

## MEETING OF APRIL 1, 2016

University President Lee Bollinger called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm in 104 Jerome Greene. Seventy-three of 100 senators were present during the meeting.

**Minutes and agenda.** The minutes of February 26 and the agenda were adopted as proposed.

**President's remarks.** The president skipped his remarks.

**Executive Committee chair's remarks.** Sen. Sharyn O'Halloran (Ten., SIPA) said she was hoping to hear that a supermajority (three-fifths of all incumbent senators) was in the room, so that the Senate could approve the Doctor of Medical Science in Dental Medicine on its third try.

She outlined some agenda items for the next and last plenary meeting of the academic year.

--Report from Advisory Committee on Socially Responsible Investing Chair Jeffrey Gordon.

### Old business

- Third attempt to present the *Resolution to Approve a Doctor of Medical Science in Dental Medicine (Med. Sc.D.; CDM)*. Education Committee co-chair James Applegate (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) outlined a presentation he had given two meetings earlier for the same program, which is designed to train practicing dentists in both clinical specialties and research for a doctorate in a manner that allows them also to continue to practice and keep up their technical skills. He said it's an excellent program, which some of Columbia's competitors already have.

With the resolution moved and seconded, the president called for a vote. Understanding that a three-fifths majority was present, he asked if any were opposed to the measure, or wanted to abstain. There being no nay votes and no abstentions, the president declared the resolution unanimously adopted.

### New business

- *Resolution to Approve the B.S./M.S. in Biomedical Engineering (SEAS, Education)*. Without discussion the Senate unanimously approved the resolution, which did not require a supermajority.

### Reports

- *Safwan Masri, EVP for Global Centers, on efforts to support research through the Global Centers; Sen. Susan McGregor (NT, Journ.) on her project with the Istanbul GC to build networks for the secure transfer of data for journalists, NGOs, and scholars in the Middle East.*

EVP Masri began by outlining the function and scale of Columbia's eight Global Centers. He said they are an innovative enterprise, developed by President Bollinger to establish a presence for Columbia around the world, with a light footprint and no financial investment from the University. The Global Centers are supported by local hosts, many of them alumni. Their purpose is to serve

faculty, students, and alumni by supporting their collaborative engagement with partners on the ground. The approach is humble, and very different from those of peer institutions: Even though Columbia is highly international, and based in New York City, there's much about the world Columbia does not know. Columbia needs to be out in the world in order to understand it better and to engage with it. Columbia faculty now use the Global Centers to support their research. The President's Global Innovation Fund also encourages research in the Global Centers. It is now in its fourth funding cycle, with 44 applications in the current round, and more than 100 since the start of the program. Columbia has spent about \$2.8 million to support this research.

EVP Masri introduced his fellow presenter Susan McGregor, an assistant professor of journalism and assistant director of the Tow Center for Digital Journalism. He said she has supervised the dual-degree program in journalism and computer science. She teaches primarily in the areas of data journalism and information visualization, with a research interest in digital security, knowledge management and alternative forms of digital distribution. He said she had just returned from Istanbul, where she had run a number of workshops with the help of the Global Center. He asked her to talk about this work, as well as about the security challenges she encountered in Turkey during the last few weeks. Two scheduled events had to be canceled.

Sen. McGregor said she was a 2015 recipient of a planning grant from the Presidential Global Innovation Fund. The project was to provide a means for journalists and others around the world to share information about the quality of communications in their region. This effort was related to her previous work of providing security training to journalists. But a lot of her work was based on the earlier efforts to train human rights activists. The circumstances on the ground were very difficult, and it was important to understand them. The original project was to deploy a technical system, but the Istanbul Global Center helped to identify local partners, and her group developed curricula for two sets of workshops that were intended to take place two weeks ago in Istanbul. The first was an information security workshop for practicing journalists.

One lesson she learned in Turkey is that reputation management is extremely important, and there's a lot of concern about keeping social media accounts secure. So there was an opportunity to provide basic information about how to secure accounts, how to develop strong passwords, etc. The second part was a partnership with the local outlet of an NGO that included a three-part series on information visualization for journalists and civil society leaders. Unfortunately, because of security problems, those workshops had to be canceled. But thanks to the Global Center, she was able to contact and interview a dozen local journalists and academics, as part of a study on the state of practice for media and academia in Turkey under current circumstances. The overall experience was very sobering, but provided a lot of insight. But without the guidance of the Global Center, she could never have negotiated the landscape or made the connections with the right people.

EVP Masri asked Sen. McGregor to talk about the impact of her work in Istanbul. He had heard from the Center that journalists who are feeling increasingly isolated in Turkey gained a sense of solidarity. He also asked if Sen. McGregor's work in Turkey had changed her relationships with other Columbia faculty.

Sen. McGregor said the work with the Istanbul Center has helped her connect with Columbia colleagues—in Public Health, Law, and other departments. She hoped to cultivate long-term partnerships that will give journalists access to expertise around the University, enabling them to cover complex topics more comprehensively.

EVP Masri said he had been at Columbia for almost three decades and was still amazed at, for example, how little he knew, as a Business School administrator, about the Journalism School. This condition has changed dramatically over the past decade, because of the interdisciplinary programs and institutes that the University leadership has fostered, but also because of the Global Centers. In some cases faculty are finding it easier to collaborate halfway across the world.

He noted the work of other senators through the Global Centers: Sens. Shantanu Lal (NT, CDM) and Debra Wolgemuth (Ten., P&S) in Africa, and Sen. Wafaa El-Sadr (Ten., PH). He invited questions.

Sen. Samuel Silverstein (Ten., P&S) said security is a serious issue for foreign journalists as well as American journalists abroad. Is there a special kind of training that journalists receive?

Sen. McGregor said this has been her research area since coming to Columbia, and she has been working on integrating this kind of training into the Journalism School curriculum. Her first exposure was through the human rights community because human rights activists were the main group that had experience on the ground coping with the kind of legal and technical issues in the age of social media that can affect journalists. She had spent a lot of time with people who travel the world doing that work. Having an information security person at a news organization is a relatively new concept. *The New York Times* just hired a well-known expert to be in charge of editorial security. The Journalism School is trying to incorporate this training into the newsroom. She said this is exactly the kind of training that she was hoping to provide in Istanbul. One success, even without being able to conduct the training she had planned, was to identify some organizations that have worked with activists on the ground in Turkey already, but didn't have a connection to the journalism community, and to try to serve as a liaison between those two communities. And she was still hoping to go forward with the training.

Sen. Silverstein asked Sen. McGregor to share any lessons she had learned about how to protect journalists in Turkey.

Sen. McGregor said that before she traveled she took precautions about what information to bring with her, and how she would protect it and transmit it back here. On this trip she would be conducting audio interviews. Travelers should use a computer that is clean—preferably a borrowed machine that is essentially empty, and not their own laptops. She also set up multiple users on her Android phone, so she could switch to a new user that had only her Columbia email account. She used some methods to protect the data she was taking, and moved it off her computer before entering or leaving a country. Another crucial protection against hacking of online accounts—not yet possible with Columbia email—is to set up second factor identification on email accounts she used, or Facebook, or Twitter.

Sen. Silverstein asked if all students should be getting this kind of training when going abroad.

EVP Masri said his office has been conducting this kind of training—and others—with undergraduates in global programs, and through the International Students and Scholars Office. His office also has an extensive orientation with students before they travel to the region of a particular Global Center.

Sen. Silverstein urged the Executive Committee to consider ways to communicate throughout the University on this need. Sen. O'Halloran thought this would be a good issue for the IT committee.

Sen. McGregor expressed thanks again for the guidance she had on the ground in Turkey which helped her make decisions about how to travel there.

Sen. Masri said he had spoken to the director of the Istanbul Center during the recent turmoil in Turkey, and they decided to close the Istanbul Center on a Friday—not knowing what would happen there shortly afterwards.

Sen. Suzanne Goldberg (Admin.) said these issues were important, not only about security but also about acculturation generally and what students and others might bring back to the University community here. So the Office of University Life, which she directs, was thinking about how to share this information across the University.

Provost John Coatsworth called attention to the [global.columbia.edu](http://global.columbia.edu) website, which provides international travelers with a wide range of resources, information, help, instructions and the like. A new travel policy requires students and staff traveling on University business to register with International SOS, an organization that Columbia pays a lot of money to help out people who get into trouble. The site also provides State Department warnings or guidance (if any) about countries people are traveling to.

EVP Masri said the Global Centers offer a lot more opportunity for faculty and students to do work in the world, but the Centers also become conduits for local and regional knowledge, expertise, and networks that were not available before.

The president thanked the presenters. He said Columbia's engagement with global issues is growing exponentially every year. Everyone at Columbia now understands that whatever their field is, it's going to be affected by what is happening globally. This situation plays to the advantages of Columbia—its natural inclination, its location, its people. So in a kind of selfish way he thought globalization was a highly favorable development for Columbia. But he said it is also Columbia's basic responsibility to pursue this effort, and he was very proud of how the institution is going about this. And it's very different from the approach of some peer institutions, which are setting up branch campuses. That approach may suit peers' institutional commitment to build their student bodies and develop an additional faculty. But Columbia's particular effort to reshape how it is here and in the world requires a different kind of platform. He thought the present period is as revolutionary in a slow-moving way as anything universities have gone through in the last 100 years.

*Initial presentation of results of the Faculty Quality of Life survey.* Sen. O'Halloran said she would start with a kind of executive summary of the top-line results and some details at the present meeting, then a more searching analysis at the next plenary.

- The survey's response rate was a little over 40 percent—an extraordinary number for the first attempt at a survey like this.
- Overall 75 percent of faculty are satisfied with their Columbia experience. The provost offered a single, loud cheer at this news. Sen. O'Halloran thanked the provost for his

support in mounting the survey.

- The areas of greatest faculty satisfaction were the libraries, the quality of Columbia students, and the officers' benefits package.
- Areas of dissatisfaction (or what Sen. O'Halloran called "opportunity areas") included administrative and clinical support staff, funding for research support, and space for meetings, conferences, and collaborative work. Sen. O'Halloran said she would follow up with some policy recommendations.
- Some key stressors facing faculty: scholarly productivity and research funding, campus and department politics, and insufficient time for family and friends. These are work-life balance issues.
- Faculty are highly satisfied with their life outside of work—90 percent—so New York City is a draw. Most say they can integrate work and family obligations, but a more detailed view is required.
- Despite the high satisfaction rates, 30 percent of Columbia faculty at any time say they are likely to leave within three years. Some recommendations will address retention problems.

Why do this survey? Sen. O'Halloran said it was important to identify what faculty see as Columbia's strengths and its challenges, and then identify areas where Columbia's unique climate can create opportunities. The survey instrument was developed by the American Association of Universities, and shared across many universities. It uses a range of types of questions. One reason for choosing this model is that it makes it easy to do comparables. Moreover, MIT has used this instrument since 2004, and it has become the industry standard. She concluded that this instrument offers a robust set of questions, enabling investigators to do comparables and to develop times series data.

Conducting this survey was a highly collaborative and consultative process. Every part of the university was contacted, and many provided help, above all the provost's office, but also the Arts and Sciences faculty, the Senate Faculty Caucus, the Commission on the Status of Women, Suzanne Goldberg's Office of University Life, and the Work/Life Office.

Once the instrument was finally agreed upon, the survey was out in the field from December 2 to January 18. In March the data diagnostics and analysis were carried out, and after the present presentation would come the drill-down, and efforts to disseminate the conclusions.

The survey platform was Qualtrics, and a lot of expertise throughout the University was shared in getting this to work. The sample size was about 1,550 respondents out of about 3,800 faculty, a 41 percent response rate. Of the Morningside respondents, 54 percent were tenured, compared to 16 percent at CUMC. But then 64 percent of the CUMC respondents are not on tenure track, compared to 27 percent on Morningside. But most of the tenured faculty reside near the Morningside campus while, most of the non-tenure-track faculty reside near CUMC. The point was that there are similarities among the populations, but also significant differences.

Sen. O'Halloran said 75 percent of the faculty are either very or somewhat satisfied, but 17 percent are dissatisfied with their Columbia experience. CUMC is 71 percent satisfied while Morningside campus is 81 percent satisfied. Another difference is that 12 percent are dissatisfied on Morningside, compared to 19 percent at CUMC.

What is the relevance of these findings? What's the benchmark? Sen. O'Halloran offered two points of comparison. In the 2012 MIT survey, 90 percent of the faculty were somewhat or very satisfied, while 81 percent of the faculty in a 2014 Harvard survey were similarly satisfied. So while Columbia has room for improvement, it is already in the same range.

Sen. O'Halloran turned to some specific areas of satisfaction. About 50 percent of respondents are satisfied with the support for their research and scholarship, while about 32 percent (a third) are not. So there is a high variation among people's perceptions these kinds of support, which will prompt questions about differences among the subgroups.

On the question of support for teaching and clinical work, about 54 percent are satisfied with resources for teaching, while 22 percent are not. On the question of support for clinical duties at CUMC there is a big divide, with about 42 percent satisfied, and another 42 percent dissatisfied—a bimodal distribution. It will be worthwhile to drill down into these findings, Sen. O'Halloran said.

The areas of highest satisfaction for faculty appear to be the research libraries, the quality of Columbia students, and the benefits package. Sen. O'Halloran noted that Harvard faculty were also satisfied by their libraries and students, but they were also satisfied with opportunities for innovation in teaching, the quality of the technical and research staff, the teaching load, the quality of support of administrative staff, and salary.

Again, the features of faculty life at Columbia with the lowest satisfaction rates were support staff, administrative and clinical assistance with patients (at CUMC), release time for scholarly activities, support for research and grant writing, and meeting and collaborative workspace.

As for workload, 57 percent overall feel it is heavier than they expected, again with a division between uptown and downtown. This may be a cultural difference, but there may be more to it. At CUMC 60 percent of the population saw the workload as heavier than expected; on Morningside that fraction was 51 percent. But the perceptions even within these populations vary widely.

What aspects of the work caused the greatest stress? About 75 percent of the faculty identifies scholarly productivity as a source of at least some stress. A quarter of the faculty identified lack of time with family and friends. Campus and department politics—an experience familiar to senators—is a source of extensive stress for 30 percent of the faculty. And 31 percent say securing research funding is an extensive source of stress.

What about recognition for what faculty do for the University? Over half of the faculty feel that they're recognized for their contributions. About two thirds feel that their colleagues value their research and scholarship, and 90 percent feel that students value their teaching. But less than 40 percent feel that Columbia values their teaching.

As for the climate within the department or school, three quarters of respondents feel that they're in the right department, and that they can navigate the nuances and unwritten rules there. But 41

percent feel that they do not have the resources necessary to do their job, and 44 percent say they have no say in the allocation of those resources or in decision making. A third feel they have to work harder than their colleagues to be taken seriously, and over a quarter feel excluded from formal networks.

What about life outside Columbia? Ninety percent are satisfied, so clearly New York is a big attraction for faculty. And this is pretty consistent across the campuses.

About two thirds of the faculty are satisfied with their ability to integrate their work and personal lives, again with a difference between the campuses (71 percent on Morningside, 64 percent at CUMC). But 25 percent of the faculty at CUMC are dissatisfied. These strong negative reactions stand out in the CUMC population.

Despite the mainly positive reactions, no less than 30 percent of faculty say they are likely to leave Columbia in the next three years, including for retirement. This result raises many questions, Sen. O'Halloran said, because it's very expensive to attract and retain faculty. What can Columbia do to relieve the stresses that faculty experience? But this issue will await the second presentation.

In response to an inaudible question, Sen. O'Halloran said the 40 percent sample of faculty opinion was quite robust across the university. The responses can be read as indications of broad faculty sentiment.

In response to an inaudible comment, Sen. O'Halloran said the study will include some additional focus groups. But she added that the response rate was good partly because the survey was anonymous, so it will not be possible to identify the people who didn't respond. The focus groups will help to make sure people are getting the right questions, and it will also be possible to develop panel questions over time. The study will also be repeated every two years, so there will be more data, hopefully with a larger response rate.

In response to a comment from Sen. Richard Smiley (Ten., P&S), Sen. O'Halloran said the ranks and approximate ages of the respondents were included in the survey. But that information was for the second presentation. It would help to show how representative the response sample was.

Sen. Greg Freyer (NT, Public Health) asked how the data would be used to effect change.

Sen. O'Halloran said some of the problems were already evident, but statistics will help to identify hidden patterns and to determine relatively minor adjustments in policy that may make a difference.

President Bollinger said he agreed that a survey like this does not provide a complete basis for making judgments. He said interviewing people who didn't respond is important. He also recognized the complexities of answers to these questions. For example, the insight that scholarship is a major source of stress is not very informative to him, without more detail and nuance. He was also not surprised to hear that 90 percent of faculty think their students really appreciate their teaching. He wanted to know more about student perceptions on questions like this.

Sen. O'Halloran said the notable perception is that faculty don't feel the university appreciates them.

President Bollinger said this finding, along with the one that 30 percent of the faculty think they'll leave in three years, is significant. He understood the psychology of these responses, as a kind of protest vote. In a way, he said, everybody's always thinking about leaving. It's a restless group; life is miserable in front of that blank page. But the key point is that there may be, with deeper analysis, some actions to take that can make life better for everybody in a meaningful way.

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S) thanked the president for his response, adding her agreement that there may be solutions in the data.

She said the 41 percent response rate is actually quite high; for many surveys, the rate is no higher than 30 percent. And those surveys have led to changes. She thought some of the resource issues could lead to better support for faculty. And deeper analysis will yield more answers.

Sen. O'Halloran agreed. She said many of the questions in this survey were chosen for their comparability to those in surveys at other universities.

In addition to presenting little topical papers on some of the survey findings, she will be providing the data to the American Association of Universities, and receiving back the comparables on these questions from all the other participating universities. So Columbia will be able to benchmark itself in a meaningful way. But she also thought it was important to start thinking about meaningful policy interventions, particularly in the areas of administrative support, research funding, and grant writing.

President Bollinger added work-life balance as a topic.

Sen. Nicole Wallack (NT, A&S/Hum) hoped the Senate would return to the question of the libraries. She understood that during the past week or so, librarians learned that they may be facing severe austerity going forward, including reductions in resources and in staff, along with some other difficult adjustments in their quality of life that will directly affect the faculty experience of the libraries. She requested a robust discussion of those issues.

Sen. O'Halloran said the Columbia library is a gem, and whatever can be done to preserve it—given whatever constraints it faces—is important.

Sen. Silverstein said the survey clearly shows that there's a difference between the Medical Center and the Morningside campus. He said there is now a universal malaise among American physicians, including the highest suicide rate ever recorded, and great dissatisfaction with the practice of medicine. He said this national picture has to be understood in considering clinical conditions.

A second urgent issue, Sen. Silverstein said, is Columbia's success rate in recruiting the best post-doctoral research fellows. He said his own lab is most productive—and his own stress levels more manageable—when he has the very best fellows. His impression is that Columbia has lately been competing less successfully with peer institutions for these fellows. When he looks at listings of fellows in the *New York Times*, Columbia never seems to come out on top. Those fellows are key students and the bridge to the faculty—the engine that drives many research laboratories' success.

Sen. O'Halloran understood that the provost would be taking strong steps to support health benefits for postdoctoral fellows.



Sen. O'Halloran closed the discussion, but invited additional questions by email.

### **Committee reports**

*Libraries.* Committee co-chair Arthur Langer (NT, SPS) asked to postpone this report until the Libraries had submitted a number of findings to the provost through his Advisory Committee on the Libraries, which was formed a year ago and on which Sen. Langer has been serving. The provost's committee has about 16 faculty and student members.

Sen. Silverstein, the other co-chair of the Senate Libraries Committee, said that committee had not heard about the cuts in staff and staff funding that Sen. Wallack had just mentioned. He said the committee would appreciate hearing about that.

Sen. Langer said the provost's committee has been looking at collections, research support, and student services, but he too had not heard anything about expected cuts. He added that Sen. Ann Thornton, University Librarian, was not at the present meeting, so he thought postponement of this discussion till September might be the best course.

*Rules.* Sen. Bollinger said this was an important report, but he was concerned that there wasn't sufficient time left to do it justice. He suggested having a brief update now, and a longer report at the final plenary.

Rules Committee co-chairs Angela Nelson (Research Officers) and Logan Wright (Stu., Law) reported. Sen. Wright outlined the group's accomplishments for the year.

1. Instructing the new University Judicial Board and Appeals Board. The committee was fortunate to have Prof. Alejandro Garro from Columbia Law School, who has a thirty-year career in alternative dispute resolution, instructing the Board members. This training will become an annual routine, both for new UJB members and as a refresher for returning members.

2. Promulgating the first draft of a set of guidelines to the Rules of University Conduct, which had been distributed in the present Senate packet. Sen. Wright said the guidelines are evolving document that outlines the history of the Rules and the implementation of the new Rules, which the committee proposed a year ago and the Trustees approved last October. One important section of the guidelines, on page 6, explains a new mechanism for protecting student press. There will be two different types of press passes—annual and event-specific—to be issued by various media organizations on campus, such as *Spectator*, *Bwog*, and the *Lion*. There will also be passes for freelance press. These passes will enable Public Safety to identify these journalists during a demonstration, and treat them accordingly. The pass also establishes a presumption under the Rules that the bearer is operating in his or her role as press. So a pass holder who is reporting on a demonstration will be assumed not to be in violation of the Rules unless it's proven otherwise. Sen. Wright said the committee took this step because it believes there's a strong policy incentive to want to further free speech, not only for protesters but also for the people who report on student protests. He said this is an additional protection for student press.

Sen. Wright added that the presumption that people with press passes are doing their job is rebuttable. The pass does not provide its bearer with a blanket shield to commit violations under the Rules, but it does add additional shielding that wouldn't otherwise be there.

President Bollinger said this committee work was a highly positive development. He said it is important to build in a kind of right of access to the Columbia campus. He had made this point at a Trustees' meeting, and he said the Trustees agreed.

Student Affairs chair Marc Heinrich (CC) thanked the Rules Committee for its work. He said SAC has been concerned about this issue for the past year, and was highly pleased with committee's thinking and eager to see the final draft of the guidelines.

*Student Affairs.* At the president's suggestion, Sen. Heinrich asked to postpone this report till the next plenary.

The president adjourned the meeting at around 2:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff