

MEETING OF APRIL 29, 2016

President Lee Bollinger, the chair, called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm in 1501 International Affairs. Fifty-one of 100 senators were present during the meeting.

President's remarks. The president noted the death of former Trustee Bill Campbell on April 18, after an illness of some duration. He said there was no Columbia alumnus more dedicated than Mr. Campbell, who became a Trustee in 2003 at the president's request and later recalled this appointment as one of the most important moments of his life. In 2005 Mr. Campbell was appointed Trustee chair. The president said he and Mr. Campbell worked together for a decade, becoming very close friends. Among his extraordinary capacities, Mr. Campbell really knew how to make organizations work and how to make people feel that they were part of something very important that was also fun and enjoyable. He seemed to have a boundless love for people, but he was also clear-eyed and astute about them. But when it came to making things happen and protecting the president and the institution, there was nobody better. A memorial service was held on April 25 in Palo Alto, attended by hundreds of people from Silicon Valley, where he had a very special career, but also by many people from Columbia and other places he had touched. At the president's request the Senate observed a moment of silence for Mr. Campbell.

Dedication of the Manhattanville campus. On May 2, the 120th anniversary of the dedication of the Morningside campus in 1896, the president will announce the dedication of the new campus in Manhattanville. People will begin moving into the buildings throughout next year, and the actual construction of the campus will continue for several decades. But within the next year and a half the University hopes to complete the Zuckerman Mind Brain Behavior Institute in the Greene building and the Lenfest Center for the Arts, which are both now nearing completion, as well as the Forum building at 125th and Broadway. The Forum will have a 430-seat auditorium—the first of its kind on the Columbia campus—along with meeting rooms and food service. In addition the Business School will move to Manhattanville into two buildings on either side of the square within five years. Another site just to the west of the Lenfest Center for the Arts, which the president has designated a “global” building, still needs fundraising, but with success that could also be completed in five years. Engineering will also have a presence. Of course Studebaker and Prentis, both old landmark buildings, were already functional and would remain so. This is a momentous time for the University as it sets out upon this new course.

Henry Moore sculpture. The president said the institution made mistakes in handling student complaints about the decision to place the Henry Moore sculpture “Reclining Figure” on the lawn in front of Butler Library. [A student petition with 1,200

signatures complained that the sculpture was ugly and ill-suited to the neoclassical design of the Columbia campus.] The president took personal responsibility for the mistakes, which he described as classic bureaucratic errors, in which different people around the institution are conscientiously doing their jobs, but there hasn't been a sufficient collective decision-making process. So the question of the disposition of the sculpture is paused now, so that a deliberative process can take place, leading to the right result. Seeing hands raised for questions, the president said time was short at the present meeting, since he had to leave for the airport at 2 pm, and the agenda was already crowded. But he said he would return to this issue at a later meeting. To laughter, he promised that summer powers would not be used to approve the installation of the Henry Moore sculpture.

Investment policy on fossil fuels. The president said there had been a number of debates about a proposal to divest the university's portfolio of all holdings in the top 200 fossil-fuels companies. He said the university has a deliberative process for making recommendations on these issues, based on the Advisory Committee for Socially Responsible Investing, established in 2000. The process includes clear criteria that must be met for any divestment decision.

The president said ACSRI chair Jeffrey Gordon of the Law School was at the meeting to report. New proposals have also come in from faculty groups, and there have been campus discussions. The president said he wanted to protect this deliberative process. Ultimately, the decision rests with him and the Trustees, who are responsible for the endowment. But this is a full community-wide process and a very important one. He praised the ACSRI and its chair, but said the university also needs robust campus debate.

Free speech on campus. The president said he and the university are committed to protecting the principle of freedom of speech on campus. This principle requires allowing people to speak whose views we deeply disagree with. There is no alternative to committing ourselves to speaking our minds and letting other people speak their minds, within the norms and customs of civil debate, if possible.

Impending Supreme Court decision on affirmative action in admissions. The president said yet another Supreme Court decision, in the case often called Fisher II, is due in the next few weeks. Columbia has submitted an *amicus* brief along with a number of other universities, supporting the position that it is constitutional for a university to be able to consider race and ethnicity in admissions for purposes of achieving educational benefits. The president said he has also argued over the years, as well as recently, that the purpose of diversity in admissions is not just to provide educational enrichment (the only grounds accepted by the Supreme Court) but also to counteract the long history of slavery and racial discrimination. He said our country has not outlived the commitment to work on these issues; building diverse student populations is one way to do that.

At some length, the president summarized the issues in the Fisher and Fisher II cases. He said that with only seven judges in this case (with the death of Antonin Scalia, and the recusal of Elena), it's possible that a majority could simply overrule the principle of

affirmative action laid down in 2003 in *Grutter v. Bollinger*. Such a decision would immediately affect public universities and, over time, private universities as well. But the president did not expect to see such a sweeping decision in the present case. There might be a majority to cut back, to put a few additional restrictions on universities, perhaps requiring them to prove that diversity does matter, or that there are no alternative means to achieve it. He thought both of these burdens could be met, and he did not expect the decision to wreck a policy he regarded as essential.

Executive Committee chair's remarks. Sen. Sharyn O'Halloran (Ten., SIPA) added a few words of her own about Bill Campbell. She said he was a very good partner to the University Senate, and genuinely valued the input of both faculty and students in a broad range of Trustee decisions. She said Mr. Campbell's efforts had also supported a revitalization of the Senate. Sen. O'Halloran said she had had the privilege of working with Mr. Campbell for a decade, and said the Senate's current strength and its good relations with the Trustees and the administration were largely attributable to Mr. Campbell.

Research Officers Quality of Life survey. Sen. O'Halloran said the first test survey had just been finished. Senate staff director Geraldine Mc Allister would now incorporate this feedback into the final survey.

Update on implementation of the Rules of Conduct. Sen. Logan Wright (Stu., Law), Rules Committee co-chair, offered an update on guidelines for implementation of the Rules that he and his co-chair, Sen. Angela Nelson (Research Officers), had been working on. He focused on a new provision for press credentials for reporters covering campus demonstrations.

Under the old Rules of Conduct, and the ones that replaced them in October 2015, there were no protections for these journalists. So press covering protests could themselves have been charged under the Rules. For instance, during the recent week-long occupation of Low Library, journalists weren't technically allowed to be in Low recording the protest because they themselves could be potentially found in trespass and therefore in violation of the Rules, with serious consequences for their academic records. To avoid that outcome, and to strengthen provisions for free speech, the committee has provided for press passes for recognized journalists, entitling them to a presumption that they are not to be found in violation of the Rules when they are acting as press. In practical terms, the pass will allow the press to trespass in an area for the purpose of recording the protest. And so this pass provides an additional level of protection that campus journalists wouldn't otherwise have, so they can report on campus without fearing sanctions under the Rules.

Adoption of the minutes of April 1 and the agenda. Hearing no objection to the minutes of April 1 and the agenda, the president declared both unanimously adopted.

Education Committee Resolutions

- *M.S. in Data Journalism (Journalism School).* Education Committee Co-chair

James Applegate (Ten., A&S/NS) presented this three-semester, 46-point program, whose purpose is to produce data- and computer-literate journalists. He said readers of the Upshot or the 538 blog in the New York Times will recognize the kind of journalism involved. Journalism schools have not taught courses like this in the past. The new program draws on two existing Journalism School programs—the flagship M.S. in Journalism and a summer program called the Lede. Sen. Applegate said the subcommittee that reviewed the proposal (himself and Sen. Candice Kail of the Libraries) was enthusiastic about the program.

By voice vote and without dissent, the Senate voted to approve the program.

- *M.S. in Insurance Management (School of Professional Studies)*. Sen. Applegate said this highly focused, one-year, 36-point program is for people who want jobs in the insurance industry. A subcommittee reviewed the program, and the committee approved it.

Sen. Raimondo Betti (Ten., SEAS) asked if the Engineering School was consulted in the review of this proposal. Sen. Applegate said it was, in the normal course of affairs for such reviews.

The Senate then approved the program by voice vote without dissent.

Resolution Concerning Summer Powers. Without discussion the Senate unanimously approved this resolution.

Committee Reports.

Diversity Commission. Sen. Jillian Ross (Stu., SEAS-Undergrad), one of the Commission co-chairs along with Sen. Shantanu Lal (NT, CDM), read the group's newly drafted mission statement aloud, taking turns with Commission member Ramis Wadood (Sen., Stu., CC):

The Commission on Diversity is committed to fostering and promoting the equality and inclusion of all Columbia University students and affiliates regardless of race, ethnicity, nationality, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, religion, gender, age, and all other characteristics of identity. The Commission shall continuously evaluate, enhance and propose University policies and programs devoted to permanently embedding values of community respect, acceptance, equity, diversity and inclusion and the fabric that unites us in the Columbia community.... [Wadood]: The Commission shall identify best practices and recommendations for fulfilling the University's diversity mission statement that will have meaningful and sustained impact by using admissions data, retention rates, community input, and other means to evaluate inclusivity and diversity. The Commission's mandate is to (1) unite all levels of the Columbia University to engage in this critical conversation, (2) continuously affirm that promoting diversity and inclusion are priorities for the University, and (3) constantly assess and initiate policies pertaining to characteristics of identity on an administrative level.

Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) recalled that when this commission was first proposed to the Senate earlier this year, its mandate called for a roster composed exclusively of students, faculty, and administrators. At the time Sen. Savin called for expanding the membership to include research officers, librarians, and other members of the University who are not currently represented but who play an important role in enhancing the diversity of the University. He asked what steps would be taken to enhance the membership of the Committee.

Sen. Wadood said next year's co-chairs could address this issue. He agreed that it was necessary to widen the membership. He said the first year was devoted mainly to identifying the group's objectives and priorities.

Student Affairs Committee: 2015-16 Annual Report. Sen. Marc Heinrich (CC), the chair, listed SAC's main accomplishments:

1. Publication of the 84-page 2015 Quality of Life Report for students (the second edition of that biennial report). Students were able to present the key findings to stakeholders across the University including the Trustees. Many of its recommendations are now being investigated; some have already been implemented.

2. Collaboration with Athletic Director Peter Pilling and his staff on improving campus recreational facilities, mainly in Dodge Gym, and on developing a long-term vision for the department. SAC also offered advice on short-term projects, such as a new floor layout at Dodge, and the new Columbia Daily Dose of Fitness program.

3. Collaboration with the Senate Education and Faculty Affairs committees, Vice Provost Melissa Begg, and the Registrar on a year-long initiative to designate the Wednesday before Thanksgiving an academic holiday.

4. Consultations with the Offices of the Chaplain and the President to help fill a vacancy for the Muslim Religious Life Advisor. President Bollinger had created and funded this position, but it had fallen vacant; SAC was able to help the process along to find a successor.

5. Several SAC members joined the Mental Health Task Force, supporting an expansion of the Columbia Psychological Services staff.

6. SAC articulated student priorities for space on the Morningside campus that is being vacated by units moving to Manhattanville, and is working closely with offices of Arts and Sciences EVP David Madigan and President Bollinger to make sure that a student voice is part of those deliberations.

7. To address one of the most important findings of the student quality-of-life survey—the dissatisfaction of students who are disabled, both mentally and physically—SAC created a subcommittee. It is creating a list of priorities, to be released before the end of the year.

8. SAC created another subcommittee to address issues of financial insecurity that emerged in the quality-of-life survey.

9. SAC revamped the constitution of the Interschool Governing Board, which oversees student groups with members from more than one school. The IGB will manage credentialing for press passes for student and freelance journalists under the Rules of Conduct.

10. SAC worked with the Executive Committee to establish the Commission on Diversity.

11. SAC helped draft sustainability principles for the University, and will announce its official support for those to affirm Columbia's responsibility to be a greener institution within our broader community.

12. SAC collaborated closely with the Columbia Alumni Association, inviting the group's leader to speak at two meetings.

13. The School of Professional Studies (formerly Continuing Education) created its first-ever student council. Sen. Heinrich thanked SPS senator Ryan Monell for his contribution to that effort.

14. A number of SAC members have been working on family policy, and have completed benchmarking research on child care support at other institutions.

Sen. Heinrich especially thanked Sen. O'Halloran for supporting student initiatives. He also thanked President Bollinger, his chief of staff Susan Glancy, and his entire staff; the Provost, his chief of staff Justin Pearlman; and the entire professional Senate staff. He thanked his vicechairs, Sens. Wadood and Emily Moore (SEAS-Grad.). He introduced next year's co-chairs, Sean Ryan (CC) and Grace Kelley (Nursing), along with vice chair Daniella Urbina (SIPA). On a personal note, Sen. Heinrich said he had spent three years on the Senate—not very long to other senators, but a long hitch for a student, and an incredible opportunity to serve.

The president thanked SAC for extraordinary work this year.

Advisory Committee on Socially Responsible Investing (ACSRI). In his remarks introducing ACSRI Chair Jeffrey Gordon, the president said Columbia's most important activities bearing on climate change are its research and teaching, particularly at Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory. He said Columbia can claim legitimately to be the leader among universities in its academic work on climate change, and there are practical activities as well. The ACSRI has also recommended a process for thinking about Columbia's institutional stance. Faculty, administrators and students from across the University are helping to plan how Columbia can be more responsible as a participant in global environmental issues beyond research and teaching. Finally, the president said, there are important issues about divestment. He stressed that many parts of the institution are concerned with these issues, and he wanted to support that concern.

He left the meeting during Prof. Gordon's presentation.

Prof. Gordon said it was a pleasure to be addressing the Senate for the fourth time in his stint as ACSRI chair. He said he would summarize the main work of the ACSRI in 2015-16, and look ahead to 2016-17.

He began by talking about the committee's deliberative process. The ACSRI has developed proposal submission guidelines, based on its experience with recent proposals to divest from private prisons and from fossil fuels. Since the criteria for a divestment decision include substantial consideration of the merits, as well as an explanation of why divestment is a better course than engagement, the Committee needs an evidence-based presentation on these points. In addition, a divestment proposal needs an identification strategy for specific firms, as well as clear ways to select them.

The ACSRI also carried out a self-study about Columbia's divestment criteria, and then compared Columbia's deliberative process to those of the expanded Ivy League peer set. The transparency of the Columbia process—both between proponents and an established committee, and between such a committee and the Trustees—is unmatched, Prof. Gordon said. The ACSRI has reports and meeting minutes available on the website. The history of Columbia's deliberative process is one of sustained engagement, and a matter of institutional pride.

Prof. Gordon said ACSRI deliberations over a divestment proposal, which would impose a specific investment constraint on the University's endowment, entail considerable process. He confessed to a law professor's bias in seeing vital due process protections in provisions that others might regard as red tape. These provisions matter because in a society of conflicting views, held presumptively in good faith, there must be a way to social peace, even if we may disagree about the outcome.

Prof. Gordon briefly reviewed the composition of the ACSRI: four professors, four students, four alumni. The University provides administrative support but the Committee does its own work, meeting in subcommittees and as a whole committee, at a rate of once a week after spring break. It is a volunteer committee.

Prof. Gordon's second topic was the divestment proposal from the student group Columbia Divest for Climate Justice (CDCJ), and the ACSRI's response. That deliberation is presented in the committee's November 2015 report, which was in the packet for the present meeting, and on the Senate and ACSRI websites. The ACSRI voted against the CDCJ divestment proposal. One reason was that in past deliberations (on Sudan and South Africa), the focus was on firms with only a small amount of business in those places, with the thought that if Columbia were to call attention to them, their behavior would change, causing an impact on the ultimate issue. In the case of fossil fuel firms, whose business it is to produce these resources, divestment would not change behavior, and would not necessarily distinguish among those firms on the basis of behaviors that they might or might not take.

Another significant point about private prisons was that their business model was wholly inconsistent with the values of the University. The ACSRI saw no reason why the

University should gain from an increase in the prison population. It's hard to take an analogous position with fossil fuel firms because everyone uses them—gasoline for our fleets, electricity from fossil-fuel generating plants, etc. Indeed, one action taken by Columbia to reduce its own carbon footprint has been the replacement of heating oil by natural gas. So where's the consistency in saying that Columbia should divest from a large gas producer as a matter of socially responsible investing when the University is in fact using precisely this fuel source, at least for the time being, as a way to reduce its own carbon footprint? For these reasons the ACSRI was not persuaded to take a broad-based approach.

The November ACSRI report also concluded that divesting is too narrow a lens to consider Columbia's engagement with the climate change issue. So the committee proposed a series of alternative measures focusing on the University's capacity to play a national leadership role. These included further efforts to shrink Columbia's carbon footprint, and further support for climate change research, for research in how to reduce the impact of existing CO₂ emissions, for education efforts about climate change science, and for more academic analysis of the current US and international approaches to climate change. And to alumni who refused to make donations supporting fossil fuels, the committee suggested that the university might set up an alternative fossil-fuel-free fund for those alumni.

The ACSRI has also recommended to the Trustees that Columbia sign on to the Carbon Disclosure Project's Climate Change Initiative, which would ensure high-quality disclosure of firms' fossil fuel footprints, as well as other activities that would enable more robust engagement.

In addition, the ACSRI is at work on a divestment proposal that would target fossil fuel reserves whose extraction is particularly costly, including oil sands (also known as tar sands). The logic of the approach might also apply to other high-cost extraction processes, such as deep sea drilling and Arctic drilling, but such an extension would require reliable data, which could be gathered through the fossil fuels index on the tar sands question.

Prof. Gordon said the committee's approach derives from its Stand Up for Science framework, which was worth explaining again. The starting premise is that actions to avert the negative outcomes of climate change ultimately depend upon the concerted actions of government, especially the legislative branch, and will entail tough tradeoffs by political leaders as they balance economic and environmental concerns. But the critical issue is that the core facts of the human impact on global climate are denied by important governmental actors and contested in mainstream political discourse, despite an overwhelming scientific consensus on this question. Thus, from our perspective the denial of human agency in climate change is a first-order issue in the debate. The scientific consensus is that climate change is in effect an onrushing train and we stand on the tracks. And it is the denial of the science that keeps us frozen in the tracks, rather than engaged in the concerted activity necessary to get off the tracks and address the issue in a different way.

It is at this point, Prof. Gordon said, that the social mission of the University takes on special importance. A core mission of the University is to foster research, to produce new knowledge, and in a democratic society to make that knowledge available to public policy debates. This is especially significant for Columbia, which has produced some of the key research on climate change. Thus, in standing up for the science the University serves one of its core missions, and also provides a limiting idea for the University's engagement in public debates. So it provides a framework for the university's involvement in this issue, as opposed to other issues.

How does the framework apply to oil sands and other costly-to-extract fossil fuels? The answer is that such extraction practices reflect denial by deed of climate change science. The scientific consensus on climate change is that the full use of previously existing cheaper-to-extract fossil fuel reserves will already produce CO₂ emissions far in excess of safe levels. Yet the development of more costly reserves presumes such prior use of the cheaper alternatives. If the world is to adhere to the 2° Celsius limit that scientists say is necessary to avoid destructive climate change, we must not burn fossil fuel reserves holding more than 1,000 gigatons of CO₂. But the already known reserves we have are about 3,000 gigatons of CO₂. So development of additional, costlier reserves entails denial of the profound fact that we cannot burn the reserves we already have without climate change disaster. The ACSRI proposal focuses on what the committee sees as the key impediment to public action on this issue—the denial of the climate change science.

Sen. Gordon said that a broad consensus in the Columbia community is one of the criteria for a divestment decision, and the ACSRI wants to hear the views of the broader community. The committee is now devising a way to elicit community feedback that will include a web tool with some questions and a chance to comment. The comment period might go to the end of June, partly because many are now busy with end-of-semester schoolwork, but also because there should be a deadline for participation. The ACSRI will spend part of the summer analyzing this feedback, and getting a better idea about how to proceed.

Prof. Gordon concluded by talking about deliberations in the coming academic year. He said the ACSRI had received a proposal in the last few days from some Earth Institute faculty calling for divestment from coal, as well as a proposal from the CU Apartheid Divestment group with a different focus. The committee will ask for revisions to both proposals in light of the posted guidelines, and plan to take them up in the fall.

Discussion. Sen. Samuel Silverstein (Ten., P&S) said fracking has many environmental consequences, especially for ground water. There's great concern about companies that do not indicate what materials they are pumping into the ground as part of the fracking process. He asked if the ACSRI makes distinctions among fracking companies, or considers them all as a single group.

Sen. Gordon said the committee, in evaluating divestment proposals, has focused on CO₂ and the climate change risks associated with that, and has not yet considered a broader

environmental proposal. The committee is busy enough at the moment, and can't increase its workload now.

Sen. Silverstein said there are huge environmental costs apart from global warming that are associated with all of the extractive industries, not just fossil fuels. But fossil fuels are egregious for fracking procedures and for coal extraction, which simply destroys the mountains.

Prof. Gordon said the committee hasn't looked at the environmental impact of coal-fired electric generating plants, or at the health impact of soft drinks. Divestment requires a special showing of a grave harm that can be addressed only by an official University response in its endowment management. If a proposal came in about one of these issues, the committee would certainly consider it. But what it has so far been asked to consider is the CO₂ burden.

Sen. Alex Beecher (Stu., GSAS/NS) asked if the ACSRI's argument that fossil-fuel companies using costly extraction processes are in de facto denial of climate change extends to any companies actively pursuing the development of any new fuel reserves.

Prof. Gordon acknowledged that a cheaper extraction technology, such as fracking, might not be seen to constitute as egregious a de facto denial of climate science, and therefore would not be as deserving of divestment. But he recognized the direction of Sen. Beecher's argument—that the development of any additional reserves, given that there are already enough, is a matter of concern. Prof. Gordon said that a divestment proposal needs to consider specific firms and criteria, and so it may help to start with the worst. The committee has resolved to make a statement about climate change science denial. And so it's the example of an activity that denies the science most conspicuously that has the value, rather than defining every specific case that might support a similar statement.

Sen. O'Halloran thanked Prof. Gordon for his presentation.

Analysis of the results of the Faculty Quality-of-Life survey. Sen. O'Halloran resumed the presentation of the quality-of-life survey that she had begun at the plenary on April 1, focusing this time on the subgroup analysis that Sen. Ron Breslow (Ten., A&S/NS) had requested then.

As at the April 1 plenary, no documents showing survey findings had been distributed, but Sen. O'Halloran referred to numerical findings projected on a screen.

Summarizing the main points of her previous presentation, Sen. O'Halloran said that the survey engaged a representative sample of the faculty population, that the overall satisfaction rate was 75 percent, and that CUMC faculty are significantly less satisfied than Morningside faculty. Not surprisingly, tenure-track junior faculty are significantly less satisfied than their tenured colleagues; more surprisingly, they are also less satisfied than their non-tenure-track colleagues. Female faculty are less satisfied than male faculty. And minority faculty are significantly less satisfied than non-minority faculty.

Sen. O'Halloran repeated the finding she had announced on April 1 that one-third of the faculty are dissatisfied with their salaries. The rate of dissatisfaction is significantly higher at CUMC, and also among female faculty (about 39 percent on both campuses, compared with dissatisfaction rates of 25 percent for males on Morningside and 31 percent for males at CUMC).

Sen. O'Halloran said male faculty are more satisfied than female faculty about their ability to integrate their work life and personal life. On this measure, tenure-track junior faculty are the least satisfied. Sen. O'Halloran emphasized that informal mentoring is viewed as significantly more important for women than for men.

Sen. O'Halloran said dissatisfaction with salary is at about 44 percent for minority faculty at CUMC, compared to about 39 percent for minority faculty on Morningside (a rate close to the overall average). She said some of the numbers for minority faculty require further attention.

As for the representativeness of the sample, Sen. O'Halloran said women responded at a rate slightly higher than their proportion of the overall faculty population. But she noted that minority faculty responses were about on par, and the sample overall was fairly robust.

Sen. O'Halloran said she wanted to make sure senators saw the actual numbers and percentages for the satisfaction rates, which show a series of subgroup differences. She said the causes of those differences in satisfaction are unclear, but will be investigated further.

On issues of work climate and opportunity, CUMC faculty consider the climate for females less accepting than do Morningside faculty. Male faculty think the climate for females is more accepting than female faculty do. Sen. O'Halloran said these perceptions are important, whether they're accurate or not. But the challenge of changing conditions that are only acknowledged by one part of the population will be greater. She again stressed the importance of seeing the data.

Perceptions of the work climate are similar for minorities, Sen. O'Halloran said. Again, male faculty are significantly more likely than female faculty to feel that opportunities for minorities are as good as for non-minorities. And non-minorities believe this more than minorities.

As for perceptions of work-life balance by gender, Sen. O'Halloran said that again male faculty are more satisfied than female faculty on this score. There may be differences in responsibilities at home that figure importantly in these perceptions. And again, tenure status is an important factor in perceptions of work-life balance, tenure-track junior faculty having the most difficulty. Policy makers have to think hard about ways to alleviate some of these pressures, Sen. O'Halloran said.

Sen. O'Halloran said questions about mentoring have stimulated extensive discussion. She said a majority of faculty value both formal and informal mentoring, but informal mentoring is considered significantly more helpful. Another result, which Sen. O'Halloran had not presented previously, was that female faculty tend to have informal mentors from outside of the University. She asked how the culture could be changed so that mentoring female junior faculty could become a priority for everyone, not just females. She said female faculty now have disproportionate responsibility for mentoring students.

Sen. O'Halloran said she had concluded her previous presentation with the finding that one-third of the faculty say they are considering leaving Columbia. Why do they stay? She showed a tally of words used most frequently in the survey responses. They might be naturally combined into the following two sentences: "Colleagues at Columbia create an environment where faculty can be great, and faculty love the opportunities to conduct quality research, teach stimulating students, and work in New York."

Discussion. Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento said Sen. O'Halloran had presented the satisfaction data, but not the data to determine why some people are dissatisfied, which Sen. D'Armiento considered more important.

Sen. O'Halloran said explaining the data at the sublevels gets more and more difficult because the questions have so many parts to them. But that information will be coming out in a report. But for this plenary she thought it made sense to give people a feel for the numbers. But all of the data from these sublevels will be summarized and made available in the final report.

Sen. Silverstein said the Harvard Assessment Project directed by Richard Light and Harvard president Derek Bok had findings for students very much like the ones Sen. O'Halloran had described for faculty. Male students mainly want to hear a candid assessment of their prospects in a field, while female students want a broader kind of mentoring, incorporating their personal lives. He stressed the importance of this finding, saying it had had a powerful effect in his mentoring of his own graduate students.

Sen. Silverstein added that the organization for scientists that has done the most in mentoring female students is the American Society for Cell Biology's initiative on women in cell biology. He recommended the work of this group for any Columbia initiative in mentoring.

Sen. D'Armiento said the significance of informal mentoring for women is not that it addresses their personal lives; it's that women have to go outside of the institution to get mentoring. Women need and seek mentoring on their careers; many do not need mentoring on their personal lives. That's a separate issue.

Sen. O'Halloran said she had presented the findings on mentoring to show the similarity in this pattern of responses to those on salary.

In response to questions from Sen. Anne Taylor, Senior Vice Dean for Academic Affairs at P&S, Sen. O'Halloran said she had been speaking of *statistically* significant differences among subgroups. She said she did not supply p values for those findings, but did provide confidence intervals of 95 percent for them.

Sen. Taylor said she would be very careful in presenting those findings, and was interested to see the final report. She said a careful qualitative analysis comparing mentoring for men and for women in business shows not just that women tend to need more networking and informal mentoring, but that the opportunity context for women and minorities—what they have an opportunity to gain through mentoring—is very different. Before there can be assumptions and conclusions about what women and men need and want, there should be careful attention to the questions being asked.

Sen. O'Halloran agreed. She said Senate staff director Geraldine Mc Allister had compiled a report on mentoring, which reviewed and analyzed all of the questions. Sen. O'Halloran offered to provide this report.

Sen. O'Halloran said she had tried at the present meeting, under pressure of time, to highlight only one aspect of this important discussion.

There being no further questions, Sen. O'Halloran said the final report would include all the questions and response rates. The report will also use a similar American Association of Universities survey to provide benchmarking across peer institutions.

Adjournment. At about 2:35 pm committee chairs were prepared to present reports for Education and External Relations that were on the agenda, but Sen. O'Halloran adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff