Ten college and university mergers are discussed to present information about the reasons for such mergers, the process employed to achieve them, and their consequences. The study provides practical information about several mergers that have taken place and suggests guidelines for those who wish to consider merger. A variety of factors contributing to a merger decision are discussed including geographical proximity, complementary programs, a history of cooperative relationships, the drive to coeducation, the desire to strengthen the quality of higher educational service, and complexities of higher education financing. The processes involved in merger are outlined as are the various consequences. Closing as an alternative to merger is presented and five case studies reveal a variety of factors contributing to that decision. From the cases studied a number of generalizations and guidelines for mergers are presented along with a checklist for merger situations. (JMF)
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Abstract. Mergers in higher education are viewed here as a sociocultural issue. Concentrating particularly on mergers in Australia during the late 1980s and beyond, highlighted are some cultural challenges that arose and strategies adopted by institutional leaders in trying to create integrated communities from the merging of campus cultures that were historically and symbolically un-complementary. By viewing a number of cases, how hoped-for post-merger integration or 'coherent educational communities' were and were not achieved is a specific focus. Evidence indicates that in newly merged campuses integrated as opposed to federal structures provide more scope for tighter cultural integration. In particular, expert leadership is needed that keeps cultural conflict to a minimum and pays special attention to developing new loyalties, high morale and a sense of community within the newly created institution.
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Introduction

While there is no one prescribed method to ensure that mergers are managed successfully, there is much to be learned from the experience of countries such as Australia where new higher education institutions formed from a series of mergers over a decade ago. Amid major systemic and organisational upheaval in Australian higher education between 1987–1991, new institutions emerged from a number of often highly contested and controversial mergers. Despite many positive benefits voiced by proponents of these mergers, around the system reactions are still mixed as to how successful these have been, especially 'vertical' mergers (Goedegebuure 1992, p. 24) that occurred between university and non-university institutions. In many cases post-merger integration has been painful, messy and protracted and, in one case, the merged partners of one newly created institution broke apart.

Merger as a policy issue in public higher education has attracted a particularly large deal of scholarly interest over the last twenty years or so,
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Abstract
Purpose – This study of a university merger seeks to shed new light on reputation-building, which has remained unexplored in the mergers and acquisitions (M&As) literature. It aims to study how key actors seek to build the reputation of the new university and how issues related to reputation become (re)constructed in different forums and vis-à-vis different stakeholders.

Design/methodology/approach – The paper offers a longitudinal critical discourse analysis of a merger of three universities in Finland. The qualitative empirical material comprises university communications materials and media texts.

Findings – The study illustrates dynamics of reputation-building in a university merger. It shows how the need to become an innovative “world-class” university acts as an imaginary incentive, and predictions of an inevitable future are used to legitimize radical actions. The study also highlights the contradictions and controversies involved.

Originality/value – The study complements extant M&As literature by offering a unique focus on reputation-building. More broadly, it offers an empirically-based critical analysis of university reform in the global economy. It suggests that the ways in which reputation-building activities impact on the (dis-)identification of academic staff in higher education reforms needs to be studied further.
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Introduction
Across the world, business people, creative types and technology geeks struggle to understand each other. Their education and training, even much of their work, is carried out in separate silos, with exciting collaborations the exception rather than the rule. Now Helsinki's business school, art college and technology school have come up with a radical plan: a three-way merger to create what they claim will be a unique, integrated seedbed for innovation. The new institution, Aalto University, will offer joint courses later this year and will be open fully at the beginning of 2010 as the flagship project in a national shake-up of higher education.

This is how the Financial Times, in an article titled “Merger with innovation at its heart”[1], commented on the merger between the Helsinki University of Technology, the Helsinki School of Economics and the University of Art and Design in Finland. First voiced in public in September 2005, the idea quickly caught on. The Finnish Government decided on the merger in April 2007 and the new Aalto University started to operate as a legal entity on January 1, 2010. The new name is a reference to the Finnish architect and designer Alvar Aalto (1898-1976). Aalto also has a metaphorical connotation as it means “wave” in Finnish, thus signifying movement and progress.

The FT article captures the official objective in the Aalto University merger. Creating an innovative “world-class” university was the explicit objective of the
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Strategic mergers are formal combinations or amalgamations of higher education institutions with the aim of enhancing competitive advantage, or merging for 'mutual growth'. Recently, in a number of countries, there has been a decided shift from mergers initiated by governments, and dealing mainly with 'problem' cases, towards institutional-initiated mergers involving strong institutions, and with clear strategic objectives. These issues are addressed and a case study is presented of the 2004 merger that created the new University of Manchester, which aims to be among the top 25 universities internationally by 2015.
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Introduction

This paper explores strategic mergers of higher education institutions entered into with the objective of safeguarding and enhancing competitive advantage, rather than addressing such problems as institutional fragmentation, falling enrolments or non-viability. Strategic mergers are formal combinations of two or more organizations into a single organization deliberately planned so as to more effectively meet external challenges and opportunities. In relation to higher education, strategic mergers are what Martin and Samels (1994) describe as strategies of 'merging colleges for mutual growth'. Driven by an increasingly competitive global market for higher education services and external research funding, institutional mergers are one of a number of responses seriously considered by higher education institutions. Other strategies include informal collaboration; joint business ventures; strategic alliances; regional, national and international networks and consortia; and cross-institutional mergers of academic and/or service departments.

Here, the focus is on one particular form of strategic merger where strong universities or colleges on their own initiative amalgamate with other strong institutions in order to enhance their competitive advantage. Our interest is
ABSTRACT. The demands for greater efficiency, higher quality and reductions in public budgets have meant that continually more countries are looking closely at the structure of their higher education systems, and this has often resulted in extensive reforms. The objective of creating larger units has resulted in mergers or closures of institutions of higher education. This article tries to elaborate the experiences of mergers in higher education in Australia, USA and several Western European countries (Norway, Sweden, Finland, The Netherlands, Belgium, Germany and Great Britain). What were the intentions with the different mergers? What kind of processes did this involve and what were the end results? We have focused on some of the problems and what went well. In the conclusion, lessons to be learned from mergers in higher education are highlighted.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to give an international overview of mergers in higher education. Briefly, we want to focus on topics like:

- Who initiated the mergers?
- Why merging?
- The merger process
- The outcomes of the mergers

The article is based mainly on merger literature. In addition, it is also based on data from interviews in a few countries (Australia, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden).

The Anglo-American literature on the mergers of institutions contains two synonymous concepts, mergers and amalgamations, which both reflect the merger of two or more previously separate institutions into one new single institution.

Since World War II there have been many mergers in higher education in different countries. During the 1960s and early in the 1970s, political authorities in Australia and Great Britain used mergers to create a binary or two-fold higher education system with the establishment of the colleges of advanced education and the polytechnics as alternatives to the universities. Furthermore, merger was an important measure in the German experiment with the Gesamthochschulen during the 1970s, and the Swedish
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Ronald A. McGinnis, MD, William McMillen, PhD, and Jeffrey P. Gold, MD

Abstract

On July 1, 2006, the Medical University of Ohio officially merged with the University of Toledo and became the third largest public institution of higher education in the state of Ohio. The combination of the two neighboring institutions occurred through the efforts of a number of individuals who recognized the potential advantages of a merger and worked quickly through challenges by early engagement of stakeholders in the merger process. The advantages of a larger, more diverse institution with increased budget and research funding outweighed the challenges of bringing two different cultures together. Changing the culture and leadership was necessary to allow the process to move forward. In addition, statewide political support was mobilized to carry forward the legislative actions that permitted the formation of the new institution. The transformation of a free standing medical campus to a part of a larger university required a fusion of the existing boards of trustees, a new organizational structure and a unified strategic plan, all of which occurred in the first 12 months after the merger. The college of medicine of the former Medical University of Ohio has been strengthened by the merger process, and the new University of Toledo has emerged as a much more diverse and complete institution.

Mergers and combinations of institutions of higher education have not been uncommon in the recent past and have been driven by both financial and strategic reasons. Such combinations, when involving a college of medicine or an academic health science campus, are relatively more unusual than those not involving health professions education, and they require clear vision, meticulous planning, and a healthy dose of patience.

On March 31, 2006, the Ohio governor signed a document merging the Medical University of Ohio and the University of Toledo into a single institution. The merged institutions retained the University of Toledo name, and the former Medical University of Ohio became the Health Science Campus of the University of Toledo, which contains the Colleges of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, and Health Sciences and Human Services. This new university became the third largest public institution of higher education in Ohio. In this article we discuss the process which led to this historic event and provide a context for each institution’s decision to merge with the other. We also review the administrative and programmatic structure of the process and discuss the accomplishments and future challenges facing the new University of Toledo.

History of the Medical University of Ohio

The Medical University of Ohio, originally named the Medical College of Ohio (MCO), was founded by the Ohio legislature on December 18, 1964, when Governor James Rhodes signed legislation passed by the Ohio General Assembly (Ohio Revised Code 3350.01–3350.05). Passage of the bill culminated a four-year campaign led by local medical and business leaders to bring a medical school to northwest Ohio, after intense competition among Ohio cities to be the home of the new medical school. Toledo prevailed partly because northwest Ohio did not have a medical school, although it was home to the University of Toledo (UT). However, in 1964, UT was a municipal university and not a state university. The new state medical school could not be part of the municipal university and it thus was decided to create a free standing medical school. UT became a state university just three years later in 1967, but by then MCO had its own board of trustees and administration, and there was no interest at either school in merging.

A 59-member faculty with 10 administrators was established at MCO to teach the entering class of 32 medical students in the fall of 1969. In addition, 175 community physicians joined the ranks of volunteer faculty. Soon after the first class of medical students began its studies, the schools of nursing and allied health were established. Initial classes were held in temporary classrooms while the campus was being developed on 346 acres of land in south Toledo. The campus was designed by famed architect Minoru Yamasaki, who designed the World Trade Center in New York City. The Health Science Building was the first building completed, followed by construction of the Mulford Library and the Health Education buildings and a tertiary care hospital which opened in December 1979.

MCO’s growth was marked by expanded clinical programs and increased numbers of students, academic offerings, and biomedical research activities. The
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Abstract
This article describes a decade of major changes at an academic health center (AHC) and university. The authors describe two major changes undertaken at the University of Colorado and its AHC during the past 10 years and the effects of these changes on the organization as a whole. First, the AHC’s four health professional schools and two partner hospitals were completely relocated from a space-limited urban campus to a closed Army base. The impact of that change and the management of its potential disruption of academic programs are discussed in detail. In the middle of this total relocation, the AHC campus was consolidated with a general academic campus within the University of Colorado system, compounding the challenge. The authors describe the strategies employed to implement this major consolidation, including changing the organizational structure and selecting the new name of the university—the University of Colorado Denver.


It is hard to imagine a time when Americans have needed the unique benefits and contributions of academic health centers (AHCs) more than they do today. As our population ages and health care workforce training becomes more constrained, it is imperative that AHCs remain the strong and vibrant centers of health care learning, research, and clinical care that they are today.

Yet, many AHCs are encountering difficulties—financial difficulties in light of rising health care costs, expanding research in an environment of flat or declining National Institutes of Health funding, declining state support for education—and have to adopt new strategies to thrive. Although the old adage, “If you’ve seen one medical school, you’ve seen one medical school,” is equally apropos to AHCs, one commonality among AHCs is that sustaining—let alone growing—them to serve the needs of society has consistently been a challenge. From the build-out of hospitals after World War II, to the recognition in the 1960s that physician practice plans could generate funds, to the advent of increased federal funding for research, the economic underpinnings for AHCs have evolved along with the makeup of the populations they serve.

This constant evolution has been the case for our AHC, previously known as the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center (UCHSC). Two enormous changes—practically unprecedented among AHCs—are fundamentally redefining its identity. We describe the history and nature of these changes as our AHC continues to adapt to a shifting landscape to serve its mission with ever-increasing excellence. The stories we tell are distinct from one another, but they are alike in the magnitude of their impact on the cultural and physical settings of the AHC, and the lessons we learned along the way may serve to inform similar changes at other AHCs.

The Rebirth of a Campus

History
The medical school (established in 1883) and Colorado General Hospital (later renamed the University of Colorado Hospital [UCH]) had shared a building near downtown Denver until 1965, when the state appropriated the funds for a new hospital across the street. The medical school took over the old hospital space, and the two buildings were connected by a five-story research bridge. Although the research bridge space accommodated the early expansion and growth of the research enterprise of the medical school, the new building was the last for the medical school for the next 25 years. In 1976, the UCHSC was formally established when the school of medicine (SOM) and partner hospital was joined by the school of nursing (established in 1936) and the school of dentistry (established in 1973). Although the additional research bridge space accommodated the early expansion and growth of the research enterprise of the medical school, the new building was the last for the next 25 years.

In 1992, plans were approved for a five-story research building to house cancer, neurosciences, and molecular biology research programs. The medical school was so short of space that the departments of medicine and pediatrics and the dean’s office contributed an additional $3.0 million to build three additional floors of research space in the new building. Two years later, the school of pharmacy moved from the Boulder campus to the UCHSC campus and took much of the last remaining land available for building on the downtown campus. By this time (1994), UCHSC had outgrown its facilities. Surrounded entirely by residential neighborhoods and six individual neighborhood associations whose residents were concerned with parking and congestion, it became clear that developing a facilities expansion plan to suit everyone involved was very unlikely.

Room to grow
In 1994, Lowry Air Force Base (which was located two miles east of the campus)
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Abstract

Naming is a significant part of image building or positioning for products and corporations. Organizations less frequently engage in name changing, but, if first impressions count, institutional names may need to be taken seriously. In this study, names of college and universities unfamiliar to potential students were presented for evaluation. One cluster of respondents had a clear preference for geographic or aspirational names while a second cluster had a preference for proper names. There was an overall preference for proper names. Cluster members differed on age, gender and level of exposure to higher education.
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1. What's in a name?

If you are a parent, plenty. Children's names are a complex product of religion, family history, culture past and present, and individual preferences. The intent with such naming may be more to capture a tradition than to influence a future, but "each name has a life of its own that endures long after the original reasons have disappeared or are even known to members of a group." There is intuitive, anecdotal and empirical evidence that names vary widely in their connotations and images, and have some intrinsic quality that may inherently predispose a reader's or listener's response.
Strategic Alliances: United We Stand: A Strategic Analysis of Mergers in Higher Education

Gillian Rowley

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)

Available online: 15 Mar 2010

To cite this article: Gillian Rowley (1997): Strategic Alliances: United We Stand: A Strategic Analysis of Mergers in Higher Education, Public Money & Management, 17:4, 7-12

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9302.00085

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.