

MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 15, 2017

In the absence of President Lee Bollinger, Executive Committee chair Sharyn O'Halloran (Ten., SIPA) called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm in the Lantern, in Lenfest Hall on the Manhattanville campus.

Minutes and agenda. The minutes of April 28 and the agenda were adopted as proposed.

Executive Committee chair's remarks.

--*Summer powers.* Sen. O'Halloran reported that the Executive Committee had no occasion to use its summer powers over the summer.

--*Nominations to committees.* Sen. O'Halloran presented the list of nominations to committees for the coming year.

Sen. Greg Freyer (NT, Public Health) asked if this presentation to the Senate accounted for the election of the Executive Committee chair. Sen. O'Halloran said it did.

Sen. Freyer asked for a clarification of the procedure on this action. Sen. O'Halloran said it is usually presented under the Executive Committee chair's remarks. Hearing no objection, Sen. O'Halloran declared the nominations approved.

Welcome to new senators. Elections Commission chair Anu Akinbamadele (Stu., Law, Nonsen.) then introduced [25 new senators](#), who raised their hands as their names were called. There was applause.

Resolution in Memory of Professor of Wm. Theodore de Bary. Sen. Robert Pollack (Ten., A&S, Natural Sciences) spoke to the resolution. He noted that Prof. de Bary, from his arrival as a freshman at Columbia in 1937 to his death last July, was involved with Columbia for 80 years, including two years as the first chair of the University Senate Executive Committee (1969-71). Sen. Pollack said that accomplishment helped to reestablish normative social structures in the university amid the confusions, police invasions, and student riots at the end of the 1960s. The Senate is here because Prof. de Bary was, Sen. Pollack said.

Sen. Pollack said Prof. de Bary, along with classmates Thomas Merton, Herman Wouk and many others, was in the war months after his graduation from the College in 1941, and became perhaps the first representative of the idea of a global Columbia. He joined the Navy, studied Japanese, went into Naval Intelligence, served through the occupation of Japan, and returned committed to the notion that Columbia must understand the intellectual life and the canonical texts that have emerged from Asian religions and cultures. He created a program in Asian Humanities, as well as a complement to the College's core Contemporary Civilization course called Asian

Civilizations. He published books through Columbia University Press, and gave the proceeds to Columbia to establish a Center for East Asian Studies. Some 50 years before Columbia launched the Global Centers, Prof. de Bary established a feedback loop of learning at Columbia how to think, applying that training to places that Columbia had never thought or cared much about, and bringing Columbia to the rest of the globe.

Resolution to Establish the Master of Professional Studies in the School of Professional Studies (Education Committee). Sen. O'Halloran said there were still not enough senators present to form the super-majority needed to vote on the M.P.S. proposal, which would entail the addition of a new type of degree to the University Statutes. But she asked Education Committee co-chair Letty Moss-Salentijn (Ten., CDM) to begin the presentation on the program anyway, with the hope that more senators would arrive in time for a possible vote.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said that when the School of Professional Studies was established (under its first name—School of Continuing Education), the intent was to award the Master of Science for all of its programs. But as the school evolved, it became apparent that a number of its programs were in fact overlapping with programs in other schools. These situations became issues of serious contention. In order to resolve these conflicts, SPS had now developed a new degree, the Master of Professional Studies (M.P.S.), which its recipients as well as the outside world will be able to distinguish from the M.S. degrees offered by other schools.

Sen. O'Halloran announced that a super-majority—three-fifths of all incumbent senators—was now present, so the Senate could vote.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the Senate should discuss the resolution first before voting.

Sen. Victor de la Pena (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences), from the Dept. of Statistics, said he was the founder of the M.S. in Actuarial Science, which is now in SPS. He asked whether the current proposal was simply to change the name of a degree, or to make more substantive changes.

SPS Dean Jason Wingard responded that SPS was seeking approval to establish the M.P.S. in addition to the its M.S. Moving forward, SPS will look for potential overlaps between its programs and those of other schools, and in those cases replace the M.S. with the M.P.S. The school will first pilot an SPS degree program to see if that works; that initial initiative will not have an impact on current M.S. programs.

Sen. de la Pena expressed concern that the new degree might have an impact on current MS programs. He said there would be difficulties in recruiting students for the M.S. in Actuarial Science, if it wasn't a Master of *Science* program, because Actuarial Science is known as a science, usually with mathematics or by itself.

Sen. O'Halloran, who is also the senior vice dean and chief academic officer of SPS, explained that existing M.S. programs will stay for the time being, but there may be opportunities in the future to change their status. Dean Wingard agreed with Sen. O'Halloran's characterization.

Sen. Freyer noted that all the current programs were listed in the resolution's appendix as M.S. programs. Will they remain M.S programs or will they become M.P.S. programs?

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said they will remain M.S. programs for the time being. She noted that two of the programs listed in the appendix, the M.S. in Communications Practice (#4) and the M.S. in Landscape Design (#10), are not being offered anymore.

Sen. Freyer asked whether those programs will remain but be changed. Sen. Moss-Salentijn said they will remain until there is a need to change them. But she doubted there would be such a need.

Sen. Raimondo Betti (Ten., SEAS) understood that the new M.P.S. would be established *in addition* to the existing M.S. programs. Did that mean that the M.S. in Wealth Management that the Senate approved on April 28, which had caused some controversy over the summer, would remain?

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the wealth management program would be the pilot program for the new M.P.S. degree.

Sen. Betti asked if the listing of a program in the appendix as M.S. in Wealth Management (#19) was a mistake.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the wealth management was approved by the Senate as an M.S. program last spring, but she understood that it would now be used as the pilot for the M.P.S.

Sen. Betti asked if that meant the listing of the wealth management M.S. would be changed. Sen. Moss-Salentijn said it would.

Sen. O'Halloran said the idea was to determine which M.S. programs should be changed into M.P.S. programs, and which should not. She said actuarial science may not be one of the programs that should be changed. A pilot M.P.S. program in wealth management would help determine whether there is a market for the M.P.S. degree.

Sen. Betti asked who would decide which programs would be reclassified.

Sen. O'Halloran asked Dean Wingard to address that question. He said SPS would present its proposals on which programs should have the M.P.S. degree to its governing body, its deans' council, which consists of senior faculty from Arts and Sciences. In these proposals, the school will exercise proper due diligence, and do the analysis to determine which degree programs may overlap with those of other schools across campus. SPS will market those as M.P.S. programs. Sen. Betti asked in particular about the concerns of the Engineering and Business schools.

Dean Wingard said SPS will keep in mind any school for which issues of differentiation from SPS programs may arise. Responding to Sen. Moss-Salentijn's opening remarks, Dean Wingard said part of the purpose of the new M.P.S. program is to alleviate some of the differentiation concerns that have arisen on campus, including in the Business and Engineering schools.

Sen. Betti said Dean Wingard knew that there are such concerns.

Sen. Wingard said he hoped that presenting wealth management as an M.P.S., instead of an M.S., would help.

Sen. Pollack asked about the schedule and procedures for Education Committee reviews of recently approved degree programs. Sen. Moss-Salentijn said these programs are reviewed five years after they have held their first class.

Sen. Soulaymane Kachani (NT, SEAS) said the proposal for the M.P.S. was discussed with the deans of both Engineering and Business and there were several conversations with senior faculty from both schools. He said the Engineering and Business faculties had both strongly endorsed the M.P.S. proposal. In the case of Engineering, he said, the chairs of all the departments had provided a strong endorsement.

Sen. de la Pena said he was not aware of a Senate review of the M.S. program in actuarial science, which began in 2006. Had there been one? Was it due for a second review?

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said that program had been reviewed and approved. But there was some uncertainty between her and Vice Provost Melissa Begg, an Education Committee member, about the date of the review.

Sen. O'Halloran said there was a motion to call the question. The Senate then voted by show of hands.

Sen. O'Halloran said she tends not to vote unless it's necessary, because she needs to be chairing. But if the vote was close she was prepared to vote in favor. Her vote in favor was counted.

The Senate voted 55-1 in favor of the resolution, with 5 abstentions —4 short of a super-majority of 59. The resolution was defeated.

Sen. O'Halloran said the Senate would vote one more time, after some further discussion.

Sen. Betti said he remained concerned about who would decide which degree programs would be changed. He proposed that all the M.S. programs should be revised, subject to provostial and any necessary governmental approval, with consideration of the possibility of changing them to M.P.S. programs without separate consideration of individual cases.

Sen. O'Halloran understood Sen. Betti to be saying that all current M.S. programs in SPS should be turned into M.P.S. programs.

Sen. Betti said an alternative would be to know who will decide whether, for example, the SPS M.S. in Construction Administration should be changed to an M.P.S. program. He said this is the content of an M.S. program in the Engineering School.

Sen. O'Halloran asked Provost John Coatsworth to address this issue.

Sen. Coatsworth said the purpose of this new M.P.S. degree is to make sure that in the course of time those degree programs in the School of Professional Studies that are appropriate for that degree will receive it, and those that are not will stay as they are. At the moment SPS wants to experiment with an M.P.S. in Wealth Management in order to see what kinds of difficulties it may face, what kinds of new marketing tools are required, whether or not the new degree is going to discourage people from applying. A longer-term hope is that a degree peculiar to SPS will end turf wars between schools and allow a degree of collaboration that has not occurred in the past. The provost concluded that no decisions will be made about SPS degrees without the Provost's approval. He urged senators who had abstained in the first vote to change their vote.

Sen. O'Halloran said any change of degree for an educational program must go through an elaborate procedure in the New York State Education Dept. Within the institution, the provost must give final approval after a process of consideration by deans. She hoped for a degree of collaboration that would address some of the concerns Sen. Betti had raised.

Sen. O'Halloran asked parliamentarian Howard Jacobson for guidance on procedure for a second vote. Mr. Jacobson said the Senate could hold another vote, but he asked whether other senators had walked in.

Sen. O'Halloran said she would need a motion to suspend the rules. Mr. Jacobson said there was no need to do that. He said there had been further discussion and a motion to have another vote would be appropriate.

Sen. O'Halloran said she would follow the parliamentarian's guidance, though she thought such a move might require the Senate to suspend Robert's Rules. She asked for a motion for another vote based on the clarification that the provost had provided.

The motion was made and seconded, and the Senate held a second vote. The resolution passed by a margin of 60-2, with no abstentions.

Resolution to Establish the Department of Medical Humanities and Ethics (P&S). Sen. Moss-Salentijn said this resolution would also require a super-majority, because a new department must also be added to the University Statutes. She said that starting in April and over the summer, a subcommittee of the Education Committee had conducted a thorough review. The proposed department combines three current themes: narrative medicine, medicine as a profession, and bioethics. The review found that no existing programs will suffer from the creation of the new department, and the budget planning has been sound. A location has been assigned; new faculty will be hired. A comparison with peer programs at Harvard and Penn shows that Columbia is a bit behind in bioethics, but way ahead in the other two areas. From the point of view of the other schools in the Medical Center, there was great satisfaction with the department chair-elect, Prof. Rita Charon, who has experience working with other CUMC programs. This will not be a stand-alone department, Sen. Moss-Salentijn said, but one that helps everyone. She said the Education Committee strongly supported the proposed department.

Sen. Pollack added his enthusiastic support for Prof. Sharon and the program.

Sen. Daniel McConnell (Stu., P&S) said the student body at CUMC strongly supported the creation of the new department. He said medical education is changing, and the new department will help educate future physicians and other leaders in medicine.

Sen. Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/Humanities) said he supported the program, which would clearly benefit the Medical Center. But he said the proposal speaks only in passing about its effect on the Morningside and Manhattanville campuses. There are programs in the Arts and Sciences in medical humanities, and the Institute for Comparative Literature in Society has the Medicine, Literature, and Society program. Sen. Slaughter expressed concern about possible duplication of resources.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn invited Prof. Charon to respond. Prof. Charon said there are growing efforts on all the campuses to address humanities and medicine, or the intersections between these disciplines and the practice of healthcare. Her goal was to make all of these efforts more integrated and collaborative. Prof. Rishi Goyal, director of the Medicine, Literature and Society program, was a student of Prof. Charon's when he was in medical school, and their programs have both grown in influence to the point that she foresaw innovative ways of knitting the approaches of the Morningside and medical campuses together. She said Columbia has a chance to do renowned work in this field.

Sen. Ian Bradley-Perrin (Stu., Public Health) asked how the program would relate to the Center for History and Ethics, and what types of students would be admitted. Will the students already have medical degrees, or will they be primarily new Ph.D. students?

Prof. Charon said the proposal was not for a new degree program, but in effect a new basic science department, which will be teaching in all schools. This will include two current divisions--David Rothman's Medicine as a Profession program and the Narrative Medicine program. The new curriculum has been taught in the Nursing School, the Medical School, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Nutrition, and the Chaplaincy, and will continue to be. But this is not a new school.

Hearing a motion to call the question, Sen. O'Halloran called for a vote. The Senate voted 62-0 with no abstentions (a three-fifths majority) to approve the creation of the new department.

Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee on Academic Freedom (with accompanying resolution, for discussion only). Sen. Pollack, speaking now as co-chair of Faculty Affairs, said the committee had talked about how, in this difficult time for our country, to preserve academic freedom, as something distinct from Constitutional rights, which interfere with academic freedom by allowing the crinkling up, the marginalization, the shouting down of rational discourse in a classroom setting. He said the accompanying resolution was therefore not about Columbia's policies governing marches or demonstrations or public events. Rather, it concerned what faculty and students might agree are boundaries that will allow academic freedom for the discussion of unpopular, novel, and—to the person saying them—dangerous ideas.

Sen. Pollack asked for Senate approval of the report, or else for reasons to change it, as a self-referential example of the kind of deliberation proposed. With Senate approval, he hoped to call upon all university constituencies to approve it as well. He said the core of the university lies in teaching and learning, and the purpose of the report is to protect that enterprise. He expressed satisfaction with the unanimous approval the report had won in the Faculty Affairs Committee, a place of vigorous debate.

Sen. Andrew Boyd (Stu., Arts) expressed appreciation for the report. He praised the following passage: “The simple proviso that the freedom to disagree must not be taken as a freedom to intimidate the person we are disagreeing with is an extension of the precept of a common humanity.” Sen. Boyd highlighted this distinction, noting that some people in this country have taken freedom of speech to mean precisely the freedom to intimidate people who are already the most marginalized.

Sen. Pollack said Sen. Boyd had hit upon the core of the argument. He said it was his honor as a professor of biology to note that saying that people are the same in these functional ways is simply restating the facts of nature. A person’s appearance at ten feet says nothing fundamental about him or her; what matters is what they say and how they behave to you. The Faculty Affairs Committee statement is meant to preserve that distinction.

Sen. Pollack asked if the Senate could vote on the resolution. Mr. Jacobson, the parliamentarian, said there could be no vote at the present meeting, since the agenda had already announced that the resolution was for discussion only.

Sen. Pollack asked if it would be possible to get a sense of the Senate in an informal vote. Mr. Jacobson said that would be possible.

Sen. James Rappaport (Stu., CC) asked whether it was correct to say that the present resolution covered discourse within the academic classroom, as opposed to the university at large.

Sen. Pollack put the distinction differently. He recalled President Bollinger’s invitation to Iranian prime minister Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to speak on the Columbia campus in 2007. Sen. Pollack said he was among the many people demonstrating against that invitation. He said this kind of discourse was not the kind of communication covered in the Faculty Affairs Committee report.

Sen. Rappaport asked if the FAC resolution was instead about discourse within the classroom. Sen. Pollack said that was correct.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn, co-chair of Faculty Affairs, repeated the earlier request for a straw vote to gauge sentiment on the resolution.

Sen. O’Halloran asked for a sense of the Senate, inviting senators to raise their hands. Mr. Jacobson said there was no need to count such a vote.

Sen. O’Halloran judged the sentiment to be positive to a lukewarm degree.

Sen. Pollack thanked the group for its patience with parliamentary procedure, and looked forward to an official vote at the next plenary.

2016-17 annual committee reports.

Research Officers Committee. Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) presented the report, referring to PowerPoint slides on the screen.

In response to a question from Sen. Pollack, Sen. Savin said Office of Institutional Research data show that professional research officers are more diverse by ethnicity and gender than the regular faculty. So these research officers are also a resource for promotion to faculty positions.

Libraries and Digital Resources Committee. Committee co-chair Arthur Langer (Nonsen., NT, SPS) and University Librarian Ann Thornton presented the [report](#), referring to PowerPoint slides.

Alumni Relations. Co-chair Kurt Roeloffs presented the [report](#), referring to PowerPoint slides on the screen, with help from committee member Joshua Schenk (Stu., CC). The report focused on CU there!, a new program that connects students to alumni

Sen. Izzet Kebudi (Stu., SEAS/Undergrad) said contacts with Columbia students from his native Turkey through the Columbia Global Center in Istanbul had expanded significantly, thanks to CU there! Whereas gatherings had formerly been mainly for Columbia College and SEAS students, they now welcomed students from the graduate and professional students schools as well.

Sen. Schenk offered a special thanks to Donna MacPhee for her extra efforts to bring the CU There! initiative together.

Sen. O'Halloran adjourned the meeting at around 2:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff