

<b>GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT</b>
Although I support the continued evaluation of a possible merger, I do strongly appreciate the idea of having two societies separated by a difference in mission - one focused on basic research, the other on applied research. If a merger happens, I would like to see this dichotomy retained rather than attempting to optimize both simultaneously.
I am a new member to the AOU who only joined in the past year, but I think that if the two societies merge and combined their resources into a single organization, there will be tremendous benefits: it will be better organized, better funded, and better able to continue as a paradigm of avian research and conservation biology. I look forward to becoming a life member of a unified society if that indeed happens.
<b>POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHER</b>
or similar ('United States', rather than 'America', would be more accurate)
very glad this is finally happening
IUCN is the world conservation union. The acronym doesn't have to match the name, if it's important to keep the brand. You could keep the AOU checklists as "AOU checklists", and just have them published by the AOS. I skimmed the report (including pages 14-17), but that wasn't a checkbox option.
<b>YOUNG PROFESSIONAL (&lt; 10 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
I briefly read through the section of the report discussing the options for names, and I think it makes a lot of sense to re-brand the new unified society with a new name and logo, to go along with the new "American Ornithology" website, and to leave open the option for other societies to join at a later date. I also like the idea of a new name to signify building something new. While "AOU" does have broad recognition, "union" has always had the connotation for me of a labor union, perhaps with implications for certain political leanings. Maybe that's just me? Name changes are always difficult, but coming from a non-profit org that has changed names more than once over the past 20 years, I urge you to select a name that will fit the long-term vision of the new society, so a name change at a later date won't be necessary and so we can start building brand recognition for the new society now.

I do not see the "AOU brand" as being particularly valuable. Anyone who cares about American Ornithology will be aware of this merger and change, and I strongly doubt someone who would have published in The Auk would now fail to do so because the name was different. While "AOU" is nice and familiar, I think that its value only lies in being a current status quo, not because of anything intrinsic. Within months of becoming "OSA", I suspect that will be comfortable and familiar. If it is "valuable", it is to those who are, frankly, older and hidebound and on their way out. While not a member of the COS, I feel strongly that retaining the name American Ornithologists Union or any name that retains the abbreviation AOU does that society and its members (of COS) a disservice, and truly does "dissolve COS into AOU". That does not, to me, seem to be the point of this merger. As stated in the report, the point of merging is to create a stronger institution serving ornithology. If it stays "the AOU", why merge in the first place? This simply becomes an abolishment of the COS and its focus, and effectively reduces a competitor the AOU. If we cannot even honor the sacrifice of the COS with a substantive name change in the merged society, I don't think the merger should happen. (And let's be honest: options b, c, and d in the report for names are not reflective of the change and will not be noted by anyone, and only serve the AOU at the expense of the COS.) I think that "America" should be included in the name, since this is the focus of new group, and in particular I laud the choices that focus on the "Americas", which I think goes far to include ALL of the members of the group. "American" (as in the AOU or the proposed AOS) is so often interpreted by those from the US as reflecting North America, that I think it best to use "Americas". I prefer OSA over OUA for two reasons. 1 - "OSA" can be said as a word, and is a nice word! 2 - We get the A from AOU, the S from COS, and of course O from the crossover from the two. In some respects I like the term Union and its nod to equality and inclusion (as opposed to a somewhat exclusionary "society") and thus would vote for Ornithological Union of the Americas (OUA) as a second choice over all others.

If no other mutually agreeable name change option is identified, I'd suggest we consider the Birdy McBirdface Society as a new name. That there is a name we probably all agree on.

If it is decided that the acronym AOU is worthy of preservation, then don't change the name of the organization! That slight change from Ornithologists' to Ornithological is basically pointless. It's minor enough to barely be noticed, and likely only to cause confusion and/or irritation. My preference for changing the name is weak. I would be fine with either it or keeping AOU.

I am a former member of the COS, but dropped that membership because I can't justify membership and time expenses to two different, largely overlapping, organizations.

I don't like either of those above - they are both trivially different than "American Ornithologists' Union", so it makes me think that the benefit of retaining an established name outweighs such a slight wording change to acknowledge the merger.

**MID-CAREER PROFESSIONAL (10-20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D)**

There is value in keeping the AOU abbreviation due to all the legacy issues laid out in the report. However, I prefer accuracy above convenience. Options (h) or (i) are preferred because they emphasize the organization's focus is all the Americas - something that was lost with the current AOU. (Option (l) does the same but is horribly clunky). I prefer (h) because it seems more accurate, flows better, and has a better acronym than (i).

<p>Having been a member of each, I can see pros and cons of merging or not. Question 4 forced me to choose between options, although I am relatively ambivalent about this decision and mostly just want it to be made. But, if it takes another 6-12 mos of discussion, that's fine just do not draw it out even longer than it has been so far.</p>
<p>I see very little benefit to the AOU from this merger. The COS continues to publish what I consider to be a marginal ornithological journal with hefty page charges and little benefit to the author. This also has the potential to marginalize other ornithological societies within North America, such as the AFO and SCO-SOC, who provide valuable services to the community at large and professional ornithologists and I am not sure that such a massive merger will be a good thing.</p>
<p>Thanks to the Working Group for putting so much effort into this. I believe it will strengthen ornithological research, conservation, and policy to have a more encompassing society.</p>
<p>I'm happy to change the name, but consideration of other organizations with the same initials is also important. I don't want the society to be confused with the American Opthamological Society or other groups. Google tells me that several such organizations exist, but not how well known they are. Ideally, the new society's initials would top browser search results.</p>
<p><b>CAREER PROFESSIONAL (&gt;20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b></p>
<p>I hope a name change does not prove to be a critical stumbling block. Nonetheless I am hesitant to toss a very strong brand, AOU. Because of the AOU checklist, AOU numbers and the Union's long history. AOU is a vey strong international brand. While giving it up would not be critical, it would be a major loss. It is the initials that are most important, hence American ornithological Union might be a choice. I note that COS is also a strong brand, so there is a loss, regardless of what happens. I will remain a member regardless of the final name.</p>
<p>I think Cooper is fully justified in requesting a new name. I was never wedded to "AOU." First, we are not a union in the way that word is typically used. Second, we were just copying the Brits, with their BOU.</p>
<p>A great idea. Changing AOU to AOS, American Ornithological Society makes sense for a combined name for the two previous organizations.</p>
<p>I strongly favor the merger for a variety of reasons, including one not addressed very seriously to date as far as I know, which is that a new society can move relatively quickly and logically in new directions, and in my opinion, as I've expressed to Scott Lanyon, North American ornithological societies need to get more serious about environmental threats to birds, especially climate change.</p>
<p>In the earlier round of discussions, about merging the journals, I was called by an AOU bigwig. He hadn't called me in 8 years, but all of the sudden was my good friend. The sell was so intense that I haven't renewed my membership or gone to a meeting since! I am an AOU Fellow by the way.</p>
<p>I gots smarts!</p>
<p>AOU is large enough now. At meetings of very large groups it is difficult to get to all interesting paper presentations, poster sessions and to reconnect with your colleagues that you probably only see at these annual meetings. The groups come unmanageable. Plus there is always the possible lower attendance at large meetings due to their large size.(Think about what goes on at NAOC meeting.)- I have attended two of them and will not attend another one. Logistics for housing, meals, travel become more of a problem. Occasional joint meetings are preferred</p>

I am not in favor of a merger in which the societies are treated as equal partners, and I view questions such as 5 and 6 as presupposing such an outcome. In fact, it appears that the leadership of the AOU has been on the trajectory of the merger for several years without a clear mandate to do so. If the AOU chooses to take on some of the activities of the COS, that is fine, but I do not believe that it is necessary to significantly distort the nature of the AOU to accommodate the COS activities.

**RETIRED PROFESSIONAL**

"Society" tends to have a more trivial connotation, even if that is not correct in the present case. There are thousands of Societies. It's likely that no name selected will please everyone, but at least 'Ornithological Union' seems to imply some 'weight'.

If a merger occurs, retire the names of both societies and create a new name, appropriate for a new association.

Merger makes sense to me. By the way, you don't have a spot in #3 above for a member who is not a professional Ornithologist, or at least that is how I read the answers. I am retired, but from Corporate Finance, not Ornithology! I know several other people who are members who are also not professionals.

I believe the brand of "AOU" has value world-wide and should be preserved. I previously was a member of both organizations and once retired maintained my membership in the AOU only.

I doubt that a combined society can achieve the strong governance structure that we must have to lead with bold and creative solutions to the challenges ahead. COS will likely infuse discussions with historical biases and agendas that impede timely consensus.

I would agree to a merger as long as the current number of papers for both societies doesn't decline.

Just get it done!!!!

In a merged organization, It appears that members get access to both The Auk and The Condor. If both publications are to be unchanged, this seems logical,

I can see no clear advantage to the merger. Both organizations have had clear areas of interest and strong reputations and publications. They can work together when needed without merging. A merger would mean reduced independence for the publications, policies, and activities and allow a smaller clique to control the policies and activities, and direction of ornithology in North America (perhaps the real reason for the proposal?).

OSNA and NAOC already exist as merged ornithological 'names' within North America. Why another? OSNA and NAOC already drastically reduce opportunities for meeting attendance for persons living far from 'centres of population'. No doubt the societies would benefit by such a merger, but what about the members?

I like American Ornithological Union because it retains some historical flavour but it is not the same, and gets rid of the dreaded apostrophe

<b>GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT</b>
<b>POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHER</b>
<p>I preferred not to answer questions 5 and 6 because I think the name of the society is relatively unimportant and do not have strong or well-informed opinions about a name. However I had to select answers before my survey could be considered. I am in favor of a merger for several reasons. First, it would reduce costs for students and young professionals who have little or no income to spend on society memberships. Even if these two societies merged, young professionals are still often members of groups like Waterbirds, Raptor Research Foundation, Wilson Society, and others. While I am now a postdoc with a good income, as a recent student my salary was sometimes below the poverty line in the US, from 10,000 to 15,000 per year. The cost of society memberships was extremely difficult under those circumstances. Another reason I am in favor of a merger is that the two societies have the potential to be more influential and powerful joined, rather than separate. In a perfect world, I view the Wildlife Society as an excellent example of what North American ornithological societies should aim for - though perhaps with more journal offerings. I think the Wildlife Society is a good example because there is one annual conference making it logistically easy to network with most everyone in the field once a year at one conference. The Wildlife Society has numerous working groups under the umbrella organization covering a wide range of topics, from wildlife diseases, to invasive plants, to spatial ecology, etc. Individuals can become members of the individual working groups for a small fee, if interested. The Wildlife Society offers a close-knit, cohesive organization with clear objectives for individuals working in wildlife biology. They have the ability to excel in numerous avenues, including publishing, lobbying, offering wildlife certification, etc. While a merger of AOU and COS does not address all of these issues, because groups like Wilson and others are not merging, it is a first step in the right direction. If the two largest societies merge, it sets a precedent for some of the smaller societies to follow. I see no reason, other than personal pride from long-time members, to keep COS and AOU as separate organizations. Thank you for conducting this survey. It is good to know that the merger is still being considered.</p>
Merge!
<b>YOUNG PROFESSIONAL (&lt; 10 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
<p>Perhaps we could merge the societies into the American Ornithological Society, but somehow retain constituent pieces called the American Ornithologists' Union (AOU) and Cooper Ornithological Society (COS) within the new merged society. Sort of like a European Union-member states model? One membership fee and administration, but the "AOU" part can still do things under its name like issue checklists, and the "COS" part can still organize occasional small friendly meetings in the western U.S. Something like a "Confederation of American Ornithology."</p>
<p>I see little up side to a merger. The fact that 92% of members are members of both societies suggests that most members find benefits in there being two societies (e.g., journal focus, leadership opportunities, etc.) and not that they are somehow redundant.</p>
<p>I feel like I cannot answer questions 5 and 6 because I don't know the impact of the AOU and COS brands. I am in favor of a branding study conducted by an impartial third party.</p>
<p>I really do not have strong feelings on the matter. AOS or AOU is fine.</p>
<p>Regional committees should address the concerns of maintaining some degree of focus on western NA birds.</p>

COS has always been more "friendlier" than AOU. This is my principle objection to the merger. But if it happens, we need to kill COS rather than suggest that somehow the new entity isn't simply the AOU. It is, and COS will be dead for better or worse. Just like I say I'm going to the AOU meeting, not the COS meeting. If killing COS is needed for the good of American ornithology, then so be it. At the end of the day, I trust you all.

**MID-CAREER PROFESSIONAL (10-20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D)**

When merging, try to change other things as little as possible. For example, keep the AOU initials for the new merged society. Keep a similar format for all 3 of the journals and avoid changing the names of the journals. (With all the recent changes in style and format of our journals, we run the risk of appearing to be temperamental drama queens if we continue down that road. We've got something that works now, so let's stick with it. Move forward and don't look back.) Thanks to the committee for all its hard work on this process!

I have been a member of both societies for many years and in general support the merger in part because of the reduction in membership fees. I want to support the AOU and COS but in the rapidly changing publishing scene it is becoming increasingly difficult to justify the membership largely based on journal access. For example I could pay about \$150 for the two journals plus SAB or I could pay \$500 for university library access to many many journals. Of course, many, if not most, AOU/COS members have institutional access to the journals and don't need the membership for that purpose. So as far as advantages of the merger for members go that leaves just #2 from the working group report, "Increased resources to support members at all stages of their careers." To be honest, I am not really sure what this support is. I have needed, and still need support in my career (or maybe I should say attempted career) but have never gotten any support from the societies (aside from the journals and meetings which may or may not count as support). The reality is that jobs in ornithology are decreasing every year, fewer colleges and universities offer courses in ornithology, and ornithology in the traditional sense is rapidly becoming marginalized. I haven't seen the societies actively confronting that main issue that is affecting their members. So the AOU/COS in whatever form it takes needs to do a better job of making that support known and available beyond the inner circles of the organizations, and more importantly, beyond the traditional cozy confines of academia. As far as I can see point #2 in the working group report boils down to fewer people doing more not an increase in resources to help the rank and file members.

I like "American Ornithological Society!"

Please let me reiterate; I do not support the merger. I think the focus of Cooper in the West is every bit as important as it ever was, and more so, especially given the horrendous impacts of so-called "green" energy on birds.

I am on the fence about the name change. I lean towards a new name to reflect the equal value of the two societies and to that end, it seems that AOS is too close to AOU to really reflect a new order. A very minor name change seems like too much bother.

I see no reason to change the name. The American Ornithologists' Union is a well recognized brand. Changing the name would just cause confusion. I believe the Cooper Society pretty much splintered off of the AOU years ago because their needs were ignored. Can't the merger just be seen as everyone coming back to the AOU, now that the philosophies of the two societies have converged? I believe recognizing the history of Cooper is important, but can be done in other ways than altering the name of the American Ornithologists' Union.

In most cases I have seen, discussion on such changes takes lot of time and the results are uncertain. Almost all Societies in the world are having troubles and I guess we should use our time and effort to improve the societies that already exist. I think it is more parsimonious than to starts again. But this is an opinion of a member that even dont read the whole report which probably had the explanation about the complains from both the Societies. I agree that mantain the name is important. In a world of disposable things some tradition may be important.

I am not in favor of a merger that resembles the COS simply being "absorbed" into the AOU. If the societies merge I think it should proceed as a forward-thinking, new, joint society with a new name to reflect this.

Let's get this over with and move on.

Lost in the discussion seems to be any consideration of Canada. I know many fellow Canadians who have become disenchanted with AOU and COS for a US-centric approach, and who have abandoned their memberships in part because of that. Yes, the Society of Canadian Ornithologists exists - but largely it seems to fill that void. Given that AOU and COS are already major partners in the North American Ornithological Conferences, and the stated objectives in the working group report clearly extend beyond the US, would this not be a good opportunity to logically evolve into the North American Ornithological Society (NAOS)?

I have been a member of both societies since I was an undergraduate in the 1980s. I am from California, my first professional presentation was at a COS meeting, and my first peer-reviewed paper was in the Condor -- so I have a deep and abiding respect for the history and role of the COS in North American ornithology. Nonetheless, I am (1) strongly in favor of the merger of the two societies, and (2) even more strongly in favor of retaining the name American Ornithologists' Union for the merged societies. Let's be honest with ourselves: the COS has effectively no brand recognition outside of a very narrow professional audience, whereas the AOU is widely known as the authoritative voice for western hemisphere ornithology. It would be terribly foolish to give up that brand value simply to make a relatively small number people feel better about this merger. I plead with my good colleagues in the COS leadership to not let this trivial naming consideration kibosh a merger that makes great strategic sense at so many other levels!

Oligarchy Of Ornithology (OOO!) Seriously, I'd prefer American Ornithological Union to preserve the AOU brand.

**CAREER PROFESSIONAL (>20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)**

I do not prefer a new name. "Union" is more indicative of a joining of two societies than is "Society" and I see no issues with retaining the AOU brand.

I absolutely hate questionnaires in which one is required to offer an opinion or an answer when one doesn't have an opinion or answer.

A change in name would be important to indicate the combined society was something new (although retaining histories and traditions of both parent groups), and leave open the option for integration of other ornithological societies.

I think it is critical for the merger talks to continue. Because both societies have long histories and their members are concerned about retaining their names, it would be best to come up with a new name but retain separate histories on the shared website to maintain their legacies.

If a merger occurred there is concern that the western US ornithological needs would not be adequately addressed, with the present emphasis of the AOU being on the eastern US where most members reside. There has to be a voice for ornithology in the western US that the Cooper Society presently provides.

I've been a member of both organizations since the 1970s. I am extremely supportive of the merger. While I prefer the initials AOU and the original name, mainly for a host of branding reasons, I can live with a slightly modified name if this clears the way. Please make this happen. Thank you for all the hard work.

I dislike AOS as it implies that it would be the only ornithological society in US. I am very fond of both WOS and AFO.

Although a member of AOU for many years, I am a working physiological ecologist, not specifically the kind of ornithologist particularly welcome in AOU since perhaps the mid-1980s. Many of my friends in my discipline have left AOU or simply don't bother with their meetings. COS is more welcoming of physiologists, but the smaller meetings they have had reduced the value of attendance with limited budgets for meetings. I would like the new society to be more open to my field. Separately, I have never been comfortable with the AOU Fellows. This 19th century method of organizing by class is both undemocratic and not welcoming. An example of the undemocratic nature of this organization is the fact that only the Fellows must vote on merger. It is good that the leadership wants to hear from all of us, but that is not required. What is the general membership and the Fellows differ in their opinion? By its structure, the AOU would go with the Fellows. I would like to see a merged organization that was truly democratic emerge from this. If the Fellows survive, they should not be given political control. That should belong to the general membership as is the case with COS.

To not rename the merged societies as a clearly new entity would be a major step backward from the current shared endeavors and a profound lost opportunity. As a longtime supporter and proponent of a merger, I absolutely would not support a merger that did not provide a uniquely new name for the merged organization (e.g., American Ornithological Society).

Thank you to members of both societies who have worked on this difficult issue.

I think it will make the merger easier for COS folks if there is a name change. The name change should be slight enough that most of the publics and Govt institutions do not really notice the difference. I do not know what the consequences of a name change are for the endowments and other bylaws. That could change what will work best. Overall, a good and necessary (for COS) development

My concerns are mainly focused on The Condor (the journal). I'm from California, and much prefer to have journals focused from a regional perspective. The Condor provided that.

Thank you for the hard work of the team

American Ornithologists' Union is imperialistic in my view. Fine, both the organizations are based in the US, but both have members from around the world, particularly the Americas. I am a US native and naturalized Brazilian (dual national) so probably have a special sensitivity to these issues. The name suggested above has nothing imperialistic about it and reflects probably well over 95% of membership, which comes from all THREE Americas: North America, Central America, and South America. So geographical emphasis, not national. We are ALL Americans, not just those who are citizens of the USA.

Note that I'm also not terribly opposed to keeping AOU from the choices in Question 5, and am thus using THIS space to elaborate a little on this lack of strong preference.

Perhaps consider retaining a "Cooper Society" western section of the merged society (AOU or AOS or whatever) to preserve the Cooper brand, to promote regular smaller meetings at smaller western venues, and to focus on more strictly western issues in ornithology and avian conservation. Perhaps the "Cooper section" could even meet jointly on an occasional basis with Western Field Ornithologists which has annual meetings in the West dedicated to field aspects of ornithology.

Given the current projected financial situation for COS, I think it is in the best interest of North American ornithology for COS to merge with the AOU. That way the history, endowment, and awards of COS can be preserved as an integral part of the merged society. It would provide a positive step forward in unifying and strengthening the groups. Being a long-time member of both societies, I would be happy to accept a new name for the merged society if that is considered of ultimate importance to members of COS. Keeping the current name would also be satisfactory to me, particularly because of the branding issue (AOU Checklist, AOU codes). I think we should consider carefully which of the AOU bylaws should be changed--many of them I think should not be. Perhaps, if members agree to a merger, a similar poll could go out regarding opinions on changing each specific bylaw mentioned in the report. Thanks for the comprehensive report. It was extremely informative! Colleen Handel

I am hoping some reduced costs can be considered, particularly for online subscriptions.

I frankly doubt that AOU as a 'brand' has substantial monetary value - it is primarily a sentimental matter. I certainly don't think that it is worth someone trying to estimate its value. Within a few years, those concerned will rapidly adjust to a new name. Frankly, updating to 'society' from 'union' (not that I am anti-union!) may be in order. While this may not be a merger of 'equals' a new name is appropriate.

Think it is only "fair" to change the name of both societies.

This entire thing is the craven capitulation of a failed executive. Having been unable to keep the existing societies going why should we have faith that they will be able to keep their new society going?

Hard work: Well done. Congratulations to the membership who worked so hard on all this. Patty Gowaty

This all makes excellent sense. I want to congratulate everyone involved in putting this report together and navigating this frustrating and lingering situation. I'm sure all of you would rather have been doing bird research!

Thanks for an excellent report. As a long-term member of both AOU and COS, and having served on the Council/Board and numerous committees for both societies, I think a merger is well-justified and makes the most sense. I do not think the name issue should stand in the way of a decision to merge. Although the name is obviously important, the decision to merge should be based on what is best for ornithology and for engaging younger members in the profession. Regarding names, I strongly favor a new name for the merged organization. I like "American Ornithological Society" because it's simple, retains some flavor of both societies, and has a parallel with the website American Ornithology. Having a new name does not mean that individual awards and committees can still retain their historical society in the name (e.g., AOU Checklist Committee), but many committees overlap in function and/or in the members who they serve. Nice job in putting together all of the information in this report.

I strongly favor the merger. Although I have indicated support for AOU at Q 6 and 7, I will agree with any other name if this is all it take to finalize the merger.
"AOU" is a strong "brand" for American ornithology, and should be retained. "AOS" is awkward (not auk-ward) to say, and it would be nonsensical to call the organization American Ornithological Society and keep the abbreviation AOU. A change to "American Ornithological Union" would do no great harm, but would be pointless in my opinion, and I predict everyone would continue to say American Ornithologists' Union for many years.
As others have noted, the merger would be most effective if it continues to serve members by meeting in locations that are accessible in different regions in a on a somewhat predictable basis. This would facilitate planning and budgeting for meeting attendance. There should be no reduction in number of papers published.
Use of American implies more than USA which I believe is not correct.
While the report is fairly thorough and reasonably balanced, it omits all data about the endowments. I think that's an important factor, and it would be good to see graphs of each going back, say 15 years and projected forward a few years based on known factors. In reading between the lines, the implication is that Cooper's endowment is getting dangerously low while AOU's is going to be providing the "financial stability" mentioned on page 11. The report actually settled my mind on the issue, which heretofore I was neutral on. I am a life member of both societies (and an AOU Fellow), so care a great deal about the future of ornithology in North America. There is strength in diversity, and the missions of the two societies do differ in important ways. Moreover, there will be a great loss in society service opportunities. I expected there to be more gains. Given how weak the gains are and the fact that AOU is poised to do great new things on its own, I find myself against a merger. If one should occur, then I strongly believe that the AOU brand has to be retained. It would be foolish to sacrifice that for what at the end of the day seems purely a political, face-saving move of politeness. If a merger does occur, I'd like to see the elimination of classes. That may not be popular, but it's a flawed system and I prefer the lack of structure, in e.g., SSE. However, should the class system be retained, then I oppose making bylaws changes 2, 4, 5, and 6 suggested on page 13. Two is especially short-sighted, as I have seen how much former presidents have to offer at Council meetings. I feel a little less strongly about the others, but keeping those bylaws does offer some protection from a possible future Trump effect (undue disruption).
Society of American Ornithologists. This name is inclusive (North & South American ornithologists) and clearly describes the membership of the group.
I am MOST strongly opposed to the merger. I'm tired of the politicians trying to run the organizations like a business instead of as a professional society. I see problem after problem as a result -- beginning with the wrong year in the date of the meeting that was held in 2015 on page 1 of the report. The politicians can't get their act together and even proofread their report!
No other society name beside American Ornithologists' Union is acceptable
American Ornithology Society. This matches the joint society website AmericanOrnithology.org. American Ornithological Society would also be acceptable. Union is a 19th century term and very old-fashioned. AOU can retain the AOU name on the Check-list, AOU Awards, etc. Ditto for COS.

This will be a disaster and will be terrible for recruiting young members. Why? Because two societies allows more opportunities for involvement for younger ornithologists as members of committees and officers. It is reasonable to predict that the sum total of the combined parts will be less than that of the two parts.

Keep American Ornithologists' Union. Frankly any other name would destroy a long and beautiful, distinguished history. If COS cannot maintain itself as COS, it should fold.

**RETIRED PROFESSIONAL**

The name "Union" is particularly appropriate given that this is indeed a union of two organizations. I would opt to keep it in some way. The above name is tongue-in-cheek of course but without the "super" and the sub-title may be a possibility. Too bad Wilson is a no-show here. Big mistake on their part...

The committees have done a good job of outlining the pros of a merger and some of the problems that might emerge. They have devoted far less attention to cons of a merger an should do so. The merger and various aspects of it are also presented in such a way as to make it seem like a done deal. This and many housekeeping details of any merger should be decided by votes by the membership, not by the Board or the Council..

A terrible idea

American Ornithological Union is a very appropriate choice, in my view.

CONGRATULATIONS on the comprehensiveness of the aou-cos merger report! Good work.

While the ultimate naming of a merged organization is important, that does not appear to be the largest issue. Content of the report indicates that there are many difficult and unresolved matters related to prospective merger. Ultimately, members of both AOU and COS will need to come to reasonable agreement on what the merger will accomplish for ornithology and ornithological professionals. Hopefully that recognition will guide all matters, including naming.

My formative years as a student and as a professional ornithologist occurred in California so COS is not something I want to see subordinated in a merger, but I also realize economics is the driver behind this merger and think it needs to happen. The proposed name (American Ornithological Society) seems the best fit for all. Still not clear if, in the new name, we now speak for (or implied so) Latin American ornithology. That seems a touchy issue. Thanks to all who have devoted so much time to this.

At least 1 original name should be maintained. Tracking of an organization is important. Creating a new one with no history of it'sown poses many difficulties. While, I hate to lose the Cooper Society, I do believe that we need to keep the AOU name as is.

I think the merger is a big mistake. As a life member of both societies, will I get a refund of my life membership money from Cooper when they merge and the AOU swallows up Cooper?

Let's get this done. Advantages seem to greatly outweigh a few drawbacks. Let's not stumble over the name; 5 years from now it won't matter.

I believe that the proposed merger is in the best interests of both societies.

I have mixed feelings about the name change. AOU is a brand name and worth keeping. Whether it is in the current or new format doesn't make much difference to me. I do understand and sympathize with those closely affiliated with the Cooper Society, though, who will lose the Cooper name. That was my first ornithological society! Sad.
I must admit that I am somewhat ambiguous on a merger. I understand the financial benefits, but I liked it when the two organizations had somewhat different orientations for the respective publications. I guess I qualify as a stuck-in-the-mud old codger!
To preserve the AOU "brand" I would support retaining the title of the "AOU Checklist" (published by the American Ornithological Society) and AOU codes. Based on my impressions and the information in the report, I think these are the primary items that would benefit from the AOU brand. All other activities of the AOU and COS would benefit from a new name that unites the societies.
I think it's very important to carry on the tradition of one of the two societies. Because the AOU is older, and arguably more esteemed, I do hope we can keep that name.
Please don't take "Western Hemisphere" into the name of the new society. The Greenwich Meridian is in London UK. Most of the UK , the larger part of France, Spain ad Portugal are in the Western Hemisphere. A true descriptor would be "of America" or keep the name "American Ornithologist's Union" That way you still have the Acronym AOU adding COS or Cooper to the name would be an alternative.
Keep American Ornithologist' Union--Cooper died financially forcing this integration with the AOU so why should AOU change its name?
Union of American Ornithologists This denotes merger without emphasizing either of the merged societies
Your questionnaire is requiring that I fill in something here, but I have absolutely no preference. AOU was always the larger/broader organization, so its name is adequate. In truth, I find this merger idea a no-brainer. Things have been oversplit for far too long.

<b>GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT</b>
<b>POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHER</b>
<b>YOUNG PROFESSIONAL (&lt; 10 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
With regard to the name and the proposed identification of a Western Hemisphere focus for membership, I think it is important to distinguish the society's name from the jingoistic term America (as in United States of America and the term American). The Americas more clearly identifies both continents in the Western Hemisphere.
American Ornithologists Union--though it is a pity to lose Cooper and I hope there is some way to maintain that name elsewhere within the merged societies.
<b>MID-CAREER PROFESSIONAL (10-20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
I don't feel that strongly about the name.
<b>CAREER PROFESSIONAL (&gt;20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
Even though I have expressed a preference for the above name change, I would be happy with American Ornithological Union as a second choice, or American Ornithologists' Union as a third option.
<b>RETIRED PROFESSIONAL</b>

<b>GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT</b> A merger makes so much sense!
<b>POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCHER</b>
<b>YOUNG PROFESSIONAL (&lt; 10 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
<b>MID-CAREER PROFESSIONAL (10-20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D)</b>
<b>CAREER PROFESSIONAL (&gt;20 YEARS POST B.A., M.S. or Ph.D.)</b>
<b>RETIRED PROFESSIONAL</b>