

## MEETING OF FEBRUARY 2, 2018

President Lee Bollinger called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm in 1501 International Affairs. Seventy-four of 98 senators were present during the meeting.

**Minutes and agenda.** The president said he would assume the adoption of the agenda and the minutes unless he heard objections. He heard none.

### **President's remarks.**

*Major gifts.* The president expressed appreciation for two major gifts received late in the fall: \$250 million from Roy and Diana Vagelos for financial aid at the Medical School, which was also renamed in their honor, and a \$400 million bequest from Herbert and Florence Irving to fight cancer. The Irving bequest will support clinical work as well as basic research, not only at CUMC but on Morningside Heights as well.

The president said these gifts are part of the current five-year capital campaign, which has four years to go and an ambitious goal of \$5 billion. The last campaign, at that time the largest ever in the Ivy League and the second largest ever in the U.S., raised over \$6 billion in 7-8 years. The current campaign is off to a successful start.

*New appointments.* The president said he had appointed Lisa Metsch as Dean of the School of General Studies, succeeding Peter Awn. Dean Metsch, a GS graduate, comes from the School of Public Health.

Alex Halliday, an earth scientist from Oxford, has been appointed director of the Earth Institute. He will begin his duties officially later this semester.

The president said he would renew the search for a new dean in Social Work after Prof. Irv Garfinkel had filled in splendidly as acting dean. Nursing School Dean Bobbie Berkowitz is stepping down. A search for her successor will begin soon.

*Manhattanville.* The president said the new campus is well under way. The Mind Brain Behavior building is filling up, with 42 laboratories now completed on the way to a final total of 50-60. The Lenfest Center for the Arts is already a thriving performance center and a vital addition to the School of the Arts. There have been magnificent exhibits there, the president said, including one on public housing in Harlem designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, one on artists from upper Manhattan, and one on dancer and Alvin Ailey School founder Arthur Mitchell. The Forum Building, ready for occupancy next fall, will provide a 450-seat auditorium and meeting spaces. Columbia World Projects will be housed there.

*Some current initiatives.* The president listed several University projects, including the newly established cancer-fighting initiative, the Data Science Institute (led by Prof. Jeanette

Wing), and the precision medicine effort. Another important effort is Columbia World Projects, an attempt to bring academic work originating at Columbia together with outside partners, government, civil society, and business. The idea is to identify real-world problems and develop solutions within a five-year time frame. The director is former Journalism School Dean Nicholas Lemann. Avril Haines, an official in the Obama administration, is also actively involved.

*Student mental health.* Columbia College Dean James Valentini has been leading a Morningside initiative launched last spring, and a CUMC initiative is under way. The Jed Foundation, founded by College alumnus Philip Satow '63 after the suicide of his son Jed, is involved in these efforts.

*Sexual misconduct* remains a focus for the university, both as a matter of policy and of culture.

*Graduate student unionization.* The president said Provost John Coatsworth, in an email to the Columbia community on January 30, had explained the University's position. He said the University has had good working relations with a number of unions over the years, but feels strongly that graduate students are not employees as defined by the National Labor Relations Act. The president said every Ivy League institution has maintained for many years that they should not be compelled under the Act to treat graduate students as employees. They want a direct relationship with their students, without a union functioning as an intermediary. Over the years the National Labor Relations Board has gone back and forth in its interpretation of the status of graduate students. A longstanding NLRB decision held that students are not employees. But then, with a change in administration, and therefore in the composition of the NLRB, that ruling was overturned in a more recent case involving Columbia. The University has decided to challenge that decision in federal court through an appellate procedure. But in order to make such a challenge, the institution must first have taken part in and lost a union election. That happened about a year ago. Columbia appealed against what it saw as problems with union behavior in the actual conduct of that election, and lost that appeal. But now Columbia will challenge the principle in the Court of Appeals, hoping that the Court will decide that NLRA does not require universities to treat their graduate students as employees. In the coming months and years, the law may or may not change, appeals may or may not be successful, but the process of ascertaining what federal law requires has not run its course. The president said Columbia wants its graduate students to be as successful as possible, and it will strive continually to improve its efforts to support them. The basic objection is that unions are not appropriate in an academic setting. The president recognized that there are strong feelings about this issue, and said he was happy to discuss it further.

#### **Executive Committee chair's remarks.**

*Appointments under the Rules of Conduct.* Sen. Sharyn O'Halloran (Ten., SIPA) announced two appointments to the Appeals Board, which hears appeals from decisions by the University Judicial Board in cases tried under the Rules of Conduct. Law School Dean Gillian Lester, already a member of the Appeals Board, was now appointed chair. And the new General Studies Dean, Lisa Metsch, was appointed to the Board, succeeding Peter Awn. Dean Metsch was present at the meeting, and the president introduced her to the Senate.

*Honors and Prizes nominations.* Sen. O'Halloran reminded senators about their responsibility to recommend nominees for the honorary degrees awarded annually at Commencement. She urged senators to spread the word, and to submit their own suggestions before the March 2 deadline. More information is available on the Senate website, [senate.columbia.edu](http://senate.columbia.edu).

*Policy on sexual relationships between faculty and students.* Sen. O'Halloran said a Senate group would be reviewing the current policy, focusing on the situation of both graduate and undergraduate students. She hoped to have a recommendation for a revised policy before the Senate by the end of the semester.

*Update from Sen. Silverstein on his remarks at the previous plenary on the tax bill passed by Congress in December.* Sen. Samuel Silverstein (Ten., P&S) said he had identified two problems with Columbia's response to the Republican tax bill: one was that the University said nothing about what it would do if the imputed income provisions were enacted. He said that change would have had a devastating effect on graduate education—a topic the president had just touched on in connection with unionization. Just before the end of the calendar year, families of Columbia students received an extraordinary email from Human Resources saying they could pay their tuition before January 1 in hopes of avoiding the tax consequences they would face if they made the payment in 2018. The issue turned out to be moot. But Sen. Silverstein stressed the seriousness of this issue, as well as of the 1.4 percent tax on the income of endowments at certain wealthy institutions. He said that the University in the future needs to be much more proactive than it was in this situation.

Sen. Silverstein said the Association of American Universities and his own scientific societies were equally inactive in opposing the elimination of deductibility for state and local taxes. He said this change would have a devastating effect on the ability of all states to support their public schools, which had already suffered a huge downturn since 2008. Sen. Silverstein said there was nothing to be done at this point, but he thought Columbia could do a lot better.

President Bollinger appreciated Sen. Silverstein's point. He added that a lot of Columbia people worked hard on these issues. He said it's very hard to say, before a law has been passed, exactly what the University would do if it were enacted. But he doubted the University would do anything different next time. He said an individual university president's phone calls would not have had much impact. Collective organization, by groups like the AAU, is more effective. His sense was that the AAU was actually very active and forceful. Should the AAU have taken a position on the deductibility of state and local taxes? He said the response might be that even though this provision would have a major impact on a few institutions, the debate in Congress concerned a national policy about appropriate federal taxation relative to state and local taxation that Columbia should perhaps not get in the middle of. So not taking a position on this question might not have been unreasonable.

Prompted by the president, Provost John Coatsworth commented on this question, but inaudibly because the microphone wasn't working.

Sen. Silverstein said the tax bill was an attack not just on higher education, but on all of American education. He said that doubly taxing people whose property taxes support the schools

makes it that much harder for everybody. And nothing makes it harder for Columbia to be a successful university than having fewer kids who have a good education coming in. This is not a parochial issue, he said, but a national issue, and the university's core business. He said universities need to stand up and say that impeding K-12 education is essentially an attack on what they do.

The president agreed that this issue is not parochial. But there are many bad things in this country now, and the University is speaking out about many of them. He agreed that the tax bill will harm K-12 public education, and penalize private universities. He added that the tax on the endowments of wealthy private institutions is surely an effort to punish universities that some legislators may not like. Columbia is trying to fight both as a member of organizations that have clout, and to make its own case where the president thinks the University can have an impact.

**Resolution Concerning the Principle of Academic Freedom** (Faculty Affairs and Student Affairs committees).

FAC co-chair Robert Pollack (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) and SAC co-chair Sonya Nanda (Bus.) jointly presented the [resolution](#).

Sen. Pollack said the resolution was self-reflective and self-exemplifying in that it emerged from joint discussions of the two proponent committees. He mentioned the crucial help of Prof. Brett Dignam, whose organizing and mediation efforts helped to assure that senators would not have to choose between a tabled Faculty Affairs resolution and a rival student resolution.

Sen. Nanda agreed that the result was a true testament to collaboration between students and faculty. She said the present version was shorter than the previous one, but much of the original language remained. She said the FAC co-chairs had taken a step back and actually allowed the students to take the wheel, and to produce multiple drafts, offering valuable feedback along the way. The result showed the students' commitment to the principle of academic freedom, but in a way that included their own voice.

Sen. Pollack said the resolution supports principles, and explicitly excludes the making of rules, which should be based on those principles. He offered the resolution as a necessary but not sufficient discussion and endorsement of the notion of academic freedom. He said it's not clear what action should be taken on academic freedom in the future, but the resolution says that it had better be based on these principles.

President Bollinger recognized that he was joining this discussion late, but offered a couple of qualifications for its main argument. He offered to then restate what he understood to be the purpose of the resolution, and to say why he supported it.

The president thought one sentence near the start of the preamble could be misinterpreted. After identifying freedom as a "first principle," the preamble says, "...one person's freedom cannot extend to actions that bring about another person's gratuitous suffering." He said the commitment to free speech means that people will use speech even when it results in gratuitous injury to someone else. He didn't want that sentence to be interpreted as a prohibition on speech that hurts someone gratuitously.

Sen. Pollack said the president had just reiterated much of the discussion that led to the private deliberations of the committees. He said the resolution applied only to the academic parts of the university, and the academic moment in the experience of its members. The standards for free speech on the street should not be applied to free speech in the classroom. He hoped the Senate would agree that in a classroom setting, a tutoring setting, a consultative setting, and by the president's own argument that graduate students are students and not employees, it is important to preserve the right to disagree without marginalizing or intimidating each other. To protect speech in the street, Sen. Pollack said, make a set of rules, but not in the classroom.

Sen. Nanda said the resolution was not trying to banish disagreement, and recognized that disagreement can sometimes be painful. But the resolution calls for respectful discourse: "The freedom to disagree must not be taken as the freedom to be disrespectful or to abuse the person with whom you're disagreeing."

The president said there are different rules for free speech and academic freedom in evaluations of teaching or scholarship. In that setting, which is the heart of the university, speech is limited all the time. In tenure judgments, people decide that someone's scholarship falls short of a certain standard. But thinking of the university as a kind of public forum, on the other hand, where ideas are debated, sometimes by outside speakers, we basically adopt the First Amendment as a standard. But no student could say, "I deserve an A on that exam because I have free speech to say whatever I want about the subject." The president thought this was an important distinction, which should be included in a statement like this.

The president's last point was that no matter what rules the university adopts about academic freedom and free speech, we should all aim for a kind of discussion that is respectful and tolerant, that tries to grapple with the arguments of the other side, that is part of the scholarly community in the best sense. So even though people have rights to say things that are hurtful to other people, we ask everyone to try to be more civil. The president said he fully supported a general statement of that kind.

Sen. Nanda said the resolution was an attempt to focus not on rules but on principles underlying rules. The hope was that in the event of a disagreement about *rules*, perhaps on the Senate Rules Committee, people could refer to the principles in the present resolution for guidance.

Sen. Nanda said the proponents wanted to make it clear that the resolution was not addressing the issue of outside speakers on campus--a point made in Whereas #3: "The right to protest on campus is governed exclusively through the Rules of University Conduct and the University Senate's Rules Committee and, therefore, not by this resolution."

The president called for discussion.

Sen. Pollack added that Whereas #3, proposed by Student Affairs, was rapidly accepted by Faculty Affairs. He said the goal of the resolution is to establish a context for further discussion about how we enjoy our First Amendment freedoms while protecting the academic enterprise in principle. Sen. Pollack said that if the Senate wanted further discussion, it should take place. But

he hoped for a vote as soon as possible because the resolution had been under discussion for a long time.

Sen. Silverstein expressed support for the resolution, and offered what he hoped was a friendly amendment--to replace “freedom cannot extend to actions that bring about another person’s gratuitous suffering,” with “...freedom cannot extend to actions that seek to silence opinions one or another group considers offensive.”

Sen. Pollack said he would prefer to keep the original language, which he considered more general than the idea of silencing.

Sen. Nanda added that the language comes from a preamble, and that the key points are in the body of the resolution.

Sen. Silverstein understood the point, but said the resolution seemed to be licensing actions that would silence other opinions.

Sen. Pollack said the Resolved clause (paragraph #6), outlining the principle of academic freedom, should leave no doubt about the resolution’s attitude toward silencing anyone.

Sen. Richard Smiley (Ten., P&S) said he was a member of Faculty Affairs when the current effort started, after a faculty member’s class presentation was interpreted as disrespectful or racist or sexist or some other “ist.” Faculty Affairs was very concerned about the need to protect freedom of expression in the classroom and elsewhere in the University. He thanked President Bollinger for addressing the two issues in the statement that also made him—and perhaps Sen. Silverstein—uncomfortable. Sen. Smiley said that it is precisely when one person’s speech inflicts some pain or discomfort on another that the speech needs protection, because if no one is hurt, no one needs protection. He said that though the preamble was nicely written, it should perhaps be removed. He said he would support the resolution, but with a sense of disappointment that it doesn’t defend academic freedom more strongly, with a little less emphasis on the goodness of being respectful to our colleagues and everyone else. The problem with statements that call for speaking freely without being disrespectful is that the respect is almost always interpreted by the person receiving the speech. If that person is offended, and can then limit speech or academic endeavors, then we are in trouble.

Sen. Smiley’s other point was that he disagreed with President Bollinger’s remark that criticizing someone’s scholarship is limiting speech. Such critiques are not limiting speech, he said, but judging it. He said there is no reason to prevent judgments or comments on speech in decisions about whether to hire or tenure or fire someone.

Sen. Nanda said she was sorry to hear of Sen. Smiley’s disappointment with the resolution. She said it is difficult to make a statement about freedom of speech, particularly when the meanings of the words are based on interpretation. The interpretation of key words like “disrespect” or “abuse” clearly depend on the understanding of the person affected. She said that’s why, again, this resolution is a document of principle, because its proponents cannot create the rules, or tell people how to feel. The application of these principles is for the Rules Committee or the people

who enforce the Rules to decide. They need to make the decision whether something was respectful or disrespectful.

Sen. Eli Noam (Ten., Bus.) said he shared the concerns expressed by the president and Sens. Smiley and Silverstein. He said the External Relations Committee was actively working on a resolution dealing with free speech on campus, which overlaps with but is not the same thing as academic freedom. He said External Relations was also working with Student Affairs, which he understood had met that morning and provided feedback that his committee would try to address. External Relations hoped to vote on a new text in the coming week, and to present a resolution to the next plenary. He added that the discussion he was hearing now might have an impact on a resolution that External Relations would be bringing.

Sen. Nanda hoped to bring the present matter to a vote soon, because she would have to leave soon for a class.

Sen. Andrew Boyd (Stu., Arts) said an important part of free speech is the ability to gather together for political change. And one setting for that kind of expression is a union election. In multiple forums last year, students in the School of the Arts heard presentations from union organizers and faculty on both sides of the unionization issue. There was a good-faith assumption that the election would be determinative, either for or against the union. For the university to participate in an election, with the open debate that is characteristic of the University, and then to disregard the result when it turns out to be unfavorable seemed to Sen. Boyd a disrespectful act.

Sen. Boyd said he had hoped to ask President Bollinger a question about this earlier in the meeting when it was on topic, but he missed his chance. He said graduate students help teach classes, grade papers, perform lab work, and write research reports and grant applications. That work is necessary for the functioning of this university. Why does that work not qualify graduate students as workers?

The president said he would respond briefly because the Senate was now on another subject. He said the work graduate students do is extremely important. It is what universities do; they train the next generation, and try to add knowledge--that's their essential mission. President Bollinger said the University believes that bringing an intermediary like a union between the faculty and graduate students in that joint enterprise is a bad idea, and it's not required by law. He said this position is not in any way intended to be disrespectful of students.

President Bollinger understood the point that after holding an election that went against the University, the University seemed to be denying the will of the people. But under the law the only path that Columbia could take in pursuing its principled view through the courts was to participate first in the election.

President Bollinger asked for one more comment on academic freedom before a vote.

Sen. Smiley moved to strike from the resolution's preamble the words starting in the first sentence "following from the equality of all humankind; for freedom to extend to all, one person's freedom cannot extend to actions that bring about another person's gratuitous

suffering.” With the proposed change, the preamble would begin, “The founders of our country took freedom, like liberty, to be a self-evident first principle.” It would then go on to a new sentence, “We take the meaning of freedom from the Declaration of Independence....” The motion was seconded.

The president invited discussion.

Sen. Pollack confessed that he was the author of the sentence now under consideration, and argued against its removal. He said it was his secular statement of the Golden Rule: If you don’t want it done to you, don’t do it to someone else. He saw this idea as a baseline principle underlying the idea of academic freedom. He was prepared to subject this conviction to a vote.

Sen. Boyd expressed confusion about the statement in the preamble that freedom is a “self-evident first principle,” followed by the statement that freedom follows from the equality of all mankind. He suggested striking the phrase “following from the equality of all humankind.”

President Bollinger said that deletion was already in the motion to amend the resolution.

Sen. Boyd said he was proposing something different. Sen. Nanda said the Senate first had to vote on the motion on the floor.

President Bollinger then called for a vote by show of hands.

The amendment carried, 42-13.

The president said the language was struck. But he invited Sen. Pollack, unless there was strong objection from the Senate, to find another way or another place in the statement to articulate the thought that mattered to him and to offer that to the Senate later.

A senator noted a typo in the word “concerning” in the resolution’s title, which was noted.

The president then called for a vote on the amended resolution. It carried, 54-0.

Sen. Pollack thanked the Senate. He promised to take the president’s offer about the struck passage at face value, and to send his revision by the end of the day.

**Report by the Commission on the Status of Women on the [College of Physicians and Surgeons Pipeline Study: The Advancement of Women Faculty through the Academic Ranks](#).** Commission chair Jeanine D’Armiento (Ten., P&S) presented the report, along with Commission members Susan Witte (Ten., SW) and Melanie Wall, Professor of Biostatistics (in Psychiatry) at P&S. The three professors referred closely to a [series of slides](#) projected on a screen. Recorded here are some points not discussed in the slides.

Sen. Witte said the study began in 2015-16 with a request for faculty data from P&S. When those data were not forthcoming a year later, the Commission sought help from the Provost’s office. In a series of meetings with Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Chris Brown and his team, the Commission worked out a protocol for data gathering that could be applied to this and to future pipeline studies. They determined to use PeopleSoft, the University’s data system of

record, and to focus on what they called Data 1, categorization based on position and one's primary appointment. Sen. Witte said the group chose this approach because it's the standard used by the Provost's Office, it's consistent with other pipeline studies, it avoids potential double-counting in a future pipeline study at another CUMC school, and it was reviewed line by line to ensure highest quality and no errors. But the group also developed Data 2, an approach applying some rules used by P&S for counting based on administrative departments, which includes a small amount of multiple counting. The total P&S faculty, using Data 1, is about 2,000; using Data 2, it's 2,050, or 2.5 percent more.

After the presentation, Sen. O'Halloran invited Sen. Anne Taylor, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at P&S, to comment.

Sen. Taylor acknowledged the Commission's work. She said she has lived the life of a woman in academic medicine, and she agreed that there's more work to be done.

Sen. Taylor said she disagreed with some of the criteria the Commission had used for including or excluding faculty, but she didn't want to use this time to quibble about that issue. She preferred to add some context about the current national setting in academic medicine. Comparing Columbia's gender comparisons with aggregated data from the 130 medical schools in the United States and Canada, she said the overall percentage of women is about 38%; Columbia is at 47 percent. The percentage of female full professors is 21%; Columbia is at 27%. The percentage of female associate professors is 34% nationally; Columbia is at 42%. And the percentage of female assistant professors nationally is 44%; at Columbia it's 55%. These numbers signify the development of a pipeline. It takes time to move individuals through that pipeline, but Columbia has made progress.

Sen. Taylor said that a comparison of the proportion of tenured women at institutions that are really Columbia's peers, with similar criteria for tenure, shows Columbia at 21-22 percent, and ahead of its peers in the fraction of women on the tenure track: 39 percent. She said Columbia's success rate in promoting its tenure-track faculty is extremely high.

Again, Sen. Taylor said, changes will take time, particularly in tenure numbers. Physician scientists have an eleven-year tenure clock, and P&S will continue to hire men. But it is aggressively pursuing an expansion of tenure opportunities for women. It is also pursuing targeted recruitments of senior women, with the expectation that they will act as "rainmakers" for junior female colleagues.

Sen. Taylor said P&S is providing supports for its female faculty. The Virginia Kneeland Frantz Society for Women Faculty is committed to the support of women faculty, and has put together peer mentorship groups, and provided support to attend outside career development programs. P&S has also added policies to relieve some of the burden of family life, for both women and men, but the main impact will be on women. This is important work, Sen. Taylor said.

She said part of her job is to keep track of relevant data over time, even on in-depth measures for which there are no national comparisons. What steps should be taken to assure inclusiveness? P&S has done a salary equity controlling for specialty, rank, clinical productivity and research productivity, and did not find significant differences between men and women. It has addressed

the differences it did find. She commended the Senate Commission for its work, and expected to continue to be at it herself for the duration of her time at Columbia.

Sen. Ian Lipkin (Ten., Public Health) asked if the Commission was presenting data on P&S or on the entire Medical Campus.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Commission would continue its series of pipeline studies, alternating between schools at the uptown and Morningside campuses.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Commission is studying the structure of P&S in an effort to understand leadership. In a recent Senate survey of faculty quality of life, women at CUMC are much less happy than their female counterparts downtown. Many women uptown feel they don't have a voice. Why? The answer may be that they don't have a sufficient role in leading the institution. So faculty in the non-tenure-track ranks at P&S may be moving up to professor titles, but these are not tenured positions. In the positions they hold, they lose some sense of leadership. But very few women are in the leadership positions: among 27 departments there are three female chairs.

Sen. Lipkin pressed for clarity in the distinction between P&S and CUMC in its entirety. Sen. D'Armiento said that every slide of the Commission's study is about P&S. She added that P&S faculty comprise 86 percent of the CUMC faculty.

Sen. D'Armiento said the most important issue for the Commission is leadership. And a key recommendation is national searches for all of the leadership positions for departments, divisions, and centers. She said it is known that following such best practices will increase the proportion of female leaders. She said the Commission recognized the effort to grow the proportion of women in the non-tenure track faculty, but that is not the group the Commission is focusing on in the present report.

Sen. Taylor said appointments of department chairs at P&S are different from those on Morningside. P&S chairs are appointed for five-year terms and have much broader responsibilities; she said all of these appointments involve national searches. P&S requires its search firms to present a diverse slate of candidates. P&S also conducts national searches for a majority of division chiefs. There are also searches for other leadership positions.

Sen. Taylor's final comment was that there is a robust literature on male-to-female differences in job satisfaction in all disciplines across the national professoriate. In all of those studies, whether they focus on professional schools, the arts and sciences, or medicine, women are less satisfied than men. There are a multitude of reasons, which are a subject for another discussion. But that's a common finding, and P&S has developed focus groups to try to understand it.

Sen. Pollack said he appreciated the strategy of starting top-down, using "rainmakers," and stabilizing at steady state, but he asked to hear more about the concern for the actual daily life of non-tenure-track people, men and women, who have been a focus of concern for the Faculty Affairs Committee. These faculty, by the definitions of the Commission survey, are not going to achieve positions of leadership and influence, but they are nevertheless full-fledged human beings who may find themselves marginalized.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Commission would work with Faculty Affairs on understanding these data. She said the working conditions are different for non-tenure-track people. They can be let go on six months' notice, no matter how long they have served the University. Sen. D'Armiento said the Commission wants to share some of its data with other Senate committees as well. Referring to the Senate faculty quality-of-life survey, Sen. D'Armiento said women at CUMC were much less satisfied even than women at Morningside in similar professions. So the issue is not just about women, but about women at P&S.

**Resolution to Establish a Program Leading to an M.S. in Genetic Counseling (Education).** Sen. Irving Herman (Ten., SEAS) presented the [resolution](#) for Education. He said the program included elements of precision medicine and genomics. He said there are similar programs around the country but there remains a great need for new genetic counselors, which a Columbia program would serve.

Sen. Herman said the program would be led by Prof. Amanda Bergner of Genetics and Development, who was in the room to answer questions. He said the Education Committee unanimously approved the program.

A senator asked what additional resources would be needed to implement this program.

Prof. Bergner said that between New York Presbyterian Hospital and CUMC there are now 34 practicing genetic counselors. Many of them have teaching experience in other programs and outside of genetic counseling. So the faculty for the proposed program will come mainly from existing faculty. The degree is interdisciplinary, and the program will be using some existing courses in other departments. The courses created for the program will be taught primarily by leadership faculty, including an assistant program director and a director of research. But the rest of the classes will be taught by the genetic counselors that are already here.

There being no further comments, the president asked for a vote. The Senate unanimously approved the program.

The president adjourned the Senate shortly after 2:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff