

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by President Steve Corns. Roll was called by Secretary Kelly Homan. Those whose names are grayed out below were absent.

Brent Unger, Jorge Porcel, Darin Finke for Terry Robertson, Mark Mullin, David Westenberg, Craig Claybaugh, Fui-Hoon Nah, Xinhua Liang for Parthasakha Neogi, Jee Ching Wang, Amitava Choudhury, Klaus Woelk, Joel Burken for Stuart Baur, Mark Fitch, William Schonberg, Michael Gosnell, Chaman Sabharwal, Michael Davis, Mahalet Fikru, Ali Hurson, Kurt Kosbar, Sahra Sedigh Sarvestani, Maciej Zawodniok, Venkat Allada, Steve Raper, Sarah Hercula, Dan Reardon, Ralph Flori, Steve Gao for Jonathan Obrist-Farner, Kathleen Sheppard, William Fahrenholtz, Jeff Smith, V.A. Samaranayake for Akim Adekpedjou, Matt Insall, S.N. Balakrishnan, Jie Gao, Kelly Homan, Ashok Midha, Lonnie Pirtle, Samuel Frimpong, Shoaib Usman, Ulrich Jentschura, Michael Schulz, Amber Henslee, Michelle Schwartze

II. Discussion of Merging UM President with UM-Columbia Chancellor

Dr. Corns had two documents to put forward, a resolution and a position letter.

The resolution is as follows; **Whereas** each Chancellor in the University of Missouri System is bound to represent the needs and interests of their own campus,

And whereas the President of the UM system needs to represent all four campuses without partiality or prejudice,

And whereas the proposed merger of the UM President and University of Missouri-Columbia Chancellor would create a conflict of interest between these two distinct roles,

And whereas the proposed merger could create a flagship/satellite model to the detriment of Missouri S&T,

And whereas a flagship/satellite model would likely limit resources, degree diversity, and support for graduate programs at Missouri S&T, thereby lowering our ranking and reputation,

And whereas no clear and convincing rationale or budget estimate for the proposed merger has been presented to UM stakeholders,

Now therefore let it be resolved that the Faculty Senate of Missouri University of Science & Technology opposes the proposed merger of the roles of Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Columbia and the President of the University of Missouri System.

The position letter is as follows;

The Faculty Senate of Missouri University of Science & Technology would like to express its deep concern about the proposed unification of the roles of Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Columbia and the President of the University of Missouri System. We are principally concerned with the inevitable conflict of interest this would create within the UM System. It is the job of each Chancellor in the System to represent the needs and interests of his or her own campus. By contrast, the President of the UM system has to be impartial with respect to the four campuses. The proposed merger would require a single individual to be partial to Mizzou but impartial to the four campuses in the System, which is impossible. We are also concerned that that the reputation and rankings of Missouri S&T, UMKC, and UMSL would suffer, due to their new status as mere "satellite" campuses. Furthermore, the almost inevitable resultant restriction in resources, diversity of degrees offerings, and support for graduate education would further damage the academic reputation of these campuses. The S&T Faculty Senate furthermore believes that a model with a "Flagship" university and "Satellite" campuses would threaten the unique strengths and diversity of each campus in the UM system.

Finally, we are concerned that no clear and convincing rationale for the proposed merger has been available to UM stakeholders. The message seems to be that it could save money, but no budget projections have been made available, nor estimates of how many new administrative positions would need to be created to ensure continuity of operations.

In summary, we are wary of any major changes made in a time of crisis. It is too easy for short-term needs to blind us to possible permanent structural damages.

A motion was made to accept the letter and put it forward.

Motion did not pass.

A motion was made to put the resolution forward.

Motion passed.

IX. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned 2:41 pm.