Consultation and Engagement Report for the Academic Modifications Advisory Committee (AMAC)

To: Professor Edward Davis, Chair, Academic Modifications Advisory Committee and Senate President
From: Christopher P. Long, Senior Vice President and Provost
Date: October 23, 2026

In accordance with our agreed upon procedures for collaborative input for significant academic changes at the University of Oregon this document, as defined by section 3, provides an overview of the engagement activities and a summary of input received by schools and colleges and the office of the provost during the confidential phase of the Academic Modifications Committee (AMAC) process.

I. Engagement Activities by Schools and Colleges 2

College of Arts and Sciences 3
Feedback collection schedule 3
Summary of feedback received 5

College of Design 5
Feedback collection schedule 5
Summary of feedback received 7

College of Education 9
Feedback collection schedule 9
Summary of feedback received 11

Clark Honors College 13
Feedback collection schedule 13
Summary of feedback 14

Libraries 14
Feedback collection schedule 14
Summary of feedback received 16

Lundquist College of Business 16
Feedback collection schedule 16
Summary of Feedback received 17

School of Journalism and Communication 17
Feedback collection schedule 17
Summary of feedback received 18

School of Music and Dance 19
Feedback collection schedule 19

Key Themes from SOMD Drop-In Conversations 21
Overall Finding 23
School of Law 23
Feedback collection schedule 23
Summary of feedback received 24
II. Timeline and Process 25
III. Feedback Concerning Academic Modifications 25
Support for the academic value of two specialized graduate programs 25
Criteria used for academic program review 26
Reductions in tenure track faculty lines impact UO's academic standing 26
Uncertainty around structural reorganization 26
IV. Feedback Concerning the Vision Document 27
General affirmation of the vision and the confluence model 27
Disciplinary breadth and the designation of anchors 27
Fundamental inquiry and discovery-oriented scholarship 27
Relationship between research vision and undergraduate education 28

I. Engagement Activities by Schools and Colleges

The below outlines the various engagement activities for each school / college, and libraries. Engagement differs for each depending on the level of academic modifications being proposed.

The Provost's Council Budget Engagement Guidelines outlines the structured, collaborative process of consultation we have sought to pursue in addressing the structural budget deficit. The Provost's Office submitted engagement plans from each dean on August 27, 2026. AMAC provided written feedback to each dean on September 15, 2026.

The feedback provided by AMAC generally encouraged the deans to ensure they have robust consultation and feedback opportunities for all proposed academic modifications, which were incorporated into their consultation process.

Some of the feedback collection schedules include activities set to take place in the coming weeks; that is, the feedback gathering is ongoing. The preliminary proposals outlined in Initial Report to the Academic Modifications Advisory Committee reflect real-time modifications made as a result of the consultation process to-date. We will continue reviewing feedback from AMAC's public engagement process through the end of November leading up to the decision deadline in December.

College of Arts and Sciences

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
July 28, 2026	Retreat	CAS Dean's Office Retreat	CAS Cabinet, Dean summarized and leadership team discussed budget scenarios.
July 30, 2025	Heads Advisory Council	Department Head leaders and dean	Dean presented and gathered feedback on budget proposals.
August 4, 2026	Meeting	President, CFO, Provost, Dean	Dean presented and answered questions about CAS budget scenarios.
August 19, 2026	Heads Advisory Council	Department Head leaders and dean	Dean presented and gathered feedback on budget proposals.
September 17, 2026	Meeting	CAS Leadership	CAS department heads, program directors, ASU associate directors and dean shared information and received feedback about scenario proposals.
September 24, 2026	Heads Advisory Council	Department Head leaders and dean	Dean presented and gathered feedback on budget proposals.
October 2	AMAC Meeting	AMAC and Dean	Dean presented and answered questions about CAS budget scenarios.
October 5, 2026	Faculty Meeting	REES Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 6, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Theatre Arts Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.

October 6, 2026	Faculty Meeting	History Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 7, 2026	Heads Meeting	Chemistry, Biology, and Human Physiology Heads, Dean, Associate Deans	Discussed possible implications of enforcing three course teaching loads in these departments.
October 7, 2026	Faculty Meeting	German Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 7, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Scandinavian Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 8, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Religious Studies Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 8, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Folklore Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 9, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Romance Languages Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 9, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Comparative Literature Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 9, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Classics Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 19, 2026	Faculty Meeting	East Asian Language and Literature Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 19, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Geography Department	Dean and divisional associate dean met with faculty to hear feedback.
October 21, 2026	Leadership Meeting	CAS Leadership Meeting	Additional consultation meeting with CAS Leadership.
October 22, 2026	Head Meeting	Romance Languages Head, Dean, Associate Dean	Further discussion of the impact of academic modifications on the department.
October 26, 2026	Town Hall	CAS-wide	A townhall for additional feedback from within CAS.
November 3, 2026	Heads Advisory Council	Department Head leaders and dean	Dean will gather feedback on budget proposals.

Summary of feedback received

The CAS Dean's Office is actively consulting with faculty, staff, department heads, and program directors on the proposed academic modifications. Given the size and complexity of CAS, the breadth of its academic programs, and the number of potential actions under consideration, this is an extensive and dynamic process involving many departments and stakeholders. The college is committed to providing meaningful opportunities for consultation and carefully considering all feedback before making final recommendations.

The Dean's Office has met with all departments where graduate program suspensions are under consideration. Several departments have submitted alternative proposals, which are being evaluated alongside other feedback and in the context of the college's broader academic priorities and budget obligations.

The Dean's Office has also met with all departments being considered for consolidation, with additional meetings being added in response to feedback. Feedback from these conversations will help inform the college's recommendations, recognizing that decisions must balance the interests of individual programs with the long-term academic and financial sustainability of CAS as a whole.

College of Design

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
July 21, 2026	Email Communication	College of Design Faculty and Staff	Dean shared information regarding the College financial outlook and emerging budget challenges.
September 10, 2026	Retreat	College Leadership	Initial discussion of budget challenges, planning assumptions, impacts, and approaches for identifying savings and revenue opportunities.
September 18, 2026	School Retreat	School of Planning, Public Policy and Management	Discussion of budget reduction planning, potential impacts, and merger-related considerations.
September 22,	Faculty and Staff	College of Design	Budget reduction planning and

2026	Meeting		merger-related topics discussed during the college-wide welcome-back meeting.
September 22, 2026	School Retreat	School of Architecture & Environment	Review of budget challenges, reduction scenarios, and opportunities for efficiencies and revenue generation.
September 22, 2026	School Retreat	School of Art + Design	Discussion of budget reduction planning and college-wide priorities.
September 22, 2026	Unit Meetings	Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture	Department-level discussions regarding budget scenarios, graduate program assumptions, impacts, and alternatives.
September 23, 2026	Leadership Meeting	College Leadership	Review of themes emerging from consultation activities and discussion of participant concerns.
September 23 - October 8, 2026	Individual Consultation Opportunities	Faculty	Dedicated blocks of time reserved by the Dean for faculty-requested one-on-one discussions regarding budget and merger planning.
September 24, 2026	Unit Retreat	History of Art and Architecture	Discussion of budget reduction planning, academic impacts, and revenue generation opportunities.
September 24, 2026	Unit Meeting	Product Design	Collection of feedback regarding operational efficiencies, cost reductions, and revenue-generation opportunities.
September 24, 2026	Email	College Leadership	Shared preliminary budget scenarios including graduate admission pause assumptions under the 10% scenario and viability concerns under the 15% scenario.
September 24, 2026	Email	College Faculty and Staff	Invitation to participate in the college-wide town hall and consultation process.
September 29, 2026	Town Hall	College Faculty and Staff	Presentation of 5%, 10%, and 15% planning scenarios. Discussion focused primarily

			on the 10% scenario.
September 30, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Portland-based Faculty	Discussion regarding budget planning, graduate program costing, enrollment strategies, Portland programs, and merger-related considerations.
September 30, 2026	Leadership Meeting	College Leadership	Debrief of town hall discussion and review of concerns, questions, and alternatives raised.
October 6, 2026	Email	College Leadership	Shared revised planning scenarios reflecting feedback received through consultation. Revisions included restoration of limited MFA admissions, removal of remission savings assumptions, delayed GE reductions, and continued graduate program analyses.
October 13, 2026	Written Memorandum	Dean, College of Design	Architecture PhD Working Group memorandum requesting reconsideration of the proposed pause in PhD admissions and proposing alternatives.
October 14, 2026	Leadership Meeting	College Leadership	Review of updated planning assumptions, revisions made in response to feedback, and issues raised through consultation.
October 14, 2026	Unit Meeting	School of Planning, Public Policy and Management	Follow-up discussion regarding budget planning and graduate program assumptions.
October 16, 2026	Unit Meeting	History of Art and Architecture	Follow-up discussion regarding budget planning and potential academic impacts.

Summary of feedback received

The preliminary 10% planning scenario, focused on in the town hall, included assumptions regarding temporary pauses in doctoral admissions and MFA admissions while additional analyses of graduate program costs, enrollment demand, funding models, and long-term sustainability were conducted. Participants were informed that these pauses were intended to create time for

further evaluation and should not be interpreted as decisions to eliminate or discontinue programs.

As consultation progressed and additional analysis occurred, several assumptions were revised. Most notably, limited MFA admissions were restored through a two-year funding model intended to preserve enrollment and program vitality while limiting long-term financial commitments. The revised planning scenarios continued to assume temporary pauses in doctoral admissions pending completion of graduate program costing and sustainability analyses. Participants were also informed that under the 15% reduction scenario, the long-term viability of some graduate programs could become increasingly difficult without significant new revenue generation, alternative savings strategies, program redesign, or other structural changes. Other themes emerged as noted below.

Budget Transparency and Access to Information

Several expressed a desire for additional information regarding financial position, historical allocations, enrollment trends, SCH production, class sizes, staffing levels, and prior reductions.

Budget Reduction Assumptions and Decision-Making Processes

Questions/answers seeking clarification regarding planning assumptions, timelines, graduate funding models, and how feedback would be incorporated into decision-making were discussed.

Academic Quality, Student Experience, and Instructional Capacity

Concerns focused on educational quality, instructional support, advising capacity, accreditation requirements, workload implications, class availability, and faculty/staff capacity.

Graduate Education, Research, and Program Sustainability

Significant discussion focused on graduate program costing, Graduate Employee support, tuition remissions, doctoral and MFA recruitment pauses, research productivity, faculty recruitment and retention, and long-term sustainability of graduate programs.

Organizational Structure and Administrative Capacity

Participants discussed department and school structures, administrative responsibilities, leadership capacity, and accreditation obligations.

Operational Efficiencies and Cost-Reduction Opportunities

Suggestions included streamlining processes, increasing coordination across programs, reviewing staffing models, sharing resources, and alternative approaches to curriculum delivery.

Revenue Generation and Long-Term Sustainability

Suggestions included expanding enrollment, certificates, executive education, summer programs, sponsored research, facility utilization, and alumni engagement.

College of Education

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
July 14, 2026	Dean and Department Heads Meeting	COE Department Heads	Dean met with COE Department Heads to discuss possible 5/10/15% budget reduction ideas in the COE.
August 25, 2026	Department heads and Associate / Assistant Deans Meeting	COE Department Heads, Associate and Assistant Deans	Discussed fall engagement process and steps.
September 1, 2026	Dean and Select Department Heads Meeting	Dean and SPECS department head	Dean met with SPECS Department Head to discuss department-specific budget reduction ideas, including possible closure of CDS, SPED, and SPSY PhD Programs, and possible closure of SPSY EdS Eugene cohort.
September 2, 2026	Dean and Co-Department Heads Meeting	Dean and CPHS Co-Department Head	Discussed department-specific budget reduction ideas and proposals.

September 2, 2026	Dean and Department Heads Meeting	Dean met with EDST Department Head	Discussed department-specific budget reduction ideas and proposals.
September 3, 2026	Finance Team Planning Meeting	Dean and COE Finance Team	Discussed college-wide budget reduction ideas and proposals.
September 9, 2026	Leadership Meeting	Dean and Associate Dean for Research	Discussed college-wide budget reduction ideas and proposals for faculty engagement.
September 10, 2026	Leadership Meeting	Dean, AD for Academic Affairs, AD for Administration and AD for Accreditation	Discussed college-wide budget reduction ideas and implications for academic affairs
September 14, 2026	Leadership Meeting	Dean and AD for Academic Affairs	Discussed college-wide budget reduction ideas related to PhD programs
September 17, 2026	Deans Leadership Retreat	Deans, ADs, and Department Heads	Discussed budget reduction levers, proposal details, and engagement process steps and activities.
September 18, 2026	Faculty Meeting	SPECS faculty Meeting with Dean	Discussed department-specific budget reduction ideas and proposals.
September 21, 2026	Department Heads Meeting	CPHS Department Heads with Dean	Discussed department-specific budget reduction ideas and proposals.
September 23, 2026	All-faculty Town Hall	All faculty (zoom and in-person)	Q&A and Discussion
September 23, 2026	All-Staff Town Hall	All staff (zoom and in-person)	Q&A and Discussion
September 28, 2026	Email	EDST Department Head	Outlined feedback and input from EPOL and QRME faculty
October 6, 2026	Individual Meeting	EDLD / COSA director and Dean	Discussed budget reduction ideas and proposals

October 6, 2026	Leadership Meeting	Dean and AD for Research	Discussed potential budget reduction impacts on career research faculty teaching opportunities
October 6, 2026	Advisory Board Meeting	Dean and COE Community Diversity Advisory Board Meeting	Held open Q&A session to discuss the current proposals
October 7, 2026	Individual Department Head Meeting	Dean and EDST Department Head	Discussed engagement with EPOL & QRME faculty around budget reduction possibilities
October 12, 2026	Individual Department Head Meeting	Dean and CPHS Department Head	Discussed budget reduction ideas and proposals.
October 13, 2026	Department Heads meeting	Dean and COE Department Heads	Discussed updated budget reduction ideas and engagement activities
October 13, 2026	Individual Department Head Meeting	Dean met with SPECS Department Head	Discuss department-specific budget reduction ideas and proposals.
October 14, 2026	Faculty meeting	EPOL and QRME Faculty	Discuss program-specific budget reduction ideas

Summary of feedback received

Several consistent themes emerged across faculty, staff, department leaders, and community partners regarding the College of Education's budget reduction planning process.

Throughout the consultation process, faculty, staff, and leadership emphasized the importance of preserving the college's core academic strengths while navigating significant fiscal challenges. Faculty and staff repeatedly highlighted the distinctive contributions of the college's doctoral and professional programs to the university's research mission, workforce development goals, and public service responsibilities. They described many of these programs not simply as academic offerings, but as intellectual communities that cultivate future educators, researchers, clinicians, and policy leaders. Concern was expressed about proposals that could diminish programs with strong records of external funding,

national recognition, community engagement, or demonstrated alignment with institutional priorities related to educational opportunity, behavioral health, and societal impact. Across discussions, the input received urged college leadership to consider not only enrollment and budget metrics, but also the broader educational, scholarly, and public value that these programs contribute to the university and the state.

A second prominent theme centered on the interconnected nature of the college's academic ecosystem. Many respondents noted that doctoral programs, graduate employee support, faculty research activity, undergraduate instruction, clinical services, advising structures, and community partnerships are deeply interdependent. Feedback frequently emphasized that modifications to any single program can have cascading effects across curricula, accreditation obligations, student support systems, research productivity, workforce pipelines, and external partnerships. Participants therefore encouraged a holistic approach to decision-making that acknowledges these relationships and carefully evaluates the long-term consequences of program closures, consolidations, staffing reductions, or changes to faculty workload.

The feedback showed widespread concern about the human dimensions of budget reductions. Faculty and staff consistently called for a process grounded in transparency, compassion, and trust. They expressed appreciation for efforts to communicate openly while also emphasizing the need for continued clarity regarding timelines, decision points, and the rationale behind potential changes. Many individuals noted that uncertainty surrounding employment, program viability, and future admissions carries significant personal and professional consequences for faculty, staff, and students. As a result, participants advocated for communication practices that recognize the lived experiences of those affected and that center respect, dignity, and care throughout the process.

Finally, they encouraged the college to balance discussions about budget reduction with conversations about future growth and institutional aspirations. Rather than focusing exclusively on contraction, faculty and staff voiced a desire to identify opportunities that build upon the college's established strengths in research, professional preparation, community partnership, student support, and public engagement. Feedback reflected a shared commitment to ensuring that near-term fiscal decisions do not unintentionally compromise the college's long-term capacity

to advance its mission, serve communities across Oregon, and contribute meaningfully to the university's broader academic vision.

Clark Honors College

Feedback collection schedule

Note that no academic modifications are proposed.

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
June 25, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Dean and CHC Faculty	Optional faculty meeting to brainstorm strategies for budget reductions.
July 14, 2026	Meeting	CHC Leadership	Discussion of 5% / 10% / 15% reduction proposals.
August 5, 2026	Meeting	UO Senior Leadership	Discussion of 5% / 10% / 15% reduction proposals
August 14, 2026	Email Communication	Faculty who attended 6/25 meeting	Shared draft notes with faculty who attended the June 25 meeting.
September 16, 2026	Email Communication	CHC Faculty and Staff	Shared draft notes from the faculty meeting on June 25 with all CHC faculty and staff.
September 17, 2026	Faculty and Staff Consultation Meeting	CHC Faculty and Staff	Budget reduction feedback consultation re: 5% and 10% reductions.
September 23, 2026	Survey	CHC Faculty and Staff	Survey opens for final thoughts and feedback.
September 28, 2026	Meeting	Dean and Associate Dean for Administration	Meet to discuss feedback and draft an updated proposal.
October 1, 2026	Consultation Meeting	CHC Student Advisory Council	Budget reduction feedback consultation re: 5% and 10% reductions.
October 1, 2026	Survey	CHC Student Advisory Council	Survey opens for final thoughts and feedback.
October 5, 2026	Survey	Faculty, Staff, StAC	Survey closes.
October 5, 2026	Proposal Submission	Dean	Revised proposal submitted to the Office of the Provost.
November 4, 2026	Meeting	CHC Core Faculty and Staff	Additional consultation meeting.
November 4,	Meeting	CHC Student	Additional consultation

2026		Advisory Council	meeting.

Summary of feedback

Although there are no academic modifications proposed, a survey was completed to gather feedback. The CHC is in the unique position of having experienced 60% growth since 2020, with an additional 30% this year (with the addition of 124 additional non-resident students). The differential tuition charged for the CHC (>$3,000/year) is the highest differential tuition charged by any public honors college. Preserving the student experience so that the CHC can continue to attract academically ambitious students is paramount. Respondents were asked to identify up to three of their top concerns about the budget reduction proposals. Workload was the clearest theme. A close second and third were concerns about losing people and expertise, as well as cuts to funding that directly help students.

Priorities to protect

- Teaching quality and small class sizes.
- Instructional faculty jobs and salaries.
- Student advising, especially for first- and second-year students.
- Student support and scholarships.
- Faculty development.
- The Faculty Fellows program.
- CHC's website and online resources.

The key takeaway was that respondents are most comfortable with cuts to events and celebrations, especially when gift funds can offset costs. They are most protective of teaching, faculty positions, and direct student support.

Libraries

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
June 2026	Leadership Team Meeting	Vice Provost and Libraries Leadership Team (LLT)	Met to craft shared principles for budget prioritization; LLT members asked to consult with their departments/constituencies and bring feedback on those principles.

June-July 2026	Individual Meetings	Associate Vice Provosts (AVPs) with all department heads/directors	Met to discuss budget priorities.
June-July 2026	Leadership Team Meeting	Vice Provost and Libraries Leadership Team	Met to finalize principles and discuss process.
June-July 2026	SharePoint	All Libraries personnel	Shared final principles with all personnel.
August-September 2026	Libraries Personnel Survey	All Libraries personnel (faculty/staff)	Anonymous survey to gather early input on implications of reductions in Library areas.
October 8, 2026	Town Hall	All Libraries personnel meeting	Share summary of input received; broad proposals for libraries to date, an outline of UO's budget decision-making process and timeline for upcoming opportunities for input and feedback.
October 8-28, 2026	Individual and Small-group Divisional Leadership Meetings	AVPs of Libraries with unit directors	Directors give further input on the latest proposals. They hosted a few meetings per director during this period.
October 14, 2026	Elected Representatives Meeting	Vice Provost, AVPs, and elected representatives – Libraries Faculty, OA, and Classified Staff Association	Discussed budget input.
October 28, 2026	Email Update	All Libraries personnel	Vice Provost shared via email or Sharepoint, a summary of the input gathered to date and any updates to proposals to date.
October 28-November 30, 2026	UO public input process	Libraries personnel	Libraries personnel encouraged to provide input through university's public input process.
Late November 2026	Email/SharePoint update	All Libraries personnel	Vice Provost shares a summary of input received from university's public input process with all personnel, and any updates to budget proposals.

Summary of feedback received

Respondents across channels suggested considering senior leadership pay cuts, deferring new debt and nonessential capital projects, and reducing university administrative spending alongside academic programs. Some expressed interest in voluntary reductions in work time or departures, including questions about whether post-sabbatical work requirements could be waived. Others raised concerns that protecting certain employee groups from reductions shifts the burden onto those with lower pay and less job security.

Within the libraries, respondents emphasized retaining specialized skills, technical knowledge, and project management abilities rather than treating employees in similar roles as interchangeable. Specific savings ideas included reducing administrative or leadership positions, maintaining or extending building access through unstaffed swipe-card entry, and redirecting proposed software infrastructure spending toward employee positions. Feedback also highlighted the value and impact of the library functions that respondents support.

Feedback to date (10/20/26) has also emphasized the need to remain flexible as we learn more about the university's broader budget plans and to adjust our proposals to maintain alignment for supporting the academic program changes and priorities that are happening in the colleges and departments we support.

Feedback reflects that some respondents feel differently about how important it is to preserve existing levels of collections spending and access. Respondents have differing opinions on whether it is important to preserve current levels of administrative services and leadership/management staffing, reductions in which may shift additional administrative burdens and reduce support to front-line staff and faculty. Pros and cons of these and other areas surfaced through discussion are included in the libraries' report to AMAC.

Lundquist College of Business

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
September 4, 2026	Retreat	Dean and Department heads	Reviewed proposed cuts for different reduction scenarios and gathered feedback.
October 7,	Department	Dean and	Discussion to gather more

2026	Heads Bi-weekly Meeting	Department heads	feedback.
September 28 – October 2, 2026	Individual Meetings	Faculty directly impacted by reductions or eliminations	Individual notification and conversation about potential Ph.D. program cuts or elimination with Management and OBA departments most likely for Ph.D. program closure.
October 5, 2026	College-wide Staff and Faculty Town Hall	Faculty and Staff	Dean presented proposed reductions and answered questions.
October 6, 2026	Lundquist Board of Advisors	Board of Advisors	Dean presented proposals and solicited feedback.
October 9, 2026	Individual Donor Meetings	Donors	Dean discussed proposed reductions and eliminations and gather feedback.
October 16, 2026	Lundquist Academic Council	Council members	Discussed feedback on the reduction proposal.

Summary of Feedback received

Throughout the process major modifications were suggested, so no changes to proposed plan have been made. A suggestion that emerged through the consultation process, that will be explored, is to form a faculty committee to explore the costs and benefits of eliminating the Ph.D. program.

School of Journalism and Communication

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
September 17, 2026	Fall All-School Retreat	Faculty and Staff	Time set aside at Fall all-school retreat for an overview of the budget situation and discuss key questions.
September 17, 2026	Survey	Faculty and Staff	Survey shared with all SOJC faculty and staff to gather further feedback following the retreat.
September 21 – 23, 2026	Faculty and Staff Open-	Faculty and Staff	Dean held optional in-person and online sessions to discuss

	Sessions		budget questions and concerns.
October 8, 2026	Meeting	Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC)	Update on overall budget reduction process and solicit additional questions and input.
October 8, 2026	Meeting	SOJC All-Leadership Team	Update on overall budget reduction process and solicit additional questions and input.
October 9, 2026	Meeting	SOJC Faculty and Staff	Dean presented a budget update with time for discussion at the all-school meeting with faculty, staff, and graduate student representatives.
November 20, 2026	Meeting	SOJC Faculty and Staff	Dean will present further budget updates at all-school meeting.

Summary of feedback received

In response to likely 10% budget cuts, the SOJC is not planning any academic modifications—no graduate program admissions suspensions or closures, department or program consolidation, or undergraduate program consolidation.

Nevertheless, they have taken the following actions to engage with our faculty, staff, and graduate employees, in the interest of transparency and deliberation:

At the fall all-school retreat leadership provided an overview of the budget situation and discussed key questions. Following the meeting, the dean's office sent out a follow-up survey to gather further feedback; the survey asked an open-ended question, "What's the biggest question you have about the SOJC's and/or the university's budget situation?" and then invited the respondent to attend a follow-up meeting if they'd like. A total of two responses were received, both noting the importance of job security as their highest concern.

The dean also held optional in-person and online sessions to discuss budget questions and concerns. Sessions were well-attended and focused mostly on understanding the overall university process.

Themes that arose in these meetings fell into two categories: Questions about overall university policies and processes, and questions specific to the SOJC's budget situation. Responses to the university policies and process included questions around the timing, details around budget allocation, and leadership strategy in response were received. In response to SOJC's specific situation

questions around accreditation, course sizes, and other SOJC specific strategies were received.

The dean met with the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC) and met with the all-leadership team (ALT, comprised of area heads and graduate program directors) to update faculty on the overall budget reduction process and solicit additional questions and input.

Feedback included the process for implications for reducing the number of PhD admissions starting next year. Particular concerns about how to staff courses typically taught by GEs. Other feedback included PhD and MABR program reviews. The process was discussed for these working groups that will follow to gather thorough information from many perspectives on the strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for both programs.

School of Music and Dance

Feedback collection schedule

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
July 29, 2026	Meeting	SOMD Leadership (Dept. Heads, Academic Associate Deans, Kay Administrative Leaders)	In advance of budget presentation to UO Leadership - shared and discussed draft models of our unit's 5%, 10%, and 15% budget cutting scenarios; discussed specific opportunities, concerns, and questions.
August 20, 2026	Meeting	SOMD Leadership	Shared revised budget scenarios; continued the arts merger discussion, received feedback on proposed SOMD Budget Reduction Engagement Plan.
September 3, 2026	Meeting	SOMD Leadership plus Assistant Dean of Admissions and Enrollment Management, Director of Development, Director of Strategic Communications	Had broader budget reduction discussions – defined the values and principles for decisions,

		and Marketing, Director of Programming - OBF	
September 11, 2026	Email	SOMD Faculty and Staff	Message and agenda shared with SOMD faculty and staff to kick off the engagement process. Notice given of a morning budget presentation and a Q&A with Provost Long in the afternoon.
September 16, 2026	Meeting	All from September 3 meeting plus other SOMD staff directors (Director of Facilities, Producing Technical Director)	Last preparations for the full SOMD budget discussion.
September 18, 2026	Meeting	SOMD Leadership, SOMD Faculty and Staff	Introduce the broader institutional context and begin a shared conversation about future possibilities for SOMD: Generic modeling of 5%, 10%, 15%. Specifics will not be given at this time. Introduce potential of UO arts merger. Get feedback on how faculty and staff would like to provide input on decisions.
September 21 – October 2, 2026	SOMD Forums	Faculty and Staff	Provide faculty and staff forums to discuss plans as they continue to evolve. SOMD-wide faculty forums, Smaller forums, Dedicated staff meeting to discuss
October 2-9, 2026	Meetings	SOMD Leadership	Meet to discuss feedback from faculty and staff.
October 9-16, 2026	Meetings	SOMD Leadership	SOMD revises plans and notifies the unit: Areas/departments that are affected by a reduction in GEs, program reductions, and/or program closures will be notified first A general notification to the unit will follow.

October 16, 2026	Submission	Dean	Revised plans submitted to OTP.
October 28, 2026	Notification	OtP/AMAC	Plans go public.

Key Themes from SOMD Drop-In Conversations

Our analysis of the feedback from faculty and staff reveals a community that is not uniformly opposed to change, but is seeking greater clarity, evidence, and participation in decisions that will shape the future of the School of Music and Dance. Across discussions, five themes emerged consistently.

1. Transparency, Communication, and Trust

Participants repeatedly expressed a need for more concrete information about the proposed restructuring, budget challenges, decision-making process, and timelines. Many found it difficult to provide meaningful feedback without a clearer understanding of possible outcomes, budget scenarios, organizational structures, and criteria for decision-making.

A recurring concern was the relationship between the budget crisis and the proposed merger. Participants wanted greater clarity regarding what problem the restructuring is intended to solve and how faculty and staff input will influence decisions. More broadly, participants emphasized that trust depends on open communication, transparency about known and unknown information, and visible accountability throughout the process.

2. Financial Sustainability and Resource Allocation

Budget uncertainty emerged as the most immediate practical concern. Participants requested a clearer understanding of potential reduction scenarios, including the impacts of 5%, 10%, and 15% cuts on personnel, programs, courses, and student support.

Questions were frequently raised about whether restructuring would reduce the need for cuts, generate measurable savings, or simply reorganize existing reductions. Participants repeatedly emphasized the need for evidence, comparative data, and transparent financial analysis before major structural decisions are made.

3. Identity, Quality, and Academic Mission

Many participants expressed concern about preserving the distinctive strengths of SOMD while adapting to changing realities. These concerns centered on maintaining disciplinary expertise, performance excellence, graduate education, specialized instruction, and the school's identity within any larger organizational structure.

At the same time, participants engaged in thoughtful discussion about the future academic portfolio, curriculum innovation, student career preparation, and the appropriate balance between comprehensiveness and strategic focus. There was broad agreement that future decisions should prioritize educational quality and mission rather than financial considerations alone.

4. Capacity, Workload, and Student Success

Faculty and staff consistently described existing workloads as stretched and expressed concern about adding new initiatives without additional support. Participants highlighted the essential role of advising, student services, administrative support, recruitment, accreditation, and other often unseen forms of labor.

While there was support for greater efficiency, participants distinguished between eliminating unnecessary work and simply expecting fewer people to accomplish more. Student advising and support were viewed as particularly critical areas requiring sustained investment, especially if enrollment growth remains a goal.

5. Collaboration, Governance, and the Future Structure

Participants were generally enthusiastic about increased interdisciplinary collaboration across the arts. Suggested opportunities included shared programming, co-teaching, interdisciplinary curricula, common spaces, and collaborative creative projects.

However, support for collaboration was significantly stronger than support for an organizational merger itself. Participants frequently asked whether collaborative goals could be pursued prior to structural consolidation and emphasized the importance of meaningful faculty and staff representation in any future planning process. Concerns about governance, voice, resource allocation, and leadership remained central to evaluations of potential restructuring.

Overall Finding

The strongest theme across all conversations is conditional openness to change. Participants generally recognize the need to address financial pressures, explore new opportunities, and strengthen collaboration. However, support for significant organizational change is largely dependent on transparent communication, clear evidence of benefits, meaningful participation in decision-making, adequate resourcing, and protection of the school's academic quality and disciplinary identity.

In essence, the central question is not whether change should occur, but whether the proposed changes are clearly justified, thoughtfully designed, and aligned with the long-term success of students, faculty, staff, and the School of Music and Dance.

School of Law

Feedback collection schedule

Note that academic modifications are proposed.

Date	Type of Engagement	Area and/or Participants	Summary
August 21, 2026	Faculty and Staff Off-site Meeting	Faculty and Staff	Dean shared an overview of the university's budget timeline (including an explanation of the AMAC's role) and reminded the faculty and staff of the law school's structural deficit and possible levers. Dean also provided the general five-year plan and vision.
September 15, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Faculty	An overview was provided of school's financial situation in more detail, including information on our working assumptions, context and constraints, revenue generation levers, and expense reduction levers.
September 22, 2026	Faculty Overflow Meeting	Faculty	More detailed discussion of levers (revenue generating and expense reducing). Communicated that without

			pay freezes, we would have to do faculty layoffs.
October 6, 2026	Deans Staff Advisory Council Meeting	Faculty Advisory Council Members	Reminder of the university budget reduction process. Discussion around pay freezes and faculty layoffs.
October 6, 2026	Deans Staff Advisory Council Meeting	Staff Advisory Council Members	Continued discussion of university and law school budget situation, including planning for staff presentation.
October 13, 2026	Faculty Meeting	Faculty	Presented information shared with AMAC. Overview of two possible routes for being run-rate neutral in FY31: faculty pay freezes for two years or 4-5 faculty layoffs/attrition.
October 15, 2026	All Staff Meeting	Staff	Presented information shared with AMAC. Overview of two possible routes for being run-rate neutral in FY31: faculty pay freezes for two years or 4-5 faculty layoffs/attrition.
October 20, 2026	Faculty Overflow Meeting	Faculty	Discussion focused on answering questions and sharing concerns about the potential levers, as well as on improving faculty utilization.

Summary of feedback received

Law Faculty and staff expressed an interest in transparency regarding the law school's financial circumstances especially given the new budget model and emerging trends in the greater legal education landscape. Both faculty and staff focused on the effects of budget reductions on personnel, programs, and workload, and they wanted to learn more about ongoing and potential revenue-generating strategies for addressing the law school's projected structural deficit. A persistent theme was the importance of staying attentive to changing conditions and making strategic and budgetary adjustments as appropriate. Overall, the discussions contributed to a broader understanding of the fiscal constraints and possible revenue-generating opportunities facing the school.

The feedback that did emerge focused primarily on the implications of salary freezes, faculty layoffs, expected faculty and staff attrition, workload adjustments,

and curricular changes. Faculty expressed concern about both salary freezes and layoffs, with some supporting a temporary salary freeze if it would preserve positions. Participants also demonstrated some openness to increased involvement in the Legal Studies program, while raising concerns about expanded teaching loads. These discussions indicated that decisions affecting workload, curriculum, and faculty responsibilities should continue to proceed through ongoing consultation and established shared governance processes.

II. Timeline and Process

Throughout the summer, deans and academic leadership developed engagement plans for communicating with and providing opportunities for dialogue and input on their proposed academic modifications. Those plans were submitted to the Academic Modification Committee on August 27, 2026. The members of the AMAC committee reviewed and provided feedback to academic leadership through the provost over the next three weeks.

III. Feedback Concerning Academic Modifications

This section addresses feedback submitted to the Office of the Provost on proposed program discontinuations, reductions in faculty capacity, possible organizational restructuring, and the processes through which academic changes are evaluated and communicated.

Support for the academic value of two specialized graduate programs

The most extensive program-specific feedback opposed the discontinuation of the Education Policy and Leadership MS and the Quantitative Research Methods in Education PhD. Supporters described the programs' contributions to professional preparation, statewide educational leadership, methodological instruction, doctoral research, as well as to the College of Education’s broader scholarly community.

Feedback concerning Quantitative Research Methods in Education emphasized the role it plays as shared methodological infrastructure that serves UO students and faculty beyond the boundaries of a single degree program. Comments concerning Education Policy and Leadership emphasized the graduate program's contribution

to preparing graduates for work in school districts, public agencies, and nonprofit organizations, as well as its distinctiveness within Oregon.

Criteria used for academic program review

Some submitted feedback argued that the UO should consider broader criteria than student enrollment for sunsetting academic programs. Suggestions for other criteria included program quality, student outcomes, time to degree, publication and research activity, externally supported work, contribution to other programs, workforce and public-service functions, statewide need, and institutional distinctiveness.

While the feedback largely acknowledged the importance of program enrollment and cost, it contends, however, that these measures alone may not adequately represent the academic role of small, specialized, or recently established programs. Several respondents asked that the university consider curricular revision, administrative reorganization, or temporary suspension rather than permanent sunsetting of academic programs.

Reductions in tenure track faculty lines impact UO's academic standing

Feedback stressed that tenure track faculty and their expertise, accumulated over time, are critical to the research and teaching mission of the university. In addition to instruction, they support graduate supervision, sponsored research, interdisciplinary collaboration, professional networks, institutional reputation, and relationships with public and community partners.

Responses cautioned that the loss of specialized faculty capacity may have effects that extend beyond the immediate affected unit, including diminished capacity to compete for external funding, reduced access to advanced methods instruction, fewer opportunities for student mentorship, and weakened ability to respond to emerging areas of inquiry or public need.

Uncertainty around structural reorganization

Feedback regarding a proposed structural change for the College of Design and the School of Music and Dance focused on uncertainty and rumors about the concept and expressed concern about the impact on specific departments and employee morale, and possible effects on students.

IV. Feedback Concerning the Vision Document

This section addresses comments on the "Toward a Premier R1 Public" vision, including the seven proposed research confluences and program anchors, operational focus for PhD programs, and the relationship between research strength and distinctive undergraduate education.

General affirmation of the vision and the confluence model

Feedback received frequently expressed support for the effort to articulate a more distinctive account of the university's research identity. The confluence model was viewed as a potentially productive means of bringing disciplines into relation around consequential questions, particularly where the university already possesses scholarly depth, regional relevance, or opportunities for public engagement.

The feedback did not generally reject institutional priority-setting. Rather, respondents sought assurance that the proposed concentration of attention would remain compatible with intellectual pluralism, foundational inquiry, and the varied ways that different disciplines contribute to a research university.

Disciplinary breadth and the designation of anchors

The most recurrent comments concerned fields that respondents believed were insufficiently visible within the confluences. Submissions identified Linguistics; History of Art and Architecture; Landscape Architecture and Environmental Design; Physics and Mathematics; Music, Dance, Theater Arts; as well as the humanities and arts more broadly, as areas that contribute to specific themes described in the vision but were not named in it.

The feedback emphasized that anchor designations may carry consequences beyond descriptive recognition. If those designations inform faculty appointments, doctoral program support, tiering, or resource allocation, omissions may be interpreted as judgments about the value to the institution of different disciplines.

Fundamental inquiry and discovery-oriented scholarship

Feedback from the physical sciences argued that the vision should more explicitly recognize fundamental discovery as a defining form of research excellence. These comments proposed broader language for the relevant confluence, explicit recognition of Physics and Mathematics, and acknowledgment of the university's leadership in major national and international collaborations.

Relationship between research vision and undergraduate education

Some comments asked that the vision put more focus on the ways research identity shapes and enhances undergraduate learning, including through participation in international scientific collaborations, performance and ensemble work, experiential learning, and engagement with communities and cultural traditions.

These comments suggested that the university's R1 identity should be narrated not only through faculty research and doctoral education, but also through the opportunities undergraduates have to encounter inquiry, creation, collaboration, and mentorship.