

MEETING OF OCTOBER 20, 2017

In the absence of President Lee Bollinger, Executive Committee chair Sharyn O'Halloran (Ten., SIPA) called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15pm in 104 Jerome Greene Hall. Sixty-five of 101 senators were present during the meeting.

Minutes and agenda. The Senate adopted the minutes of September 15 and the agenda as proposed.

Executive Committee chair's remarks.

Appointments to the University Judicial Board. Sen. O'Halloran reminded senators that the Executive Committee appoints the UJB, the five-member hearing panel that judges charges of violations of the Rules of University Conduct governing demonstrations. The committee recently filled three student alternate seats.

Student Affairs Committee co-chair Josh Schenk (CC) said students conducted a university-wide solicitation process for UJB candidates, and got a large response, which the SAC chief of staff winnowed down to about 20 finalists. SAC deliberated at length, and finally agreed on three nominees to present to the Executive Committee.

Sen. O'Halloran announced the new UJB alternates: Erica Diaz (SEAS), Austin Kaidi (P&S), and Alexis Marin (CC). The last two were present, and waved.

Sen. Eli Noam (Ten., Bus.) expressed the hope that more law faculty would serve on the UJB. He said that the country—not Columbia, but other places—is suffering from something of a due-process deficit at times. Would it be possible to encourage a law professor to join the board?

Sen. O'Halloran said Law School faculty had participated in the development of the revised Rules that were promulgated two years earlier. Other law faculty have served as advisors to students facing charges under the Rules. But she agreed that it would be a good idea to have law professors on the UJB itself.

Sanctions against students who participated in October 10 demonstrations. Sen. Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/Humanities) said he had a question about due process. He understood that charges against some students for possible violations of the Rules of Conduct were expected. But he also understood from *Spectator* and other reports that some of the students who may be facing these charges have already had sanctions imposed upon them in the form of a prohibition against attending further events sponsored by the College Republicans, the group that sponsored the original event. Sen. Slaughter said that as he read the Statutes such a determination could only be made by the University Judicial Board. He asked what the role of the UJB is in cases in which the Rules Administrator either ignores or is otherwise at odds with the Rules.

Sen. O'Halloran said she was unaware of this situation, and because the Senate is involved in the Rules process, she could not speak to the issue. She asked if the provost would say something.

Provost John Coatsworth said the Rules of Conduct allow the University President to take steps to protect freedom of expression on the campus. He said the administration had in a small number of cases—only one or two so far—taken a step that would help a student organization make sure that its events go well, and that its freedom of expression is preserved. The students who have been forbidden to attend the next meetings sponsored by the College Republicans have not been charged with any violations of the Rules. But interim measures have been taken to assure that the next set of meetings goes peacefully.

Sen. O'Halloran stated her understanding that the arrangement described by the provost was made outside the Rules, and was adopted on an interim basis to ensure smooth functioning of the next event.

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S) understood that the action the provost described was not outside of the Rules, but was allowed by the president's authority under the Rules.

The provost offered the clarification that no charges have been filed that would require the UJB to judge any of these students.

Update from Student Affairs on the next quality-of-life survey. Sen. Schenk said the survey is conducted every two years. The latest one was launched in May, but because SAC was so focused on mental health issues at the time, the group was unable to achieve an optimal response. So SAC was now relaunching the survey. In two days the survey has had more responses than it had altogether last spring, and SAC anticipated statistically significant findings. The results will be presented to the Senate, and may be useful to other committees.

Sen. Nanda added thanks to faculty and deans who had helped SAC market the survey to the student body of the University.

Sen. O'Halloran said the current effort was the third iteration of the survey. The first two, in 2013 and 2015, had a significant impact on issues ranging from mental health to disabled students to the next student recreational center.

Resolution to approve the [Faculty Affairs Committee report on academic freedom](#). Sen. O'Halloran said this item had been on the agenda for discussion only at the previous plenary, and was now on the agenda for action.

FAC co-chair Robert Pollack (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) said the committee was seeking a Senate vote, with an intention to forward the resolution to the Trustees for appropriate action. He suggested taking up the question of what is appropriate action after the vote.

Sen. Pollack said FAC's responsibility for the principles involved is expressed in its full name—Committee on Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom, and Tenure. From the outset the question had

been, What can academic freedom mean in the context of the committee and the Senate? He said the resolution is not solely concerned with the classroom, but with a larger argument that the exchange of ideas between people in an academic setting requires certain voluntary constraints not to use one's constitutional freedoms at the cost of intimidation and the ending of a mutual exchange of ideas. He said this position was discussed at the previous plenary, with a fairly strong positive response. Sen. Pollack said he hoped for an outcome as close as possible to the unanimous agreement that the committee had achieved with great effort in its own deliberations.

Sen. Indira Martinez (Stu., SW), a new senator who had missed previous discussions, asked why the resolution was being put forward now. It seemed to be simply reaffirming current language.

FAC co-chair Letty Moss-Salentijn (Ten., CDM) agreed that the resolution did not express a new idea. But the committee had decided to reinforce a current idea because in the present teaching environment existing niceties are sometimes forgotten. She said FAC wants to assure a balance of power between the teacher and the taught so that both have a chance to make their case without being intimidated. Sen. Moss-Salentijn said FAC was concerned about intimidation of students, but students can also intimidate teachers sometimes.

Sen. Pollack added that said the next-to-last paragraph of the report expressed the rationale for the resolution. The committee was proposing the voluntary acceptance of a set of constraints to assure that "all members of the Columbia community—faculty, administrators, staff, and students at all levels—have the freedom to disagree with prevailing wisdom, with one another, and perhaps most importantly with official policies, whether institutional, local, national or global. It's this freedom that empowers each of us to continue to question, experiment, explore and even be wrong, undertakings that support and perhaps even define the academic mission." Sen. Pollack did not think Columbia has a clear statement of an academic mission distinct from all of its other missions. Now is a time for such a statement.

Sen. Andrew Boyd (Stu., Arts) said he seemed to be hearing two interpretations of the resolution. On the one hand, it sounded like a broad statement in favor of academic freedom. Or did it apply only to the classroom and not, for example, to outside speakers on campus?

Sen. Pollack directed attention to the document again, reading the following passage aloud: "We must be free to disagree with our colleagues and our students, and students must be free to disagree with their classmates and with us. But as members of an academic community we must all, students, faculty, administrators and staff, voluntarily accept that these freedoms do not license us to abuse those with whom we disagree. An environment of honest advocacy, openness and mutual respect is precisely what makes the essential work of education and true academic inquiry possible. This agreement to disagree with both humility and sincerity thus defines freedom in an academic setting." Sen. Pollack said this was an academic setting more broadly construed than a classroom. He said the room in which senators were now sitting was also part of the academic setting, for instance, and he hoped the group would remain civil there.

Sen. Boyd sensed an ambiguity about the boundaries of the academic setting. He said the College Republicans had invited Mike Cernovich to speak on campus later in the month. Mr. Cernovich has said that date rape does not exist. Sen. Boyd said such a speaker was not likely to

be respectful to Columbia students. If the resolution was construing the academic setting in the broader sense that includes outside speakers invited by campus organizations, then it would seem to allow Mike Cernovich to speak on campus.

Sen. Pollack said he didn't know the man invited by the College Republicans. He said he would expect the people inviting him to present him and their own constituents with the constraints outlined in the FAC resolution. He said he would expect a civil discourse in which, when someone says something outrageous, or unrelated to reality, he or she is civilly responded to without loss of the capacity for discourse. Sen. Pollack acknowledged that this was a difficult, possibly impossible approach, but that is why institutions like Columbia have the status of a tax-free institution for the greater good of the country. People are here to learn from each other, teach each other, and not intimidate each other.

Sen. Ramond Curtis (Stu., GS) said he had attended the October 10 Tommy Robinson event, which had resulted in the present Rules investigation. Sen. Curtis said some of the issues students were raising now bore directly on that event, since most students believe that the provost's email to the University community was based on what happened there. He was now prepared to bear witness that the deterioration of that event was attributable to factors that had nothing to do with the students who ended up protesting. By the time Tommy Robinson was finally connected by Skype, he was calling people names, mentioning specific students that he could see on the feed, and using derogatory terms like "snowflake" before he even started his conversation. The Columbia administration did not address this situation. Furthermore, an intoxicated alumnus who was there to support Tommy Robinson was allowed in despite his condition. Before the event began, some students were complaining that they were not being allowed into the auditorium, even though it was only one-third full. Sen. Curtis said the general student view is that because a majority of the students who wanted to attend were not in favor of Tommy Robinson, a cap was set to keep their numbers low.

Sen. O'Halloran said she wanted to hear a question.

Sen. Curtis apologized, but explained that the case he was making was not hypothetical. He said a number of students had their information collected by the administration. There was some discontent about such actions, which seem to have been carried out only for students, and not for other members of the Columbia community, or for invited outside speakers.

Sen. Pollack said Sen. Curtis did not seem to be asking a question. Sen. Pollack thought it was unreasonable to ask about the scope of the resolution before it had been approved. He urged senators to approve the resolution so people can apply it to future situations. He repeated his earlier request for amendments or acceptance of the resolution, so that Sen. Curtis's question could be properly considered.

Sen. Nanda said that at the last plenary a student asked about the range of the resolution, and was told it was the academic classroom. When Faculty Affairs presented its first resolution on freedom of expression in September 2016, the scope was broader, and students and faculty expressed concerns. The resolution was withdrawn. Sen. Nanda recognized that the term "academic setting" can refer to a number of situations, and she understood the discrepancy. She said students were seeking some clarity about the definition of that term. She said the current

confusion may be based on the concern that if the new resolution is based on a broader understanding of the term, then how does it differ from last year's resolution?

Sen. Pollack said the resolution now before the Senate was the same one the Senate seemed to welcome at the previous plenary, though without a formal vote. He repeated that his committee now wanted to hear suggestions for changes to this so far unchanged resolution. He argued that neither he nor Faculty Affairs consider the classroom to be the only place where academic relationships develop. A department meeting, a lunch with a student, a seminar—these all are academic experiences. Their essence is the risk of disagreement, of hearing something one didn't want to know, of someone abusing academic freedom to insult, intimidate, or marginalize somebody, not for the sake of argument but for the gratification of doing so. Sen. Pollack said the aim of the resolution was to provide a safe place for disagreement in an academic setting, wherever that may be.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn stressed that even the resolution presented in September 2016 was focused on the educational environment. She said an external speaker whose ideas are frankly upsetting to many people has no place in her definition of the academic setting.

Sen. Nanda pointed out the place in the minutes of the September 15 plenary where Sen. James Rappaport (Stu., CC) asked twice if the scope of the resolution was limited to the classroom. Sen. Pollack's first answer was extensive and nuanced, but his second answer was emphatic and affirmative. She concluded that there was a change between the meetings.

Sen. Pollack offered one more attempt at an explanation. He did not dispute the minutes. But he said a key idea in the language of the resolution as written is that there is a boundary between what one may say or do in a public place and what one may say or do in an academic place. He said the resolution might be called a document on academic privacy. The goal is to establish a protected environment for academic discourse. He took the point that an invited speaker may be outside that boundary, a question on which he was not an expert. He said he'd be willing to accept that situation as an example of something outside a boundary. The present document contains the notion of a boundary for academic freedom. He said the laws of the land obtain all over, not just in an academic setting. This document is not about the law, but about the protection of academic discourse. If the Senate wants to call for a boundary outside of which only the law applies, that's the Senate's decision. Inside that boundary are all places where discourse takes place in an academic setting.

Sen. Noam said another deliberative process was now under way in the Senate External Relations Committee, which considers the university's dealings with the outside world. He said External Relations may be bringing a resolution to the Senate that deals precisely with those external questions, with issues outside the boundary the Senate was now discussing. The present resolution covers a setting broadly defined as internal and academic, and that is appropriate. But he alerted the Senate that its concerns with "outside" issues were not over.

Sen. Noam also applauded the Faculty Affairs Committee resolution. He said Columbia and universities in general have been something of an archipelago of freedom of expression in the broader society, but have more recently been under siege, from the outside but also from the

inside. So the FAC resolution is arriving at exactly the right time. He said Columbia has always been a beacon in this environment, and it should continue to be so. And yet troubling things are happening. On October 5 Suzanne Goldberg's class was disrupted by students not in the course. A few years earlier there was the situation (which in fairness was subsequently rectified) of an Engineering School professor who was accused in anonymous student evaluations of making inappropriate comments on racial and gender issues. He was able to show conclusively by way of videotapes for every class meeting that there were no such comments. Whoever reviewed these tapes probably searched hard because of the university's legal liability. Finally apologies were issued, but the professor had already been suspended from teaching his class. Sen. Noam said it was important to have a reminder of the mutual responsibility to discuss such issues freely. He said it is not progressive to restrict such discussions. It's aggressive, even depressive.

Sen. Rappaport said Sen. Nanda had articulated the sentiments of SAC but also of university students at large about the importance of the issues of free speech and the right to protest at this particular time on campus. What excited him about the FAC resolution was its particular application to the classroom. It was this point, recorded in the minutes, that led him to vote for the resolution in the straw poll at the September plenary, which reflected at least a spirit of unanimity. If the Senate wanted to keep that spirit, it should retain the classroom as the focus of the resolution. He said he was also enthusiastic to hear about the broader conversation about free speech to come from External Relations. He said he—and the rest of SAC—saw the FAC resolution as a first step.

Sen. O'Halloran asked Sen. Rappaport if he was offering an amendment. He said he was not.

Sen. Pollack said he thought Faculty Affairs would be glad to be part of an ongoing process that extends to External Relations, with the FAC resolution as a first step.

Sen. Slaughter said he was a new senator, and had missed the discussion the previous year. He said the discussion September 15 was understandably cursory. He said that after reading the resolution he was sympathetic with the spirit, though he also shared some of the concerns expressed at the present meeting. He raised a separate issue, based on his sense that the resolution didn't simply reaffirm principles, but construed academic freedom as a constraint on free speech, as opposed to a commitment to the pursuit of truth. The statement also added the language of intimidation and abuse, without defining either term. Sen. Slaughter said he could easily imagine the scenario in his own classroom teaching controversial subjects, in which he, as the professor giving the grades, could be accused of intimidation simply for not accepting an opinion as valid when the class is engaged in pursuing knowledge. Rather than making debate safe, the resolution seemed to Sen. Slaughter to open the university up to potentially gratuitous charges of intimidation, and to risk shutting down the pursuit of truth in favor of validating all opinions as equal in some fashion.

Sen. Pollack said he saw the present conversation as a counter-example to Sen. Slaughter's concern, since he disagreed strongly with Sen. Slaughter, but the conversation was civil.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the key term in the present statement was “respect.” As long as there is mutual respect between teachers and students in the classroom or in other interactions, then the purpose of the resolution will be served.

Sen. Slaughter said he recognized the spirit. His problem was the lack of definitions of key terms. He said it was easy to see how the category of intimidation could be manipulated to produce charges against somebody expressing views that a student or a professor doesn’t like. Sen. Pollack said that it was for future modifications of the resolution to provide those definitions, perhaps in a round of discussion to be led by External Relations. But the terms do have common meanings, and he thought the present resolution was a good start, attempting to state the possibility of boundaries of any sort. Defining the quantitative nature of the boundary would be a second step.

Sen. James Applegate (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) said he had taken part in debate on the present FAC resolution over the summer. He voted for it because he thought it nicely states a set of principles and ideals that he upholds within the classroom and without, as well as outside the university. He too was concerned about the words “intimidation” and “abuse,” and about the slippery slope of affirming freedom of expression but opposing hate speech, then branding any speech one doesn’t like as hate speech. Such a slippery slope is a possibility, but an avoidable one. Sen. Applegate said any serious issue that is debated off campus, or reported on the front page of *The New York Times*, is one the university should be able to handle at least as well as the outside world does, and in a civil, respectful way. Disagreements, even vehement ones, must be respectful. One finds agreement where one can, and maintains fundamental differences without gratuitously insulting people. He added that he had been in the University Senate for a long time, and had been in the thick of debates on emotional issues. He said the Senate community had handled such situations in the past, and could continue to do so in the future.

Sen. Schenk said the discussion had gotten broader, and moved away from the current argument. He said student senators agree completely with faculty in supporting academic freedom within the classroom. But the range of the term is much broader in the text of the FAC statement. On behalf of SAC he proposed an amendment to change the phrase “academic setting” to “academic classroom” in the third-to-last paragraph. He said SAC would not feel comfortable supporting the resolution without this change.

Sen. O’Halloran asked the amenders to write down their amendments on a piece of paper, and hand it to the parliamentarian.

Sen. Schenk agreed to write down the amendment, but he also read it aloud from the third-to-last paragraph: “This agreement to disagree with both humility and sincerity thus defines freedom in a *classroom* setting [replacing *academic* setting].”

Senate Parliamentarian Howard Jacobson said Senate procedure requires a written version of the amendment as well.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn asked if that change would exclude a discussion in a professor’s office as an academic setting. Sen. Pollack said it would. He offered to review academic settings that are

outside the classroom: the discussion in the professor's office; the intimidation of a junior faculty member by a tenured faculty in any number of ways, in a faculty meeting with no students present; a conversation among students about another student who is intimidated either about his or her ideas or his or her appearance. He said the FAC resolution is an argument for what in an Asian context Prof. de Bary had called civility, as a necessary prerequisite to disagreement without intimidation. Sen. Pollack said that a Senate vote to establish that idea in the classroom would be better than nothing. But he said the first person in the room who is intimidated and treated badly in an academic setting but not a classroom should remember this discussion. Sen. Noam asked if the Senate was part of the academic setting. Sen. Pollack said the present Senate discussion would be covered by this resolution as written, but not under the proposed amendment.

Sen. John Donaldson (Ten., Bus.) asked whether the amended resolution would cover departmental seminars. Sen. Pollack said it would not. The speaker does not imagine he or she is in a classroom when giving a seminar that might yield a promotion or a raise. But for that person the seminar is an academic setting in the deepest sense.

Sen. Nanda acknowledged that there is a range of relevant circumstances. But she also said the amended resolution would be a start, and the External Relations resolution to come would address those circumstances. But they would also require a larger discussion than students would want to go through before supporting the present resolution. A solution would have to protect both sides: students certainly want faculty to teach comfortably, but SAC also wants to make sure students are also comfortable voicing their opinions.

Sen. Pollack suggested defining all settings in which all participants have a CUID as appropriate academic settings.

Sen. Nanda said that would be a fit subject for Sen. Noam's External Relations initiative. She noted that that rule might allow the Tommy Robinson event since everyone physically present at that meeting may have had a CUID (Robinson participated by Skype). This complication was an example of SAC's concerns about the broader interpretation of the academic setting. She said students were trying to work together with faculty to support this resolution. She suggested taking a smaller step toward a bigger step.

Sen. Pollack asked senators to remember that if the resolution were approved without amendments, it would not be holy writ, but subject to reconsideration by the External Relations Committee and others. He asked the Senate out of respect for the hard work of the Faculty Affairs Committee to approve the resolution as written, with the understanding that it may be modified and even overridden later. But he hoped not to see the resolution cut back before it had a chance to live.

Sen. Ian Bradley-Perrin (Stu., Public Health) recalled that the resolution FAC brought to the plenary in September 2016 was an endorsement of a statement on freedom of expression from another institution—the University of Chicago. At the time SAC asked for language suited specifically to the Columbia environment. Sen. Bradley-Perrin said students are still hesitant to support the resolution because the specific language students had requested was still missing.

Sen. O'Halloran briefly explained Senate procedure governing amendments to resolutions. The amendment gets discussed, and then voted on before the resolution itself. If the amendment passes, the Senate then votes on the amended resolution. If the amendment fails, the Senate votes on the original resolution.

In response to a question from Sen. Curtis, Mr. Jacobson said the Senate can consider other amendments, but only after prior amendments are addressed.

After some back and forth, Mr. Jacobson read the amendments to the resolution, which consisted of two substitutions of the phrase "classroom setting" for "academic setting."

Sen. O'Halloran invited discussion.

Sen. Samuel Silverstein (Ten., P&S) asked whether hospital rounds are a classroom setting. Sen. Pollack said he thought not.

Sen. Schenk made three points. One was that Columbia University itself is an academic setting; that's why students want a narrower definition. The other was that focusing on classrooms in the statement does not mean that freedom of expression is limited to classrooms. But it's a starting point. The third point was the issue of consistency: students want to follow up on the same resolution that they thought they were supporting at the last plenary.

Sen. Pollack asked if students could support "educational settings" in place of "classroom settings," so that rounds and labs could be included.

Sen. Schenk said that, as with academic settings, an educational setting is pretty much any space in the University.

Sen. O'Halloran asked for and received a motion to go to a vote, with a second. She asked all in favor to stand or raise their placket.

The motion was defeated by a vote of 41-12, with five abstentions.

Sen. O'Halloran called for a vote on the original resolution. She said Robert's Rules would only allow a privileged procedural motion at this point.

Sen. Rappaport made a motion to table the resolution until senators have a chance to work together on language for the resolution.

Sen. O'Halloran said this was a privileged procedural motion.

Mr. Jacobson asked for clarification of the motion's intention.

Sen. Rappaport said he did not want to send the resolution back to committee. He wanted to give SAC and FAC (and perhaps the Rules Committee) an opportunity to work together to build consensus on this issue. He hoped for unanimous approval at the next plenary.

Asked again by Sen. O'Halloran, Sen. Rappaport repeated that November 17, the date of the next plenary, was his "date certain." He asked if Sen. Pollack was comfortable with that arrangement. Sen. Pollack said he was quite uncomfortable with the idea. He repeated that the Faculty Affairs worked on this for months, and their commitment to reaching consensus should be taken seriously by the Senate in turn. He said it had been an academic, if not classroom, experience.

Sen. O'Halloran said a motion to table is privileged above all.

Mr. Jacobson said the only debatable question about a motion to table is the date to which the business is postponed. Sen. Rappaport repeated that the business would come back on the date of the next plenary.

Sen. Slaughter noted that part of the motion was to send the resolution back to various committees to work on it together.

Sen. O'Halloran said that Sen. Rappaport did not say that. The tabling was till a date certain.

The motion to table till November 17 was passed by a vote of 32-17 with 9 abstentions.

Annual reports.

Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee. Committee chair John Donaldson (Ten., Bus) based his presentation of the committee's work in 2016-17 on his written [report](#), which had been distributed. But he devoted the bulk of his talk to the committee's plans for the current year.

Sen. Donaldson said he was the new committee chair this year, with the help of vice-chairs Patrice Derrington (NT, GSAPP) and Teresa Zhao (Stu., SEAS). He said the committee's intention is to be proactive. It wants to know what the plans are before they're set in stone so it can make useful comments about them. That means the committee has to learn who makes major decisions, what kind of background information goes into those decisions, and who provides it. The committee wants to know what new projects are actually pending, aside from the giant project in Manhattanville, and how they are initiated. What are the maintenance protocols for space, particularly for classrooms? Most importantly, Campus Planning wants to be informed of all upcoming and proposed major projects so that it can offer its modest input in a timely way.

Sen Donaldson put classrooms first on the list of facilities issues to address. He said the committee learned from a wonderful presentation by University Registrar Barry Kane that there are not enough classrooms, particularly on Morningside. The available ones are often the wrong size, with the wrong equipment. And professors and students don't want to use some of the most recently renovated classrooms. The most conspicuous example of this problem is one of the lecture halls in the Northwest Corner building. The committee wants to know about newly available space in time to recommend its use for classrooms. Recently the Wallach Art Gallery

left the Morningside campus, and its space became available. The committee would have wished to have classrooms in that space, but it's being used instead for offices. Sen. Donaldson understood that there may be a shortage of offices as well, but he said this decision was reached with no chance for committee input. He hoped to change that situation.

As for Manhattanville, the committee notes the lack of gym or library or parking facilities there. Someone who commutes by car has to park the car at Engineering Terrace, and then get down to Manhattanville, even though originally there was supposed to be parking there for 2,000 cars. The committee would welcome an environmentally sound approach to parking, such as requiring all parkers to own electric cars. The committee would also like to start a serious discussion of tying the campuses together and making the walk between them more pleasant, perhaps with more benches and trees along the route.

Sen. Donaldson said the committee also worries about insufficient meeting space, an issue of special concern to students. That raises the question of how Uris Hall will be used when the Business School moves to Manhattanville in four years. The committee wants to assure faculty and student input into how the enormous amount of space in Uris will be used. A lot of housing is also planned for Manhattanville, but the committee doesn't know when or how.

Sen. Donaldson said the committee is also interested in issues of the community broadly defined. The Morningside area is going to become much more crowded in the future, with at least two 35-plus-story apartment buildings planned. What can be done to help this neighborhood remain the most pleasant place to live in Manhattan? A number of issues to be considered are separately rather small, such as smoking or dogs on campus, or the need for better care of trees near the University. Taken together these issues can make an important difference over time.

Sen. Irving Herman (Ten., SEAS) thought it would be a valuable project to label the full variety of types of trees on campus. Sen. Donaldson welcomed that idea.

Sen. Silverstein said one important omission from the Manhattanville planning was attention to the social organization of the new campus, and the interaction of students and faculty there with Morningside. He said a crucial way to make the university more than the sum of its parts would be to assure better interactions between faculty and students from many different disciplines in conducive settings. He suggested this challenge as a worthwhile agenda item for Campus Planning. Sen. Donaldson appreciated the suggestion.

Housing Policy Committee. Co-chair Andreas Hielscher (Ten., SEAS) elaborated on a written [report](#) that had been distributed before the meeting. He said Housing Policy, like Campus Planning, was in transition last year, with himself and Sen. William Duggan (NT, Bus.) as the new co-chairs. They decided to undertake a broad review of the university's housing policies of a kind that hadn't been done in at least 20 years. The committee learned that a third of the faculty are in Columbia housing. If it's such a good thing for the university to provide faculty housing, why not provide it for all faculty? And if it's a bad thing, why doesn't Columbia get out of housing altogether and provide other subsidies? Sen. Hielscher said the committee's project then became a fact-finding exercise. Invited speakers from the Provost's Office and others, in real estate as well as business, conveyed a sense of why and how Columbia reached its current

housing situation. That effort took up most of last year. Now the committee will consider various economic and other types of models to use in considering Columbia's next steps. Next year the committee hopes to provide a larger and more specific report.

The committee's other main initiative is to consider housing options for Manhattanville. Again, should Columbia provide a lot of housing, or perhaps none? Some of these questions intersect with the work of Campus Planning, such as how to make the Manhattanville area a lively neighborhood, and how best to connect the campuses.

Sen. Daniel McConnell (Stu., P&S) asked if Housing Policy was aware of the troubles last year that beset the residential towers on the medical campus, where residents lost use of their kitchens for several months—a situation that may have amounted to a violation of the tenants' leases. During this difficult period the university generally mishandled the situation.

Sen. Hielscher said he was not aware of this situation. He said students and other residents should bring cases like this to the attention of the committee.

Sen. Raimondo Betti (Ten., SEAS) said Columbia offers significant financial incentives to Columbia professors in university rental housing to leave and find housing elsewhere. He complained that this policy was developed for faculty starting at Columbia after a certain date. Faculty who left Columbia housing before that date—like himself—never received any offers or inducements to leave. Sen. Betti said that state of affairs was unfair.

Sen. Hielscher said Housing Policy had devoted some time to that issue, but it deserved more attention. He added that these policies are changing, and different schools have different policies. So the committee needs a better understanding of what school is doing what.

Presentation on officers' benefits for 2018. Ann Kraus, AVP for Total Compensation in Human Resources, introduced her colleague Michael Bloom, AVP for Benefits Strategy and Administration. Mr. Bloom based his presentation closely on a set of [slides](#).

After the presentation, Sen. Victor de la Pena (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) asked if spouses of Columbia officers were eligible for long-term care policies. Mr. Bloom said they were.

Sen. Susan McGregor (NT, Journalism) asked if officers signing up for long-term care during Open Enrollment would be covered under the current policy or a new one being rolled out now. Mr. Bloom said officers can stay in the current program as long as they enroll with an agent by December 31, 2017. Otherwise, they'll be subject to the new policy.

Sen. McGregor asked if there had been any changes to the policy for coverage of domestic partners. Would opposite-sex domestic partners be covered, as same-sex partners are?

Mr. Bloom said this policy has not changed. The Senate Benefits Subcommittee meets with administrators to consider possible benefits changes. Coverage for opposite-sex domestic partners was not now under consideration for 2018, but the issue will come up again next year.

Sen. O'Halloran said Ombuds Officer Ann Waters had graciously agreed to wait till the next plenary to give her annual report.

Sen. O'Halloran adjourned the meeting shortly before 3 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff