and adopt the language approved unanimously by Graduate Council; this might send a message that this is not the way we do business at the University of Toledo. That was the idea, to send a signal - maybe not to stop the train, but to at least get the attention of the conductor.

Senator Piazza: My preference at this point is to support the stronger language in the original proposal and not necessarily support the more moderate language being proposed. My feeling is that we have an opportunity here right now. I am not happy with the way the opportunity came to me or presented itself, but if we grab this opportunity now then we can begin to manage and shape it however we want to. If we don’t grasp this opportunity now or we appear to equivocate, it may be years, or months, before we have this opportunity again. These may be years in which other opportunities may be lost. Certainly the benefit of the combined institutions might be lost during that time. We have lost opportunities for the last 40 years. Why should we try to lose these opportunities for two more? I say we go ahead with the stronger language and let people know that we are prepared to accept this opportunity while still letting them know we are not happy with the way it was presented to us.

Senator Lipman: I would concur with my fellow senator who supports the stronger language. I was among that group of senators that went down to MUO yesterday and heard the dialog between the senate and Dr. Jacobs. Their questions were very similar to the questions that we have. In fact, I think it would be fair to say it really mirrored the discussions that we all have been participating in. I think it is worth noting that in a very direct response to a lot of questions from the senators, Dr. Jacobs made it clear, and I am going to offer a few direct quotes from him, that the process guarantees “That what would result would be degrees of autonomy, which is the commonest model.” So there would be fire walls and separations like a lot of us are discussing. He said quote: “the road itself is a multi-year road”. We know this process, though perhaps poorly launched, is going to continue for some time and Dr. Jacobs addressed things like “communities of interest,” and different models for unionization on different professional campuses.

I came away from that meeting looking forward to an enhanced University of Toledo. I think a lot of little questions like what would we name the institution are insignificant and I would support our backing this merger process with the stronger language of the original resolution.

Chair Jorgensen: Some additional information on that subject. Yesterday President Johnson said that the name of the institution would be The University of Toledo.

Senator Hoover: With all due respect to my colleagues, I take the opposite point of view. I believe that the amended proposal captures my feeling of what should be happening in this decision. It encourages the “continued exploration,” and that is the language I prefer over accepting “in principle,” which I understand to mean the merger process is going forward regardless with whatever happens. I believe as faculty members

we have the responsibility to learn more about such a proposed merger before it receives our endorsement and support to it.

There has been talk of 40 years. I have not been here quite 40 years, but in the setting up of the arrangements for the Medical College of Ohio, it has not been necessary for us to proceed with a merger. I do not believe we have to make this decision within the next 40 minutes, or even 13 minutes. I believe the ideas are good and they will prove themselves in time and I hope to be able to enthusiastically, but intelligently, support the merger.

Senator Tramer: I would also like to speak in support of the proposed modification to the resolution. With my reading of the Board of Trustees resolution language, it seems the original Faculty Senate resolution goes further than the one that the Board of Trustees will be voting on this afternoon. Furthermore, I don't see anything in the resolution that Senator Stoudt has proposed that would prevent us from participating fully in the planning and so on, as the merger plans go forth.

Adam Kophian, Student Senate Liaison to the Faculty Senate: Student Senate also has prepared a form of legislation similar to what Senator Stoudt has proposed asking for continued exploration in slightly different wording.

Senator Skeens: In the amendment to the original resolution, I feel a very important point has been taken out. The FSEC had included "partnering with the MUO Faculty Senate and administrations" in our resolution and that has been taken out of the amended proposal. I think that is a very important part to include in the resolution.

MOTION: I move to amend the amendment and inserting "partnering with the MUO Faculty Senate and administrations" in the amended resolution.

Chair Jorgensen: A discussion of this wording inserted into the amended resolution. Hearing no discussion, it needs a second.

Senator Bresnahan: Second

Chair Jorgensen: We will vote on the addition of those few words to the amendment. *Amendment to the amended resolution passed by voice vote.*

We are now continuing discussing the text of the original proposal.

Senator Wolff: Do we know if our Board of Trustees is considering a second vote on this issue? Not only is this supporting the goal and but apparently they are gathering information.

Chair Jorgensen: My understanding is that they will meet to vote on what has evolved. There is a document that is being prepared, a Memorandum of Understanding. I would presume that the Board would have to approve that Memorandum of Understanding after it develops.

Senator Wolff: Presuming that there is going to be a period of time when there is going to be some sort of feasibility study. It seems to me that this speaks more to that faculty participation in that process, and constitutes that we agree "in principle" and to what that involves.

Senator Barden: We discussed in Graduate Council Exec. Committee, that the same language of our resolution would leave the door open for another final vote to approve the merger by Graduate Council at a later date.

Senator Olson: I reluctantly support this merger. I think that the merger is an outstanding opportunity and in the long run will benefit this University. My reluctance is based on four issues. First, I don't have a clear understanding of all of the documents exist and what is contained in those documents. Clearly there are more documents than

just the Ryan Beck & Co. report. It is my understanding that those documents have not been released for our purview.

The second concern that I have is the Beck report itself. The Beck report is a very superficial report. It considers financial issues only, and it is not with in-depth understanding of the financial issues that exist. It is very glowing in all of the issues that it presents that are favorable, but very scant on any information that might be detractors to such a merger. I find the Beck report unsatisfactory and not a convincing document for me to make this decision.

Thirdly, I believe The University of Toledo should prepare its own report exploring the issues. There are issues that are pertinent only to this University and not necessarily to MUO. Those issues need to be explored. This merger will affect both universities separately and jointly. To make a decision like we are being asked to make, The University of Toledo should have its own report to support making this decision.

Fourth, I do not understand the urgency that we are being presented with. I have yet to hear a cogent reason as to why we have to act immediately with insufficient information. Why can't we consider this merger in a timelier, in depth deliberation? I really do have these four issues at heart while I reluctantly support this merger.

Senator Barrett: I am not seeing a meaningful difference in the Board's comment that they support the goal of merging and our language in the original draft of supporting "in principle" the merger. What they are both saying; to me, is this seems like a good idea but the devil is in the details. That is what preferring something "in principle" means and if you don't like the details, that is where you say you are getting off the train. The amended language says something fundamentally different which is; we don't know if this is a good idea or not, let's look into it. If you think at first blush the merger is a good idea but you want to know the details, you should vote for the stronger language. If you really don't have a sense, then the amended resolution is the more appropriate statement of your view.

The other comment I would like to make is I've never merged two public institutions of any size, but I did do merger work as my prior incarnation as a lawyer. I did find in doing that kind of work between private entities, that there is a momentum to mergers. They can simmer along for a long time and nothing happens and some of them die, or suddenly things get hot and they move forward or they bust. I do not know the details in why we are being rushed right now, but if you think you have all of the time in the world; things won't come of it. That does not mean we should move ahead without caution or due diligence. The Board's resolution talks about conducting diligence, that's in the last two lines of the resolution. They know that there is more to be done here. These are just a few thoughts for everyone's consideration.

Senator Floyd: I would like to speak against the amended resolution. I know that we are all products of our history, and I think that what we are seeing here today is a level of distrust that relates backs to what happened to this institution in 1999. Those of us who lived through that know that was one of the worst things that our Board ever could do. I believe though that this is a different time. I have worked for four Presidents of this University in 20 years, and there has never been a President I have felt more trust in than Dan Johnson. When he says something, I believe it. I also believe we have a historic opportunity here to say we're going to make a decision that will impact our history for the future.

This is not about what happened in 1999, it is about what will happen 40 years from now. What sort of institution are we going to be 40 years from now? If this had happened 40 years ago, I think we would be a very different institution today. We have a chance to correct the mistakes of the past; which is pretty rare. I think we should take that opportunity by stating we support this merger “in principle.” This does not say we agree with how it is done. The reason it was done this way was because the media would have jumped all over this information and critiqued it to death preventing it from getting as far as it did. Dr. Johnson is not trying to do something untrustworthy, he is trying to get something done that he believes is very important, and I believe is very important, to this University.

Senator Schultz: I think what this original amendment is asking us to do overall, is to take a leap of faith. If we look at the process in a very positive way and look toward the future with a sense of hope, or are we going to rely on the past occurrences and allow that to cloud our judgment given the urgency to go forward at this point and time. Including the words “in principle” clarifies the opportunity for the process to move forward but doesn’t commit anyone to any particular direction.

Senator Thompson-Casado: For me this decision is not based on a level of mistrust at all. It is based on a sense of responsibility that I have for this University and for this university family that we are; students, faculty and staff. I agree this is an opportunity, but I don’t know what type of opportunity this is going to be. I haven’t seen a balanced accounting of what type of opportunity this will be. There has been a lot of cheerleading about it but there hasn’t been a balanced view of what the negative impact will be to our students, faculty and to this staff here. For that reason I can not possibly be in favor of this in principle because I don’t have enough information to make that decision.

I would vote in favor of the amended resolution’s wording because I feel like I don’t have the information to make the responsible, informed decision on this.

Senator Bresnahan: I think that Senator Floyd made some good points about the efforts Dan Johnson has made since he came here to communicate openness. I think because of those efforts that I and certainly some of the faculty and staff that I have talked to, have a concern about the merger. It is hard for me to believe that there has not been some sense of understanding as to what will happen to the leadership if this merger takes place. Dan Johnson was asked in the Town Hall Meeting yesterday are you still going to be the President if the merger goes through. His answer was correct in that the Board will decide whose job it is but was a little bit disingenuous? My understanding is that Lloyd Jacobs does not even live in Toledo; he lives in Ann Arbor. How would the Presidency of Lloyd Jacobs of the entire institution have impact on our metropolitan engagement? I don’t know the answer to those questions so I am asking, you are our representative in the Cabinet, Andy, have you discerned discussion in the Cabinet about President Johnson’s plans for his own goal once this merger is underway.

Chair Jorgensen: Not at the Cabinet and it is not appropriate for me to quote from the Cabinet. The other thing said yesterday at the Town Hall Meeting, which was telling me that he views this merger to be larger than any one single president. I also quote from the President of MUO last week when I heard him speak, and I understand he also said this yesterday when I was here, was that he knew Dan Johnson was aiming for a different time in his career whereas he, President Jacobs, was not.

Senator Sherman: I speak against this amended resolution. It sounds to me like what has been around a long time, a typical wishy-washy, no stance, caution that I have heard for the last 10 years, and will never go away. I do support the resolution including “in principle.” It is a done deal and we have to find out what the details are yet, but this moves forward in a little more positive way. The amended resolution to me says nothing.

Call the question.

Chair Jorgensen: OK, Senator Sherman calls the question. On the amendment first we had original resolution and that requires a 2/3 vote; it is non-debatable. Those in favor of carrying on a vote on just this amendment say aye. Opposed to voting on this amendment, same sign.

Approved for voting.

We are ready to vote on the replacement of the last two paragraphs of the original written resolution document with the paragraphs Senator Stoudt suggested.

In favor of the replacement please raise your hands – 11 Opposed – 28

Approval denied for replacement of the last two paragraphs of the original resolution.

What is back on the agenda is the original resolution proposal and anything about is up for discussion.

Senator Lipscomb: I was at the meeting yesterday and I was very impressed by Dr. Jacobs although he did leave some questions open in term of issues that need to be resolved, but I would look forward to working with him. I believe that this resolution says that.

Chair Jorgensen: Lloyd Jacobs has been the President of MUO for about two years and is a heart surgeon by training and does have a background in the Marines, in case you are interested.

Senator Komuniecki: I just want to say that the motion that was passed at MUO yesterday was 20 for and 2 against and is similar to the language that we see here in our resolution especially as it relates to the full participation of the faculty and the implementation involved.

Chair Jorgensen: I have a copy here of what was passed by the MUO Faculty Senate:

Resolution of support for the possible merger of the Medical University of Ohio and the University of Toledo:

WHEREAS the Medical University of Ohio and the University of Toledo have existed primarily as separate and independent institutions of higher education in Northwest Ohio with limited prior business, academic and/or public relationships:

AND WHEREAS the presidents of the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio have begun talks concerning a merger of the two institutions:

AND WHEREAS an analysis of the merger commissioned by the board of trustees of the Medical University of Ohio projected many positive financial, academic and political advantages of such merger;

AND WHEREAS the faculty of the Medical University of Ohio believe there exist multiple potential academic, research and public service advantages of such merger;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of the Medical University of Ohio supports the move toward merging the two institutions in principle and believe that the full participation of the faculty is critical to the success of the merger;

AND, welcomes the opportunity to partner with the faculty of the University of Toledo and the administrations of both universities as the merger discussions proceed.

Senator Skeens: I would like to call the question.

Chair Jorgensen: Senator Skeens has called the question. Those in favor of voting on the open resolution please say aye. Opposed same sign.

Approval given to vote on the original resolution.

Those in favor of this resolution, as it is on the overhead say aye, Opposed same sign.

MOTION: Resolution of support for the possible merger of the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio

WHEREAS the presidents of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio have begun talks concerning a merger of the two institutions;

AND WHEREAS the positives of a potential merger included: improved prestige, improved political positioning, better public perception, enhanced fundraising capability, and increased state appropriations;

AND WHEREAS a merger would present the possibility for enhanced research funding and collaboration between existing research departments;

AND WHEREAS the merger of The University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio would produce the third largest public university in Ohio;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of The University of Toledo supports in principle merging the two institutions;

AND, in the longstanding tradition of shared governance, the UT Faculty Senate looks forward to partnering with the MUO Faculty Senate and administrations of both universities as planning for and implementation of such a merger proceed.

Chair Jorgensen: Let's consider a hand vote since that was indecisive.

Senator Barden: I call for a roll call vote.

Chair Jorgensen: Hearing a request for a roll call vote, I will ask Senator Floyd to begin calling the roll.

Senator Floyd: Ahmed-aye, Barden-aye, Barlowe-aye, Barnes-aye, Barrett-aye, Bischoff-aye, Bopp-absent, Bowyer-absent, Bresnahan-aye, Cluse-Tolar-aye, Edwards (Sullivan)-aye, Floyd-aye, Fournier-aye, Fridman-aye, Hoover-abstain, Hottell-no, Hudson-aye, Humphrys-absent, Jorgensen-Chair (no vote), Kennedy-aye, King-aye, Komuniecki-aye, Kozlowski-absent, Kunnathur-aye, Lambert-aye, Lipman-aye, Lipscomb-aye, Lundquist-aye, Martin-absent, Morrissey-absent, Niamat-absent, Olson-aye, Piazza-aye, Poling-aye, Pope-aye, N Reid-aye, Ritchie-aye, Schultz-aye, Sherman-aye, Skeens-aye, Spongberg-abstain, Stoudt-no, Suter-aye, Teclehaimanot-aye, Templin-aye, Thompson-Casado-abstain, Traband, Tramer-aye, Wilson-aye, Wolff-aye **Aye-36 Abstain-3 No-2 Resolution passed**

Chair Jorgensen: One last item of business as mentioned in my opening remarks will be a move from the Senate Executive Committee, so it does not require a second but does require consideration, to establish a UT/MUO Faculty Synergy Work Group who will study the impact of the merger on faculty. It will be comprised of five senators from UT and five senators from MUO. The two chairs of the Faculty Senates will serve as ex-officio members. This group will look specifically at faculty impacts. We would like to start that committee right away.

MOTION:

I place a motion on the table to establish the UT/MUO Faculty Synergy Work Group.

Comments/Questions

Senator Olson: I would highly suggest that we change the word synergy. The reason for this is that in the business community, synergy is an alternate word for downsizing and that is not what we are talking about.

Chair Jorgensen: At the joint meeting of the UT and MUO Faculty Senate Exec Committees, in which you were present, you made no mention of that change. That concurring, I hesitate to change the name now because that is the name that was agreed upon by both Exec Committees.

I ask Senators to also think about who would be the best faculty members to serve on this committee. We would like someone who can broadly look at the institution as well as broadly look at the roll of faculty. This is a Senate group; not a committee appointed through the President. The University will be appointing steering committees and we will have members on that, but this is group starting right now.

Senator Lipman: Perhaps, someone can give us a timeline so people can give this a little thought and discuss it with one another, and maybe, email their nominees to you. Perhaps it would be best to pick this up at our next Senate meeting.

Chair Jorgensen: That will not be till January 17th. You may email to any member of the executive committee, at your suggestion. However, these members may very well be appointed before January. We are not seeking nominees right now, but only voting on the existence of the committee. We will now vote.

All in favor of the motion please say Aye. Opposed, same sign.

Motion to form The UT/MUO Synergy Group approved.

New Business: None

VII. Adjournment: Chair Jorgensen: Before we adjourn, I would like to once again remind you about the Open Forum on Admissions Criteria held immediately following this Faculty Senate meeting. Carter Wilson and I will be attending the Board of Trustees meeting in the next room, but Steve LeBlanc will be moderating the forum. Chair Jorgensen adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven J. Martin
FS Executive Secretary

Tape summary: Betsy Welsh
Faculty Senate Office Admin. Secretary