

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON: ARCHITECTURE SPECIAL FACULTY MEETING

February 15, 2018

In person: Tice, Keyes, Corner, Van Den Wymelenberg, Haight, Williams, Nettles, Duff, Moye, Givens, Cartright, Zimmer, Rockcastle, Davis, Rowell, Ahn, Gillem, Elzeyadi, Cheng, Brodie, Larco, Neis

Remote: Genasci (via Tanberg), Neis, Moore, Kive, Hagenlacher, Hahn, Kwok, Young, Muller

MOTION

In response to input from a substantial group of self-organized Department of Architecture faculty, the Department of Architecture Ad Hoc Committee, whose members were elected by a vote of the Architecture faculty, advanced the following motion (made by Tice):

As one of the best known programs of architecture in the United States with a distinguished legacy of faculty, students and alumni going back over a century and to best serve our current and future students, the University of Oregon, the State of Oregon, and the profession of architecture:

- *the faculty of the Department of Architecture believe it is imperative to expeditiously create a School of Architecture at the University of Oregon that is autonomous and independent of the College of Design, and*
- *the School of Architecture should oversee, direct, and manage all academic and budget matters within its purview on the Eugene and Portland campuses, and*
- *initially this School of Architecture should include three departments: Architecture, Interior Architecture, and Historic Preservation.*

BACKGROUND

The need for an independent School of Architecture is driven by the necessity to address at least 10 issue with the current structure of the College of Design:

1. Fiscal autonomy (example: lack of budget control - it is now primarily at the SAE and CoD level)
2. Program autonomy (example: closure of summer academy)
3. Assignment autonomy (example: Portland criteria)
4. Communication autonomy (example: lack of input on website - may seem minor but may have significant recruiting impacts)
5. Hiring autonomy (example: inability to forward needed positions outside of the CoD)
6. Administrative autonomy (example: SAE office staffing shuffles may have driven retirements and limited retention)
7. Endowment autonomy (examples: Ross and Baker endowment fund allocations)
8. Outreach autonomy (example: Dean's Advancement Council rather than a true advisory council we can outreach to for advice)
9. Access autonomy (example: Architecture is not even represented at the Dean's level and accessing the Dean through additional layers is time-consuming and inefficient)
10. Strategic autonomy (example: the CoD Strategic Plan (draft) has been developed with little to no input from architecture faculty and says nothing directly relevant to a professional program)

To ensure maximum participation, the motion was also sent out via a websurvey to architecture faculty with instructions to either vote in person or on-line by 530pm. Cheng requested that the voting period be kept open as long as possible. Voting was kept- open until the end of the meeting.

DISCUSSION

Attendees discussed the motion in the following manner: attendees in the meeting room first, followed by those participating remotely. During the discussion, Larco proposed a second motion but since active on-line voting was already under way on the motion above, the second motion did not proceed to the floor. No other motions were presented.

VOTE

The results of the vote on the above motion were as follows:

- In Favor: 20
- Opposed: 9
- Abstained: 1
- Total votes in favor/opposed: 29 (represents 69% in favor and 31% opposed)
- Total votes: 30 (67% in favor and 30% opposed, 3% abstained)

NEXT STEPS

Since the Ad Hoc Committee advanced the motion, that committee will facilitate an inclusive process for moving forward.