Bill,

On Thursday, March 2nd, 2017, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the Proposal for the College of Design. Dean Christoph Linder and Roxie Thoren, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in AAA, presented the proposal to the Council. The Council did not take a vote. We discussed the proposal and there are considerations the Council recommends be addressed as the redesign proposal moves forward. These considerations include:

1. There is wide support among members of the Council for reorganizing into a College of Design. The rationale (pages 1-3) was clearly conveyed to the Council with the exception of one question during discussion. The proposal states, “a college structure will provide parity with peer institutions” (p. 1). The Appendix includes organization structures of AAU peers and there is a wide range. How does this proposal fit within the AAU peers listed in the Appendix? Are there existing programs listed on this document that inform this proposal? The Council recommends further articulation of how the proposed College of Design is reflective of examples from the Appendix.

2. Members of the Council expressed concern for the organization of 3 schools with 1 department (p. 4). While this proposal reflects the preference of faculty in AAA, members of the Council expressed concern for how the proposal would be “lived” with the status of a department alongside three schools. Will the Department Head of History of Art and Architecture have the same role as the Heads of Schools? This appointment suggests a different workload (Head of School + Department Head responsibilities) in comparison to department heads within the schools – has this been considered? At the level of the Dean’s Office, will the Department Head of History of Art and Architecture be viewed as equal to a Heads of School by the Dean’s Office and across the College of Design?

3. The proposal was presented as “budget neutral.” During discussion, numerous questions were raised about the feasibility of a budget neutral proposal with elements of the proposed restructuring (such as the appointment of Heads of Schools). Will this be achieved as savings through consolidation?

4. Questions were raised about how the use of schools and college in the proposal fits within existing school and colleges at the University of Oregon. This also applies to the leadership structure with Heads of Schools and Department Heads.

5. The proposal reviewed by the Undergraduate Council is dated January 31, 2017. The Council would like more information about the restructuring proposal and recent discussion about AAD since this date. Last year, the Council approved the proposal for the new major that is now under review for possible termination. During the discussion a year ago, members of the Council raised concerns about sending forward a major with primarily NTTT faculty with concerns about viability. The vote was not unanimous, but the proposal was solidly approved. A program was started and students were admitted. At the Undergraduate Council
meeting on 3/2, we heard this major is "not sustainable" for the reasons of TTF/NTTF imbalance. During discussion, members of the Council pointed out that the major could be sustainable if AAA wanted it to be. The proposal was passed with expectation the major would be supported with the hiring of further TTF. New leadership and a new budget outlook have created a new context. Is the curricular scope of the major no longer of focus for AAA and the redesign? How was this decided? Is the decision only about the budget? Is terminating AAD contributing to a budget neutral redesign? Is this part of the campus wide effort to increase TTF? If so, in what way is the redesign supporting this goal in other areas of AAA?

Please let me know what further information would be helpful as the proposal moves forward.
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