MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2017

In the absence of President Lee Bollinger, Executive Committee chair Sharyn O’Halloran called the meeting to order shortly after 1:15 pm in 104 Jerome Greene. Fifty-nine of 98 senators were present during the meeting.

Minutes and agenda. The minutes of March 31 and the agenda were adopted as distributed.

Executive Committee chair’s remarks. Sen. O’Halloran said Provost John Coatsworth was prepared to answer questions in the president’s absence.

Sen. O’Halloran touched on the following subjects:

-- She congratulated the Alumni Relations and Student Affairs committees on the early success of their joint CU There! initiative, a program to bring students and alumni together during the summer. Sen. Sharon Liebowitz (Alumni) said that since the launch of the program at the previous plenary, some 2,400 students had signed up.

-- Sen. O’Halloran announced the release of the 2016-17 annual report of the President’s Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault (PACSA). Sen. Suzanne Goldberg, EVP for University Life and PACSA chair, will present the report to the Senate in September. Sen. O’Halloran read from the executive summary: “The Committee recommends that partners across the University continue to connect prevention work with community engagement and continue to consider how to engage more students in prevention efforts.” Sen. O’Halloran said prevention is really a community activity, and must be everyone’s responsibility. Pooling efforts and resources is the only way to be effective in the long run.

Sen. Goldberg said she would welcome senators’ ideas before giving her September report about prevention and engagement efforts.

New business

Resolution Concerning Summer Powers (Executive Committee). Sen. O’Halloran said the resolution empowers the Executive Committee to address urgent business on behalf of the Senate during the summer, and then report on any such actions to the Senate in the fall.

In response to questions from Sen. Andrew Boyd (Stu., Arts), Sen. O’Halloran explained that the Executive Committee has always had these powers, but has used them rarely. She said student members of the Executive Committee take part in such summer deliberations.

Sen. Ronald Breslow (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) said that as the world has progressed, communication has become easier. Couldn’t the Executive Committee communicate to senators about its deliberations over the summer, instead of simply acting on its own?
Sen. O’Halloran said the committee could notify the Senate, but the Senate does not vote by email, so the Executive Committee would have to act when the Senate is not in session.

Sen. Breslow said senators could easily provide feedback.

The Senate then voted in favor of the resolution, with one opposed.

Resolution to Establish a Program Leading to an M.S. in Wealth Management (Education Committee, from the School of Professional Studies). Education Committee co-chair James Applegate (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) said the student in this program wants to enter a moderately specialized field. Wealth managers are essentially money managers. Sen. Applegate said many people at the present meeting, particularly those with graying hair, have talked with people like this as they plan for retirement. This field is expected to grow for straightforward reasons, mainly that the baby boom generation is retiring, or will soon. With lengthening life spans, and with traditional retirement vehicles such as corporate pensions now being phased out, people have to worry about these issues themselves.

Sen. Applegate said the program now before the Senate was designed to train a class of professionals to serve as financial advisors in wealth management. He said the curriculum was straightforward in this 36-point master’s program, with such courses as Introduction to Accounting and Finance, and Introductions to Financial Markets, Estate Planning, Retirement, Insurance, and so on. A student could pursue the program full time (in three semesters) or part time over a longer period.

Sen. Applegate said the Education Committee had prompted significant revisions in the proposal, and had unanimously approved the last version at its last meeting.

SPS Dean Jason Wingard thanked the Senate Education Committee for its review of the proposal, which had helped to assure that it had all the elements that everyone intended.

He offered some context: the program had been through a rigorous review process, starting in the School with the Committee on Instruction, which is composed of SPS faculty and senior administrators. SPS also has a Standing Committee on Appointments and Promotions, which selects for the program, and a new Dean’s Council, which consists of five senior faculty members from Arts and Sciences who give the final approval within the School for faculty and for programs. Program proposals then go to the A&S Executive Vice President David Madigan, and then to the Provost, who puts the program before his Council of Deans, a valuable process that the present proposal had just completed.

Dean Wingard said SPS is the newest school at Columbia, a professional graduate school with 14 master’s degrees. What was unusual among the school’s peers was that SPS had only had 12 programs for the previous six years. This year the school had introduced two new programs, in Applied Analytics and Enterprise Risk Management, and was now introducing one more.

Dean Wingard cited two successful programs: Actuarial Science, which he said was number one in North America and number two in the world, and Sports Management, number two in the
world. Dean Wingard said most SPS master’s programs are small: seven have fewer than 100 students, and three have fewer than 50.

Dean Wingard introduced Charles Chaffin, from the Center for Financial Planning Board, which sets standards for the financial planning industry. He helped to design the program now before the Senate. He asked Dr. Chaffin to talk about how SPS made this program market- and employee-driven.

Dr. Chaffin said his role on the CFP board is to evaluate close to 400 college and university programs nationally in what he characterized as a lighter form of accreditation. He had been involved in the development of the wealth management program with SPS for the past two years. He commended SPS for conducting very thorough market research and an analysis of peer institutions offering this program. He added that this was not a case of keeping up with the Joneses; the SPS program would be by far the most innovative in the nation because it incorporated not only the traditional elements of wealth management but also many of the interpersonal elements that practice demands. He said the placement opportunities are immense: there are now more professionals in this field who are older than 70 than the number who are younger than 30, so there is great potential for growth.

Sen. O’Halloran invited questions.

Sen. Donald Mustard (Stu., SPS) asked Dr. Chaffin to say more about the target audience for the SPS program, as well as the likely career path for its graduates.

On the subject of career tracks, Dr. Chaffin anticipated that a majority of students would be hired into boutique, comprehensive planning firms requiring Registered Investment Advisors (RIAs). The Columbia program would be innovative. A large majority of graduates are going to be in demand. Given the average age of the planners, a lot of RIA firms will be looking for succession plans. And students graduating from a program like this one are going to have the skills to be part of those succession plans.

Sen. Mustard asked about the skills to be expected of students entering the program.

Dr. Chaffin envisioned a diverse group of students from diverse educational backgrounds. He said students with undergraduate degrees in subjects ranging from the arts to education will do well. Many of the interpersonal elements involved in these fields are quite critical.

Sen. John Donaldson (Ten., Bus.) noted that the final page of the report from the External Relations Committee that was in the packet for the present meeting expressed concern about SPS programs. He suggested that this section of the External Relations report should be heard before any Senate vote on the wealth management program.

Sen. O’Halloran said the Senate was now considering the content of the proposed SPS program and whether it meets the standards of the Education Committee. She said the issues raised by External Relations were completely appropriate for Senate consideration, but were separate from the question of the quality of the this particular program.
Sen. Breslow said a wealth management program at Columbia would have great appeal quite apart from its actual academic content. He wondered how many people would be tempted to say they were “participating in” or “working toward” a three-semester master’s degree. He said the program must have real academic content, and not just be a way for people to seem to know more than they do.

Sen. Applegate said that if the Education Committee had thought the program was a diploma mill, it wouldn’t have approved it.

Sen. Andreas Hielscher (Ten., SEAS) said he had been approached by faculty members from the Business and Engineering schools who want to know why this program is not in the Business School or in the Industrial Engineering and Operations Research Department of SEAS. Had there been coordination with these schools? Wasn’t there an executive program in wealth management in the Business School?

Sen. Applegate said he would run the risk of answering these questions with faculty members present from both SEAS and Business. His take on the master’s programs in those schools (as well as a new one from IEOR in Business Analytics that senators would hear about shortly) was that SEAS had carved out a niche for itself in high-end technical work. This is serious data science done by serious data scientists, without the attention in the SPS Data Analytics program to the development of interpersonal skills. Sen. Applegate saw relatively little overlap between these two types of offerings.

Sen. Applegate saw more overlap between the proposed SPS program and the Business School’s MBA program. He thought a graduate of the MBA program would be qualified to compete for the same entry-level jobs as somebody in the proposed SPS wealth management program. But he said the MBA is a much broader degree, requiring 60 points of academic credit, and covering many subjects that the SPS degree does not. The SPS degree is more of a niche program.

Sen. Donaldson repeated his earlier request to hear the broader concerns about SPS expressed in the External Relations report before any Senate vote on the wealth management program.

Sen. O’Halloran asked Sen. Donaldson if he was asking to make a motion to that effect. He said he was.

Howard Jacobson, the parliamentarian, said he didn’t see the need for formal parliamentary action on a request to discuss the External Relations report in conjunction with the wealth management resolution.

Sen. Donaldson said that was all he was requesting. He said he was not a member of External Relations. He had simply noticed that the last page of the External Relations report seemed to be pertinent to the present discussion.

Sen. Applegate said his own answer to Sen. Donaldson’s request would be no. The Senate was being asked to vote on a specific program. He said the External Relations Committee report sort of called into question the School of Professional Studies in general—a rather different
conversation. So his preference, given his strong feelings about this issue, would be to clear all three master’s degree programs on the agenda for the present meeting, and then discuss the External Relations report. He said he would not tie the two discussions together.

Mr. Jacobson next asked if someone from External Relations was prepared to present its report. Sen. Howard Worman (Ten., P&S), chair of External Relations, said he was ready.

Mr. Jacobson asked Sen. Worman if he would prefer to give the report toward the end of the meeting, when the agenda called for committee reports.

Sen. Worman said he would present the report whenever the Senate wanted it.

Mr. Jacobson considered it odd that someone not from External Relations was making a motion in support of an action by External Relations that External Relations did not seem to be committed to taking.

Sen. Worman said he was present to give the report. He offered to second Sen. Donaldson’s motion if that would help.

Mr. Jacobson then declared Sen. Donaldson’s request—to have the External Relations statement heard in conjunction with the Education Committee resolution—a motion on the table. He said the motion had been seconded. He called for a vote by show of hands.

Sen. O’Halloran reminded those present that only senators were allowed to vote. The motion passed by a vote of 24-20, with 6 abstentions.

Sen. O’Halloran asked Sen. Worman to read the report.

It was agreed that Sen. Worman would read only the Statement from the External Relations Committee Concerning the School of Professional Studies, which was page 3 of the committee’s annual report.

Sen. Worman began by giving some background. He said the committee had met with Executive Vice President for Arts and Sciences David Madigan, and with SPS Dean Jason Wingard, as well as some SPS students. He said the committee was concerned that some degree programs in SPS lack adequate academic oversight, and that this situation could threaten the Columbia brand and its external reputation. That concern had prompted the committee’s decision to speak out. Sen. Worman said the committee was not focused on specific programs. He referred to a slide in the External Relations annual report that reported rough translations of comments on a Chinese social media site about SPS programs. Sen. Worman said his committee was concerned that what’s on Chinese social media today might end up in *The New York Times* or on CNN tomorrow. He then read aloud the Statement Concerning the School of Professional Studies (see page 3) which his committee had unanimously endorsed. After reading the statement, Sen. Worman said he was the messenger, and that was the message.
Sen. O’Halloran said the Senate has jurisdiction over issues concerning the entire university or more than a single school, but never just one school. The jurisdiction of the External Relations Committee is confined to the external relations of the University. She added that the Education Committee could look at SPS in its regular reviews of different programs five years after their inception. So it’s within these limits that the Senate can act, but it does not review a particular school or any one particular program outside of that authority.

Sen. Worman said his committee’s concern was about the possible impact of SPS programs on the University’s external reputation.

Sen. O’Halloran said External Relations had now expressed its concerns, and it was time to open up the discussion.

Sen. Ron Prywes (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) asked who the faculty are for SPS programs, because they do not seem to be based in academic departments or under departmental review, or on tenure track, or full time. He thought that was the heart of the issue of the quality of the school and its programs.

Erik Nelson, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at SPS, said the school’s faculty is made up senior lecturers, lecturers, and practitioners. He said SPS uses a scholar-practitioner model that he said is very appropriate for the school. Half of the faculty are full time, with terminal degrees, and the other half are high-level people in industry, who bring their real-world experience to the classroom. He said SPS feels very strongly about its scholar-practitioner model.

Sen. Sonah Lee (Stu., Journalism) asked whether a master’s degree is a requirement for working in the field of wealth management.

Sen. Applegate said he thought the answer was no. He said a company like Merrill Lynch can and does hire people with bachelor’s degrees.

Dr. Chaffin said there’s a broad array of positions in wealth management. Some firms hire folks with a baccalaureate degree who may be working in a commission-only model, which would be very different from the goals of the proposed curriculum. So a boutique firm will not hire somebody with a baccalaureate degree or even an MBA unless it’s focused on wealth management.

Sen. Mustard then read the following statement:

My name is Don Mustard and I’m speaking to you today as the elected representative of students in the Master of Science in Applied Analytics Ad Hoc Committee, as a student senator representing School of Professional Studies, and as a 2017 candidate for the Master of Science in Applied Analytics program. As currently delivered the Master of Science in Applied Analytics program may be placing the stellar academic standards of Columbia University at risk. That is the conclusion of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee is a group of experienced, predominantly mid-career professionals who were recruited to the MSAA program and who have experienced the first year of the program’s delivery. The Committee is composed of a diverse cross-section of students--
international and domestic, native English speaking and non-native speakers, students with years of experience and recent graduates. The Ad Hoc Committee was formed when, following the announcement of the Trump University lawsuit settlement, word circulated that some Applied Analytics students were considering launching their own lawsuit. The Ad Hoc Committee believed the first course of action should always be to pursue concerns through proper channels and to do everything possible to uphold the stellar academic reputation of the University.

In light of the developments within the last 48 hours, including a telephone conversation that I had last evening with one of the original program designers, I have concluded it would not be prudent or in the best interests of Columbia University for me to further discuss our findings. Our primary concern is the academic integrity of the reputation of Columbia. We are gravely concerned that it is at risk. The Ad Hoc Committee has pursued a due diligence process working bottom-up to ensure that those who should be addressing our concerns are provided the necessary context to know the severity of the situation. We are asking that SPS deliver to the 2016-2017 MSAA class the education they were promised, commensurate with the program design and University standards. We share this information with the University leadership because we believe it is important that all are made aware of the challenges, the urgent need to address those proactively, and to seek out the advice and assistance of University leadership to ensure all Columbia University degrees are delivered in a manner consistent with Columbia’s stellar academic reputation. Thank you.

Sen. Eli Noam (Ten., Bus.) said the stellar reputation of the University that had just been mentioned was based on a centuries-long tradition of faculty governance in academic standards, hiring, promotion, course content and course selection. In SPS that tradition structurally does not quite exist. Instead, there is a largely administrative model. An advisory committee of faculty from around the University meets once a year; it was described to the External Relations Committee as something of a joke. Since the school has no full-time faculty of the kind that other departments and schools have, the right approach, without judging a particular program, may be to establish some form of regular faculty supervision. Sen. Noam said the Senate should encourage the creation of such a model. This could go through the schools in the Arts and Sciences and their Executive Vice President, or perhaps through other channels, but it should be established, and it should be a governing kind of supervision, not an advisory kind.

Sen. Sonya Nanda (Stu., Bus.) said that broad academic issues involving SPS should be kept separate from evaluations of its individual programs. She said she herself was in wealth management before she came to the Business School. She saw that school’s focus as very broad, and thought there would be a purpose in having a focused wealth management program in SPS. She thought that particular master’s programs could be reviewed separately, asking whether each one was good for Columbia as a whole, whether there was a need of it, and whether it will be useful to students in the future. And separately, there could be consideration of providing a better overall academic structure for SPS.

Sen. Applegate said he had been in the middle of the present dispute for some years, since the SPS programs all come through the Education Committee. Earlier in the semester, he had asked to be invited as an observer to the meeting some members of External Relations were having with A&S EVP David Madigan and SPS Dean Jason Wingard. Sen. Applegate was sufficiently
upset by what he heard at the meeting that he apologized afterwards to EVP Madigan on behalf of the Senate. He said he had been a senator for 20 years, and in any discussion of the quality of a program everybody has to hold up their end of the conversation.

Sen. O’Halloran said the question before the Senate was whether the proposed program satisfies the criteria set forth by the Education Committee: Does it meet academic standards? Is the course content appropriate? Does it clearly state its curriculum requirements? Sen. O’Halloran said other legitimate concerns were being raised, and they deserved attention, perhaps in other venues. But the business before the Senate right now was the wealth management program. At her invitation, there was a motion to adopt the resolution establishing the wealth management program, and a second.

The Senate then voted to approve the program by a margin of 32-12, with 10 abstentions.

Resolution to Establish a Program Leading to an Executive LLM in Global Business Law (Education, from the Law School). Education Committee co-chair Letty Moss-Salentijn thanked her co-chair for managing the difficult previous discussion. She hoped things would go more smoothly with the next degree program. She said the executive LLM is a 10-month, 24-point program, like the traditional LLM. The main differences are that the new degree focuses on global business law, and that the admission requirements are different. While the traditional LLM requires one year out in practice, the executive version requires five. The residency requirements for the executive program are considerably shorter—only twelve weeks on site, with the other courses done online. The new degree will not satisfy educational requirements for the New York bar exam. The students attracted to the program will likely be returning to their homelands to practice this particular kind of law. The courses in the two programs are identical, except for one additional four-credit colloquium in the executive program.

Sen. Logan Wright (Stu., Law) asked if this was mainly a summer program. Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the twelve weeks on site are during the summer, with online courses before and after.

Sen. Breslow said he thought the key factor in setting Columbia’s reputation is not fundamentally the quality of the ideas in a program but the quality of the faculty teaching them. How do they present the material in such a way that people say, “That must be a great course. Look who’s teaching it”? He said he hadn’t heard enough of that at the present meeting.

Sen. O’Halloran asked Sen. Breslow what program he was discussing. He said he was not mainly concerned about the program now before the Senate, but about the previous one. The concern about faculty quality was the reason why he had voted against the previous proposal, and the reason why he would abstain on the present one, though he thought the LLM proposal was fine as long it was taught by the regular faculty, which he said makes all the difference in the world.

Sen. O’Halloran called on Prof. Edward Morrison, co-director with Assistant Dean Julia Miller of the Law School’s executive education program. Prof. Morrison said regular faculty would staff all the courses except the colloquium, which would be overseen by a professor. He explained that the point of the colloquium was to show students an intersection between what
they’re learning in the classroom and what’s happening on the street, so that one class will have a large number of visitors and adjunct professors who’ve been approved by the Law School.

Sen. Wright said he thought this program was a pretty good idea, with a number of benefits. He noted that the Law School hasn’t made a lot of use of its space over the summer. He thought the summer program would enhance the use of the facilities and bring in revenue. He said it’s also an honest program, in the sense that it’s geared toward students expecting to return to their country of origin, and the program is more straightforward about its goals. It makes no promises of an immediate job in New York City.

Sen. O’Halloran asked for and received a motion for a vote. Without dissent but with one abstention, the Senate approved the executive LLM program specializing in global business law.

Resolution to Establish the Master of Science in Business Analytics (Education, from SEAS). Sen. Applegate said the proposed program was a collaboration between the Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research in SEAS and the Business School. He said it is an outgrowth of a very successful piece of an already existing master’s program. Sen. Applegate said business analytics is a rapidly growing discipline in the field of big data. The proposed program would require 36 credits over three semesters. Most of the curriculum is existing courses in SEAS, with a few from the Business School. These are graduate-level courses taught by the Engineering School, and intended for people preparing to crunch numbers on big data. He said the Education Committee had endorsed the program.

Prof. Garud Iyengar of IEOR was present to answer questions about the proposal, but did not make any remarks.

The Senate then approved the program unanimously.

Committee reports.

Update from the Faculty Affairs Committee on its statement on grievance procedures. Sen. Moss-Salentijn, speaking now as FAC co-chair, reminded senators that she had presented an FAC statement on faculty grievances at the February 24 plenary. It turned out that the version presented then was not the final one, because some more issues had to be discussed with the Provost’s Office. Those were now straightened out, and Sen. Moss-Salentijn thanked Vice Provost Chris Brown and Heather Parlier, Associate Provost for Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, for their help in the late stages. Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the statement would be posted on the Senate website.

Education Committee annual report. Reverting to her role as Education Committee co-chair, Sen. Moss-Salentijn then presented that committee’s 2016-17 annual report. She highlighted two points.

The first was the difficulty of addressing proposals that reach the committee near the end of the academic year, as two of the proposals just approved by the Senate did this year. She announced that future proposals that reach the committee after January cannot be guaranteed Senate action by the end of the academic year if they are at all controversial.
The second point was a change in the way the committee schedules its “five-year” reviews of programs. At one point the committee conducted reviews of programs after three years, but that interval was changed to five years from the registration of the programs with New York State. That starting point has also been moved, to the start of the implementation of the programs, which can come some time after the registration.

Finally, Sen. Moss-Salentijn called attention to the last page of the report, which was the agenda of the annual joint meeting of the Education, IT, and Libraries committees on April 21, which she thought demonstrated the vitality of this collaborative tradition.

*External Relations annual report.* Sen. Worman, the chair, who had presented a portion of the committee’s annual report during the previous discussion of the proposed M.S. in Wealth Management from the School of Professional Studies, now presented the rest of the [2016-17 External Relations Committee annual report](#).

In related discussion Sen. Worman reported that the committee had been told that the Faculty Handbook would affirm the requirement that departments must henceforth fund the effort that researchers put into writing their grant applications—a part of their work for which grant funds may not be used. In a meeting with senior administrators, the committee had been told that language to this effect would be in the Faculty Handbook by December 2016. He asked the provost about progress toward this end.

Provost John Coatsworth replied that the new provision had not yet found its way into the Faculty Handbook, but his office was working on it, and the language would appear there soon.

*Student Affairs annual report.* SAC Co-chairs Grace Kelley (Nursing) and Sean Ryan (Columbia College) and Vice-chair Daniella Urbina (SIPA) presented SAC’s 2016-17 annual report.

Sen. O’Halloran thanked the students for their report. She also thanked all senators for a highly productive year and wished them a relaxing summer.

She adjourned the meeting shortly after 2:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff