

To: University Senate Executive Committee
From: Multi-Campus Ad-Hoc Committee
Re: Committee Recommendation
Date: April 17, 2024

In response to the charge to “identify and define specific challenges faced across UConn’s campuses ... to assess whether these areas of concern are being addressed by existing university structures, support groups, or committees,” and evaluate the need for a University Senate standing multi-campus committee, the Ad-Hoc Multi-Campus Working Group (the Working Group) met as a whole a total of four times as a group, formed subcommittees who met separately to discuss specific topics related to the Committee's mission, and interviewed and surveyed relevant stakeholders including Campus Deans, current Senate standing committee chairs, and faculty and staff across the seven campuses. The Committee also examined the governance structures of peer and aspirant institutions. Complete lists of committee members, stakeholder participants, and the list of peer and aspirant institutions reviewed are in Appendix A.

The Committee recommends, by an 11 to 0 vote, that the Senate Executive Committee establish a standing multi-campus committee to facilitate equitable standards and access to support for both students and faculty and provide the perspective of multiple UConn campuses to other Senate Committees.

- **A Standing Committee with Representation Across All Campuses Will Increase the Diversity of Perspectives in University Senate Decision-Making**

Stakeholders expressed a need for increased insights from the multiple campuses in University Senate decision-making. Two-thirds of standing committee chairs agreed with the statement, “It would be helpful to our committee if the University Senate had a standing committee to represent the multiple campuses.”

Current standing committee chairs expressed a need for more input from the various campuses, acknowledging that while committees have representation from the campuses outside Storrs, this representation is often limited due to committee composition. One chair commented, “The non-Storrs campuses plus the 8 Extension offices not located on one of the other campuses do not always gain the same level of appreciation with regards to budget, and with staff at facilities stretched so thin, they do not get the same attention to detail.” Another noted, “Having a single campus rep is often not sufficient. A standing committee would foreground all regional campus issues more clearly.”

Standing committee chairs said their Committee had adequate input from UConn's multiple campuses, but they saw the benefit of a multi-campus standing committee. As one chair explained, “[w]e currently have sufficient input because our Committee happens to be chaired by a regional campus member and includes several faculty from regionals. With a different make-up, though, I believe there would be a need for more input.” Detailed results from the survey of standing committee chairs are in Appendix B.

- **A Standing Multi-Campus Committee Could Facilitate Consistency Across Campuses**

A perception of inequity in workload and workload expectations across campuses exists among some faculty and staff. Stakeholders provided the following examples of such perceived inequity:

- 1) advising workloads appear, in some cases, to diverge among faculty on different campuses;
- 2) some faculty on the multiple campuses appear to have more course preparations and/or a larger number of courses in rotation than Storrs-based faculty of equivalent rank;
- 3) access to administrative and other resources may be available in varying degrees by campus; and
- 4) regular transit between campuses and time required for that travel may not be considered when evaluating faculty and staff workloads and service assignments.

A standing multi-campus committee could increase communications to align related policies, explore if and to what degree perceived inequity in assignments exists, and craft or review policy with the goal of equitable and consistent policies and procedures across the institution.

- **Stakeholders See a Multi-Campus Committee as Key to Promoting Equitable Access to Student Services**

Campus Deans from Avery Point, Hartford, Stamford, and Waterbury expressed the need for a standing multi-campus to advocate for policies that ensure equitable access to student services across campuses. Deans expressed a need for multiple campus perspectives to be considered when considering policies related to supporting International students, students registered with the Center for Students with Disabilities, students requiring academic support, and student services more broadly (health, financial aid, etc.).

Deans from UConn Law School and the School of Medicine, with their own systems of shared governance student bodies of professional graduate students, felt less strongly about the need for a multi-campus standing committee. Stakeholders from both schools expressed the value of their campuses having a connection to, or representation on, the University Senate and a standing committee should one be established.

- **A Multi-Campus Standing Committee Could Facilitate Inter-campus Communication and Coordination**

The Working Group's Infrastructure Subcommittee observed that a standing multi-campus committee could be invaluable for exchanging and discussing developments on other campuses. New developments, problems, and solutions could be regularly shared with and explored among committee members. "It could be an invaluable space where regional campus representatives could share information about the infrastructure issues and developments occurring at their

specific campuses and how they address them” concluded a subcommittee member. Sharing information about other campuses’ programs, how they are structured, and how junior faculty and staff are supported could contribute to self-study, improved programmatic effectiveness, and potential cross-campus collaborations.

- **Self-Governance Structures Vary Among Peer and Aspirant Institutions**

The university senates of the peer and aspirant institutions, on average, include more standing committees than UConn’s University Senate. Despite efforts, we could not identify an analogous multi-campus committee among other universities’ self-governance systems. The Ohio State University has explored similar questions about the representation of faculty on their Columbus-based main campus. In OSU’s “Regional Campus External Review” 2021 report, reviewers noted “[f]irst and foremost, there must be a clear sense of the regional campus mission and most importantly, the central role these campuses play in OSU’s mission as a land grant institution. The current ambiguity is detrimental to both current operations and the long-term sustainability of these campuses.” (<https://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/reports/regional-campus-external-review-2021.pdf>, p 8) While there was no mention of changes to the OSU senate as a result of the external review, many of the issues and concerns described in the report are similar to issues of multi-campus representation at UConn.

- **There is strong stakeholder support for a standing Multi-Campus Committee**

Opinion on the need for a University Senate standing Multi-Campus Committee was consistent across stakeholder groups. Stakeholders believe that a standing multi-campus committee will ensure that UConn’s shared governance system include the perspectives of all seven campuses when making decisions and planning events.

Throughout the Ad-Hoc Committee’s exploration, three additional considerations were raised. Three stakeholders shared concerns that a standing committee might isolate or silo the campuses outside of Storrs, promoting, rather than rectifying, a Storrs-centric model of decision-making. Stakeholders, especially those located on campuses outside Storrs, also expressed concern about adding additional service work to faculty and staff at UConn’s smaller campuses. Third, if the Senate Executive moves to establish a standing Multi-Campus Committee, careful thought should be given to the Law and Medical Schools’ representation and participation. Most Ad-Hoc Committee members and Campus Deans see Law School and Medical School involvement as essential for fostering UConn collaboration, shared initiatives, and advancing a “One UConn” model; some believe that Law School and Medical school representation on a committee may be inappropriate as they have separate governance structures.

Appendix A

Ad Hoc Working Group Members

Name	Department	School/College/Campus
Amy Gorin (ex-officio)	Vice Provost	Provost's Office
Jennifer Dineen (co-chair)	APIR, Public Policy	CLAS, Hartford
Nathaniel Trumbull (co-chair)	Associate Professor, Geography	CLAS, Avery Point
Zachary Boudah	Undergraduate Student	Avery Point
Sidratul Muntaha	Undergraduate Student	Hartford
Mohammed Ruwaid	Undergraduate Student	
Oskar Harmon	Associate Professor, Economics	CLAS, Stamford
Morty Ortega	Associate Professor, Natural Resources & the Environment	CAHNR, Storrs
Daniel Burkey	Associate Professor, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering and Associate Dean, Undergraduate Education and Diversity	ENGR, Storrs
Katie Martin	Assistant Campus Director	Hartford
John Cooley	APIR, Biology	CLAS, Hartford
Katherine Pancak	Professor in Residence, Finance	School of Business, Stamford
Laura Tropp	Director, Academic Affairs	Stamford
Annamaria Csizmadia	Associate Professor, HDFS	CLAS, Stamford
Linda Sprague Martinez	Professor	Professor, Department of Medicine/Director of the Health Disparities Institute at UCH)
Nakeia Moore	Program Director, Undergraduate Programs	Waterbury
Peter Tribuzio	Director of Student Services	Waterbury
Shelby Summers	Student Affairs Director	School of Law

Campus Deans Interviewed:

Dean	Campus
Annemarie Seifert	Avery Point
Mark Overmeyer-Valazquez	Hartford
Jennifer Orlikoff	Stamford
Fumiko Hoeft	Waterbury
Eboni Nelson	UConn Law School

Peer and Aspirant Institutions

Rutgers
The Ohio State University
Tufts
University of California
University of Delaware
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
University of North Carolina
University of Washington

Appendix B

4/10/24, 3:41 PM

Senate Committee Chairs: Feedback to Multi-Campus Ad Hoc Working Group

Senate Committee Chairs: Feedback to Multi-Campus Ad Hoc Working Group

9 Responses

02:14 Average time to complete

Active Status

1. Which of the following best describes the issues on which your committee focuses?

- Issues relevant to all of UConn's... 8
- Issues relevant to UConn campu... 1
- Issues relevant to the Storrs cam... 0



2. In your standing committee meetings, how often are multiple campus perspectives a specific part of the conversation?

- Frequently 4
- Sometimes 3
- Occasionally 2
- Rarely 0
- Never 0



3. If regional/law school/medical school campuses are already part of your committee's conversation, how would you evaluate the level of input you currently receive from those multiple campuses?

- We currently have sufficient inp... 6
- We could use more input from t... 3
- I have no opinion 0



4. Which of the following overall statements comes closest to your opinion?

- It would be helpful to our com... 5
- Our committee would not benef... 1
- I have no opinion on whether a ... 3



5. Please add any additional comments (optional)

5
Responses

Latest Responses

"We are lucky to have multiple regional campus folks on the Student Welfare.."

5. Please add any additional comments (optional)

5 Responses

1	anonymous	The non-Storrs campuses plus the 8 Extension offices not located on one of the other campuses do not always gain the same level of appreciation with regards to budget and with staff at facilities stretched so thin, they do not get the same attention to detail.
2	anonymous	We currently have sufficient input because our committee happens to be chaired by a regional campus member and includes several faculty from regionals. With a different make-up, though, I believe there would be a need for more input.
3	anonymous	Having a single campus rep is often not sufficient. A standing committee would forefront all regional campus issues more clearly.
4	anonymous	I put that I have no opinion above, but this is not entirely true. It depends. I think this issue comes down to what is the best way to make sure that the multiple campuses have input on the issues the Senate discusses while also being mindful of adding additional service to our already very busy staff and faculty. A standing committee could isolate these issues but would also allow them, perhaps, to receive more consideration. There may also be issues that are unique to various campuses that this committee might give space for a hearing about. The alternative would be to require that every committee have some representation from non-Storrs campuses. I guess it would come down to the charge of the standing committee. Is their charge to address issues specific to having multiple campuses (e.g., coordination or equity)? If so, then it might work. If, however, the point is to make sure committees also keep in mind issues that arise from having multiple campuses, then representation would likely be better. There would be a symbolic side to having such a committee that might weigh in its favor, but again, I cannot help but wonder if the extra service and additional layer of a standing committee would be helpful.
5	anonymous	We are lucky to have multiple regional campus folks on the Student Welfare