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Statement from Mark Carey, CHC Associate Dean and Associate Professor of History
I think this is a poor site location that will have a significant negative impact on Chapman Hall, the Honors College, and the flow of traffic along the south side of Chapman Hall. The views currently from most of CHC rooms will look smack into this building that looks to be placed extremely close to Chapman, infringing on the building, ruining the only view of green space (since the other side of the building looks onto 13th, Fenton, etc.) and generally changing the entire feel and quality of this area of campus.

The way the proposed building is designed by footprint seems to wrap around and half strangle Chapman. It will become a narrow, very urban path between Chapman and the new building, removing the lovely quad feel it now has in the walking space between JSMA and Chapman, which is used extensively by students, classes, and everyone walking from the quad to anywhere else east of the quad. This is a high traffic area that this building will block in like a big reservoir dam.

The newly renovated Chapman Hall, if it goes through, will suffer a major blow by having this building right on top of the new Chapman. Many millions of dollars will be spent on that renovation, yet many millions of dollars worth of view, curb appeal, access, value, and feel will be thrown away with this new building placed right in the face of Chapman.

If the Clark Honors College is supposed to be at the center of the UO, a place to attract the best and brightest of Oregon’s students, the place the current president wants to grow, then this new building sends the absolute wrong message and in fact hinders the president’s own plan. What this new placement says is that we should not highlight Chapman Hall and the Honors College, but rather we should cram it up against CAS that literally wraps its arms around the Honors College and half strangles it. What this proposed placement says to me is that we should not make Chapman Hall and the Honors College look appealing and open and accessible from the outside, but rather the CHC should be jammed up against another building that will destroy its view and beautiful placement that it now enjoys. That’s not exactly a way to attract Oregon’s best and brightest.

The big problem in my mind is the way it wraps around and strangles Chapman. If the new building were placed strictly on the parking lot that now exists, that would be very much better because it would only be on one side of Chapman, instead of half strangling Chapman as the proposed footprint looks to do.

Please, please, please move the proposed building or at least change the design of the footprint and structure. This proposed building plan looks to me like a heavy blow to the Honors College, the destruction of one of the nicest parts of campus greenspace, a big infringement on foot traffic flow, an eye sore, and a way to detract from the new remodel to Chapman. I think this is a poor placement that will have a lot of negative impacts.

Where else in this part of campus (around the quad) are the buildings built right on top of one another like this? It doesn’t make any sense to destroy the openness of the quad that now exists, including this section coming down between Chapman and JSMA.

Mark Carey
CHC Associate Dean and Associate Professor of History
320A Chapman Hall

The above comments are also endorsed by:
Mai-Lin Cheng
Assistant Professor of Literature
101A Chapman Hall
Statement from Dan Rosenberg, Professor of History

To the College and Careers Building Siting Advisory Group, Campus Planning Committee, and Space Advisory Group,

I recommend against choosing for the College and Careers Building Site B south and east of Chapman Hall in the strongest possible terms. I have read your report, which is careful and detailed, and I appreciate all of the care that has gone into it. However, it does not consider the crucial issue.

The site to the south of Chapman must be made available for the Chapman Hall renovation. It would be best if the site to the east were as well, but south of the building should be removed from consideration for the College and Careers Building. There are several important reasons, but the key argument is this: Chapman Hall is both the physical and the symbolic home of the Clark Honors College. For both practical and symbolic reasons, the Chapman Hall site must be dedicated to the Clark Honors College.

The CHC is one of UO’s eight academic colleges with deans. The CHC is a key academic and symbolic asset of the university, bringing UO its best students and one of its finest academic programs, substantially raising its profile, and serving as an important point of reference in fundraising, as has frequently been stated by President Coltrane. Every UO college has its own building or cluster of buildings. It has taken years of careful work to create Chapman Hall as the home of the CHC, which brings CHC facilities in line with the best honors colleges in the country. This is how we recruit students and donors. A major Chapman Hall renovation is currently in planning, which, not incidentally, has been the most powerful fundraising tool that the CHC has had in its history.

As an independent, free-standing building, Chapman Hall has a particular importance in signaling the identity and the message of both the CHC and UO. It is our “small college at the heart of a major research university,” and the physical structure and location project this fact very effectively. Were Chapman Hall to be wrapped in a building with other purposes, it would lose this character, and this would be a major loss for UO at the level of messaging and branding, to say nothing of the functioning of the building for the Clark Honors College. For this reason, the Chapman site simply cannot be considered equivalent to the others under consideration. Every department at the University deserves resources and attention. The UO colleges require college buildings. Chapman Hall is the Clark Honors College building.

UO must not wrap the Clark Honors College in a building dedicated to other purposes for the same reason that it would not do this to College of Education, the College of Music and Dance, the College of Business, or the School of Law, nor, for that matter, the UO Library or the Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art. The physical independence of Chapman Hall as the Clark Honors College is essential to the identity and academic aspirations of the University of Oregon.

From a practical standpoint, as well, site B should be taken out of consideration for the College and Careers Building. As you report, plans for a full renovation of Chapman are ongoing and renovation is imminent. For this reason, site B must be available to the Clark Honors College.

In my view, it is also the case that the site study vastly underestimates the importance of the east-west greenway connecting the historic quad to the new centers of campus as the center of gravity on campus moves eastward. In the CHC, we are particularly sensitive to this as our students live in the Global Scholars Hall and traverse this walk every day. I also believe that the connection of Chapman Hall to the greenway and to the quad are important features that will be activated in the renovation. The new Chapman Hall will open to the campus through its green spaces and will bring vital new energy to this area with benefits to the art museum, administration building and other neighbors. That having been said, reasonable arguments
may be made about how exactly to employ the space immediately south of Chapman, as an extension of the specific purposes, program, and symbolism of the Clark Honors College. Purposes foreign to those of the CHC should not be considered.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Rosenberg
Professor of History
223 Chapman Hall

The above comments are also endorsed by:
Mai-Lin Cheng
Assistant Professor of Literature
101A Chapman Hall
Statement from Monique Balbuena, Associate Professor of Literature
I find it a bad idea to deprive not only us, but the general campus community, of a beautiful grass area that defines much of that part of campus. We need those spaces. They "feed" our and our students' mood, and they make the campus more beautiful.

(If they want take something from that area they would do all of us a service by tearing down the eyesore that is PLC and building there.)

Monique Balbuena
Associate Professor of Literature
101G Chapman Hall

Statement from Roxann Prazniak, Associate Professor of History
I think this is a very sad idea. What were the other two possible locations? What happens to the "Instructional Trees"? This outdoor space is an integral part of our Honors College space. It would be tragic to lose it.

Roxann Prazniak
Associate Professor of History
221 Chapman Hall

Statement from Kelly Sutherland, Assistant Professor of Biology
I really enjoy seeing grass and trees out of the library and classrooms on the south side of the building. I doubt that looking out at a brick wall will have the same appeal. This is one of those 'intangibles' that I think is pretty important.

Kelly Sutherland
Assistant Professor of Biology
101E Chapman Hall

Statement from Ocean Howell, Assistant Professor of History and Architectural History
I think the (PLC) parking lot makes more sense, and south of Deady makes all the sense in the world to me. That space is currently just a jumble of paths. The space just south of Chapman, by contrast, is a lovely, open, gracious area. Standing between Condon and PLC, looking east, is one of the nicest moments on campus, with an axial view of the EMU, as well as views of Collier and Johnson. That'll go away. Might as well put it just west of Allen Hall.

Ocean Howell
Assistant Professor of History
101B Chapman Hall
Statement from Trond Jacobsen, Instructor and Director of Forensics and University Forum

The proposed footprint of the CAS College and Careers building site study surrounding Chapman Hall raises a number of concerns.

The proposed site and footprint:

- Threatens the integrity of the Clark Honors College identity and mission, diluting its attractiveness as a physical and intellectual space for current and especially future students.
- Undermines the effectiveness of the CHC as a leading face of the ongoing campaign for academic excellence.
- Worsens the educational experience of students using Chapman whose views will be limited to the exterior of a nearby building, changing the experience of college life from a bucolic campus experience to one more akin to an urban university experience.
- Denies CHC faculty access to proximate green space for pedagogical purposes.
- Precludes a modest CHC footprint expansion because only 28% of Sub-Area 5 of Design Area A (Academic Center and Historic Core) can be developed under the 2014 Campus Plan. The proposed building will consume all “buildable space” within the zone. It would preclude any expansion of the Chapman footprint even as the university is committed to a 50% increase in the size of the college. To me that is a non-starter for this proposal. It will prevent the university from achieving something at the heart of the current academic capital campaign. The only alternative is to splinter the CHC among several spaces, something I believe would destroy the CHC experience and eviscerate our identity as a coherent college.

Such observations have been well-articulated by other members of the CHC faculty.

I would like to focus on another set of concerns: The site threatens the identity of the University of Oregon as a national leader in the sustainable design of campus spaces.

We are justifiably proud of this identity, prominently featured in our recruiting materials and our website (cf. “green is more than just a school color. It’s a lifestyle in which each of us makes daily, conscious choices about resource use, conservation, and preservation”).

Our national leadership in sustainability finds pride of place in our online presence and is often prominent in non-athletic news coverage.

Our identity constitutes a crucial recruiting draw because it clearly differentiates us from nearly every other campus: Bright students, for whom participating in sustainable initiatives are important, push Oregon toward the top of their lists. The recent marketing campaign acknowledges this opportunity and uses this identity. It is one the distinguishing essences of the campus according to the marketing focus group analyses.

Developing green spaces is the campus equivalent of sprawl in as much as it irreversibly consumes something in limited supply and which cannot be recreated elsewhere. When campus green spaces are gone they cannot come back. There are good reasons to convert green space but a campus committed to sustainability will choose to do so only when there are no viable alternatives and the imagined use is of such a great benefit that the loss of green space is justified. I do not believe this is true of the proposed CAS and Career Center site.

The importance of campus green space is at the heart of 2014 Campus Plan which reads “The fundamental character of the University of Oregon’s campus is represented by a series of large open spaces, a mature
landscape, and the accompanying buildings conceived and executed by Ellis F. Lawrence in the early part of the last century. The concepts Lawrence employed include high-quality, humanly scaled, carefully-detailed buildings arranged around a system of open spaces interconnected by pathways. These concepts are the basis for further campus development.”

The proposed footprint eliminates one of the more important open spaces on campus, reducing the open space for sub-area 5 to a slender Johnson Hall corridor, essentially a footpath toward the EMU sandwiched between JSMA and the proposed building. That is inconsistent with the guiding vision. It is also runs afoul of the spirit of Policy 2 on Open Spaces and indirectly Policy 4 (Space Use and Organization) and Policy 10 (Sustainable Development).

From a holistic and ecological point of view, one more consistent with the university’s master plan and our identity as a national leader in sustainable campuses, the PLC parking lot is the better site.

Better still - better ecologically, aesthetically, and in terms of our leadership identity - the university should build a large parking structure with non-parking offices (OPD, Operations, Landscaping, key and card offices, etc.) on the ground floor at the PLC parking lot site. A substantial parking lot is ecologically preferable to an asphalt surface parking area. Moreover, such a structure would free existing surface parking lots elsewhere for future development, effectively creating new development areas where none now exist (because we do need parking) while reducing pressure on green spaces posed by future expansion needs.

A large autonomous institution like the University of Oregon has the means and planning horizon to effect wise planning on long time scales of this type. That is the essential definition of sustainable development.

The alternative is that future growth will proceed until every bit of developable open green space is consumed. Open green space on campus cannot be restored once it is lost. Sometimes losing that space is worth the cost. The proposed CAS and Career Center site is not worth the cost, especially when there is space on the PLC lot for the building and placement there is consistent with the sustainable transportation planning of the university. Even better, a large parking structure could co-exist with the CAS and Career Center or release other surface parking for the CAS Building (for example, lot 17 or 40 near HEDCO, 06A or 12B along Franklin, 42 along 12th). Even the space between the EMU and Esslinger would be better than the proposed site wrapping around Chapman.

The PLC site is vastly preferable to consuming the green space around Chapman Hall.

Best,
Trond Jacobsen
Instructor and Director of Forensics and University Forum
222 Chapman Hall

The above comments are also endorsed by:
Mai-Lin Cheng
Assistant Professor Literature
101A Chapman Hall

Vera Keller
Assistant Professor of History
320C Chapman Hall
Statement from Sander Goldberg, Professor of Practice

Dear Colleagues,

I, too, agree with everything that has been said so far: a quick stroll through the Lokey Science Complex or Lillis Hall (despite its serious architectural effort) will show what happens when views and pedestrian dynamics are sacrificed to other interests. A defense of the green campus should definitely be made, but having been involved in hotly contested space decisions elsewhere, may I also introduce a note of reality?

Green is nice. It is also the case, however, that UO facilities are woefully inadequate to UO aspirations, which means that some lawns and some trees somehow and somewhere are going to have to turn into buildings. What arguments from Green then really amount to is Not In My Backyard. I do not think this is a productive rhetorical stance, nor do I think it advisable to point a finger at somebody else’s backyard. That only turns off planners and pits potential allies against each other.

Dan Rosenberg made the most potent and productive argument: the proposal we are discussing seriously compromises any plan for the renovation of Chapman Hall and with it the administration’s own professed desire to raise the prominence of the CHC. That campus planning can be so at odds with itself is very troubling in principle and should not be tolerated in practice.

To put it crudely: pit a building against a building. The Chapman renovation (and expansion) should take precedence because it immediately benefits the College and, as part of that benefit, fulfills an essential objective of the UO academic plan. That it can be done without compromising the basic integrity of campus open space is an added attraction, which should certainly not be ignored, but when talking to people who think first about buildings, it’s generally most effective to talk (first) about buildings. That way they know you are speaking their language, which makes them—at least sometimes—more prone to listen sympathetically to what you have to say.

Best,
Sander M. Goldberg
Professor of Practice, Literature
309 Chapman Hall

Statements from Barbara Mossberg, Professor of Practice

Dear (CHC) Colleagues,

The discussion expresses CHC as an inspired, inspiring, green ethos. I find this a poignant issue; you have articulated the issues with verve and eloquence. An element to what is at stake in my perspective is my actual use of the natural scene outside the windows as part of my teaching, including eco-literature (Chapman second floor), epic (307 Chapman) and Einstein and Emerson (303 Chapman). In many discussions, we consider the meaning of the view outside the window, trees, sky, clouds, and grass, and connect its art and science to what we are discussing. In fact, the ability to integrate where students are learning and what they are learning is critical to the understanding of how classical learning reveals and illuminates our natural world. Ancient learning of the original "academy" took place literally in a grove of trees, and learning throughout global history is in sight of trees.

The case for the architectural integrity of Chapman is also critical for the perception and role of CHC as a liberal arts college within the university. The building represents a visibly discrete learning environment that needs space and classical green moat.
(Second response from Prof. Mossberg):
I am grateful for all this work and attention and resourcefulness in making the case. I reflect that a green college, literally, metaphorically, epistemologically, philosophically, in terms of our curriculum, pedagogy, and stance in our dedicated mission, is important not only for CHC but UO's going forward in its next stages. In arguing the case for preservation of a green CHC defined by our architecture, we also are representing UO's vision of its role in the state in the coming decades. As an example, the newly-reorganized study abroad office told me they are actively seeking to promote UO study abroad to distinguish ourselves in terms of broadly-conceived green curriculum.

Sincerely,
Barbara Mossberg
Professor of Practice, Literature
309 Chapman Hall
Student input collected as part of the Chapman Hall Architectural Programming Study

While the Architectural Programming Study focused primarily on interior renovation, comments and feedback concerning the building’s relationship to its landscaping and setting near the Memorial Quadrangle were also part of the study. Many honors college students participated in the Programming Study’s Open House, held on March 31, 2015, as well as focus groups. Below is a summary of inputs collected from the Vision Cards exercise, part of the Open House, which was predominantly attended by students.

Vision Card Exercise: Participants were asked to share their vision for the college in a newly renovated Chapman Hall by choosing (3) images that best represented their thoughts from a coffee table of choices. Participants were also asked to supply words that accompanied their images. Each row below depicts one person’s choices. (References to nature, and connection to nature are shown in bold)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events happening in CHC</th>
<th>Abstract beauty, landscaping</th>
<th>Feeling of suspension, view, canopy</th>
<th>Serenity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haphazard feeling – constrains possibilities, “the problem we have”</td>
<td>Serenity, relaxed feeling</td>
<td>Camaraderie, collaboration</td>
<td>Collaboration, people together, global connection and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing people, travel, working with each other</td>
<td>Relaxation, beauty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming for everyone, diversity</td>
<td>Outdoors, connection to nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity, people helping each other, diversity</td>
<td>Clean water, fresh</td>
<td>Organization, way finding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration, connection between people, support</td>
<td>Many ideas wound up together, exploring ideas</td>
<td>Uplifting, clear vision, happy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, supporting each other</td>
<td>Peaceful, zen, nice study space</td>
<td>Connection to outdoors, nature, peaceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together, instinctive</td>
<td>Organized, functionality</td>
<td>Working together, humans together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated into landscape, not industrial, connection to nature</td>
<td>Place where everyone connects and supports</td>
<td>Natural materials, form that evolves naturally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place to take care of people</td>
<td>Our own little world within the larger world, green = alive and growing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful, natural, comforting</td>
<td>Small spaces, people working, organized chaos</td>
<td>Calm, wood, light, nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun maze = what learning should be, challenging, interesting, fun</td>
<td>Togetherness, welcoming, helpful</td>
<td>Intellectual engagement, old/young = professors &amp; students engaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to nature</td>
<td>Fun, enjoying your work</td>
<td>Culturally diverse, collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Warmth, historical aspect</td>
<td>Soft, comfort, good acoustics/not loud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth, nature, respecting history, tradition is important</td>
<td>“Thinky” space, concentration is important, few distractions, focus</td>
<td>Compartamentalized spaces, reduced distraction, community: honors college is part of bigger whole but unique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This should be a place we want to be more than anywhere else, an “Oregon” feel, relaxing

| Collaboration, global worldview, cultural diversity | **Sustainability**, green technology, environmental planning | Tranquil, peaceful, calm, focus |
| Feel of age, timeless, adequate space and closeness at the same time | Intangibility, removes distance, pretty, white/black simple contrast | Bright, contrast, simple color scheme, sense of duplication, tessellation |
| Organization, creativity, color | **Light, air, comfort, natural** | Passion, energy, community, youth |

The images below were selected by students and correspond to nature and connection to nature (i.e. the bolded responses in table)
Statement from Paula Braswell, CHC Director of Admissions

The proposed location of the CAS and Careers Building is very disappointing. The proposed building would prohibit the natural light that falls on the south side of Chapman Hall; essentially Chapman Hall would be encapsulated in darkness on the south east sides obstructing the view to the old growth green space. The required removal of the trees would be a travesty to the aesthetic view of the south lawn which is frequented by students during the spring and summer terms.

Undoubtedly, there would be an increase in the noise volume in the construction phase and in the completed building due to foot and vehicle traffic along the south side of Chapman Hall. The locations of the classrooms in Chapman Hall are on the both the south and east sides of the buildings, the noise distractions would be ongoing.

I would propose the committee investigate another location. A possible suggestion would be south of the Knight Library in the open space adjacent to the Pioneer Cemetery or on the PLC parking lot provided their plans include ample underground parking spaces.

Paula Braswell
CHC Director of Admissions
126 Chapman Hall

Statement from Renee Dorjahn, CHC Director of Finance and Administration

I urge the College & Careers site study committee, Campus Planning Committee and Space Advisory Group to select a site other than the proposed location close to Chapman Hall for the 50,000 SF College and Careers Building. At 50,000 SF, the proposed building will dwarf neighboring structures: Chapman at 23,050, Fenton at 27,998, Johnson at 32,201, Susan Campbell at 21,308. The JSMA, already 71,301, is proposing an addition along its north side (SF data from Campus Planning and Real Estate report UOBldglist(2-15-12).xls). The west end of Chapman sits below the plane from the JSMA’s northern courtyard. Placing a 50,000 SF building, even at three stories high, would visually overwhelm Chapman.

The proposed building includes at 100-seat classroom and several smaller classrooms, office and meeting space for CAS administration, and expanded facilities for the UO Career Center. The pedestrian traffic in and out of the building will be significant, and the proposed building footprint cuts off several well-traveled pedestrian walkways linking buildings on the Memorial Quadrangle to Fenton, Friendly, Allen and other structures located NE of the proposed site.

Given the amount of student-focused activities in the building (classrooms, UO Career Center), why not consider other locations such as the space between the EMU (parking lot 29A) and the newly expanded Student Rec Center? Putting more classrooms near the recently renovated Straub Hall, would also make it easier for students coming to/from classes in the Global Scholars Hall to get to their next class within a reasonable walking time (and without sprinting across campus).

I am aware that the site study committee considered and ultimately rejected the Collier House site. While there is a historic structure on that site, locating the College and Careers building on the corner of University and 13th puts CAS administration in the true heart of campus, and the Career Center at the very crossroads of student pedestrian traffic.

Another site considered by the committee is the PLC parking lot. This location represents a terrific opportunity to build a large structure on top of a surface parking lot (or over a sub-grade parking lot such as HEDCO). Since a 50,000 SF structure would not fully utilize the available space, might it be possible to link
the College and Careers building with a new residence hall or new academic building? A new academic building could accommodate new tenure-related faculty, which the university plans to hire; not all of those faculty require a lab, but they require offices. Why not be bold? The 160over90 campaign emphasizes learning, connections, and the innovation possible at this place – the University of Oregon - our arboretum campus. Converting a cement parking lot into a multipurpose building (or buildings), while preserving green space and trees elsewhere on campus, is a win-win.

Chapman Hall and the Clark Honors College occupy a unique space on the UO campus and in its strategic vision. I do not support siting the College and Careers Building next to historic Chapman Hall, essentially cloaking the home to many of Oregon’s best and brightest students. If the UO is serious about growing the Clark Honors College, it needs to respect this historic structure and its environs.

Renee Dorjahn
CHC Director of Finance and Administration
120 Chapman Hall

Statement from Shelise Zumwalt, CHC Receptionist and Alumni Outreach Coordinator
While I am delighted to hear that CAS will have a new facility, I am concerned with the location choices. The proximity to Chapman Hall will make a significant difference in the ambiance and feeling for those of us working here, and especially for our students. (I feel similar about the proposed Fenton Hall location).

Placing a building by Chapman will make an impact on our green space. As a city and campus we are renown for our attention to green space, in fact Eugene was named the number one green city in the US (including green space, air quality etc.) in National Geographic’s “Green Guide”. Even the EMU project boasts green space as a key highlight to their renovations and expansion: “Dramatic and spacious new campus outdoor green space for casual use, programming, and ceremonies such as graduation.”

Placing a building next to Chapman will change the “feel” of the location. The proposed location will likely change the amount of sun we receive, will feel less open, and will likely change walking paths.

The Honors College continues to grow, and having a building close would limit or prevent any expansion of Chapman Hall.

I respect our need to grow, and while I understand the drawbacks of using the PLC Parking Lot, I think the lot would be a more appropriate choice. I would feel much better building over my parking space than reducing our fantastic arboretum, making campus more dense, and limiting our future options.

Shelise Zumwalt
CHC Receptionist and Alumni Outreach Coordinator
119 Chapman Hall
Background

The University of Oregon’s Robert D. Clark Honors College (CHC) is housed in Chapman Hall, one of four historic “sister” buildings flanking 13th Avenue on the Memorial Quadrangle axis. The one of the first four-year honors college at a public university in the United States, CHC has flourished since its founding in 1960. Its students benefit from a liberal arts education as well as access to the academic richness of a large research university. Students enjoy intimate seminar classes with fewer than 20 students taught by resident faculty and experts from across campus. The College benefits UO directly through higher freshman metrics, as well as keeping Oregon’s brightest students in state.

With current enrollment at 800 students and plans to expand to 1,200 students, CHC's current arrangement in Chapman Hall is lacking in area and functionality. While many of its spaces are well-liked, there are also significant opportunities for improvement. In early 2015, in order to plan for future renovations, the University established a Leadership Group to guide a Programming Study and hired THA Architecture from Portland, Oregon to inform the work. This core team met four times over the ensuing months and organized outreach via an Open House, a series of Focus Groups, and individual meetings with faculty members.

Purpose

The purpose of this Programming Study is to record how Chapman Hall is used currently and to identify ways in which it could be reconfigured to support CHC’s mission, establishing a series of Planning Principals to guide future design work. The Study suggests options for space reconfiguration to improve the environment for student learning, faculty-student interaction, faculty research, and administrative work. The ultimate goal is for Chapman Hall to better serve CHC’s faculty, staff and students and to be an effective recruitment tool for prospective students.

Findings

Chapman Hall’s current configuration serves to separate rather than integrate the different types of building users; this bifurcation also hinders CHC’s ability to message its distinct identity to its visitors. This said, Chapman Hall is well-loved, and strongly identified as the home of the Clark Honors College. Its sense of history, its dignity, and location are well liked. Students appreciate its amenities and the privileges it affords their CHC cohort, but would like greater access to study spaces for groups and individuals – and more robust technology. Faculty would like a variety of office types based on their approach to research and education. Staff would like a home that supports CHC from student recruitment to thesis defense and graduation. Everyone – faculty, staff and students – recognize a fundamental need to organize and modify Chapman Hall in order to create a strong sense of “ownership”, to encourage faculty/student interaction, and to unite everyone in the Honors College in a single place: interconnected, accessible, and discoverable. The renovated Chapman Hall will continue to welcome students and faculty who use the general university classrooms – and while the Lecture Hall will remain, other classrooms may be modified to better support CHC’s seminar model of instruction. This may enable a greater proportion of CHC’s classes to return to Chapman Hall, thus reinforcing the presence of the Honors College in this beautiful historic building.

Next Steps

Upon approval of state bonds to augment $2.5M in privately raised funds, the work to reimagine and renovate Chapman Hall can begin immediately.
PLANNING PRINCIPLES

1. Create a welcoming entry sequence into CHC that is both well connected to predominant university traffic flow and that clearly expresses the college’s identity.

2. Honor the historic look and feel of Chapman Hall while adjusting the building’s layout to support a diversity of learning and working styles.

3. Build a more integrated community by promoting informal interaction along the user’s circulation path.

4. Consider the experience of the visitor as they go on their first tour of the college.

5. Improve vertical connectivity between all levels and, if possible, provide ADA access to all levels.

6. Mix faculty office clusters, student study space, and seminar rooms to encourage interaction and dialogue between different building users.

7. Create flexible/reconfigurable seminar style classrooms that support a variety of seating layouts.

8. Create a diversity of faculty office types that cater to the range of faculty uses (social, quiet, high and low volume storage, part-time use).

9. Create rational security strategies/zones that address different hours of use.

10. Place general education spaces for non-CHC students together in order to maximize CHC’s feeling of ownership of Chapman Hall’s footprint and minimize non-CHC traffic through core CHC spaces.

11. Physically showcase the diversity of topics that is taught and researched by CHC faculty and students.

12. Increase the presence of the sciences within the building.

13. Array group study and personal study spaces throughout the building to best support student learning.

14. Provide for a diversity of classroom types.

15. Employ gradients of acoustical privacy to optimize the user’s experience throughout the full range of activities within the building.

16. Meet or exceed the University’s Oregon Model for Sustainable Development requirements while paying particular attention to how the building environment may enhance the occupant’s connection to nature.
Excerpt from the Chapman Hall Historic Assessment (completed May 2015)
This historic assessment, completed by Rachelle Byarlay, graduate student in historic preservation, and Christine Thompson, Campus Planning Manager, complements the Chapman Hall Architectural Programming Study conducted by THA Architecture. The excerpt below is reproduced from pages 15-16 of the draft report.

EXTERIOR
The character and the quality of craft and materials of the exterior of Chapman Hall plays a significant part in the architectural character of the building. In addition, it contributes to the spatial quality and architectural character of the Memorial Quadrangle, a primary and significant public space and landscape on campus. It also contributes to the character of the 13th Avenue Axis, a primary public corridor through campus. The treatment of the overall exterior of Chapman Hall, especially is primary and secondary ranked landscapes, facades, and entries, should be completed in such a way that it does not diminish the overall historic character of the building and adjacent public spaces.

LANDSCAPES
- Retain and preserve landscape features of Chapman Hall that are important in defining its overall historic character and its historic relationship between the building and the landscape. Pay particular attention to the primary and secondary ranked landscapes. This includes the north entry sequence and entry court, the west entry sequence, the south entry sequence and court, and their associated historic walkways and paths, vegetation, landforms, walls and fences, and furnishings.
- Protect and maintain the building and building site by providing proper drainage to assure that water does not erode foundation walls; drain toward the building; nor damage or erode the landscape. Preserve important landscape features, including ongoing maintenance of historic plant material. Provide continued preservation of masonry, wood, and architectural metals which comprise the building and site features through appropriate cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.
- Repair features of the landscape by reinforcing historic materials before considering replacement.
- If an entire feature of the landscape is too deteriorated to repair and if the overall form and detailing are still evident, replace the feature in kind. Physical evidence from the deteriorated feature should be used as a model to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.
- If a historic landscape feature is completely missing, design and construct a new feature. It may be based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building and site.
- When required by new use, design new exterior additions or adjacent new construction which is compatible with the historic character of the site and which preserves the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape. Remove non-significant buildings, additions, or landscape features which detract from the historic character of the site.