

MEETING OF MARCH 30, 2018

President Lee Bollinger called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 in 104 Jerome Greene Hall. Fifty-one of 99 senators were present during the meeting.

Minutes and agenda. The minutes of February 23 and the agenda were adopted as proposed.

President's remarks. The president expressed surprise and delight that so many senators were present on this day, which was Good Friday and Passover eve.

He listed the following current University initiatives:

Capital campaign. Columbia is now in the first year of a five-year effort to raise \$5 billion, or \$1 billion a year. No university has ever reached that goal. The president was confident that this year's \$1 billion goal could be reached. A \$250 million gift to the Medical School from Roy and Diana Vagelos, which will take away all loans for medical students, has been announced. Another gift of \$400 million from the estate of Herbert and Florence Irving will support research and clinical efforts to fight cancer. The president said there have also been many other significant gifts.

Manhattanville. The new campus is unfolding, including the following projects:

—The Mind Brain Behavior facility is filling up, with 45 labs set up, and 10-15 more in the works. There is extensive community engagement in MBB, with training programs for health workers and opportunities for educational sessions for kids; soon there will be some restaurants on the ground floor.

—The Lenfest Center for the Arts is already fully active.

—The Forum building, nearing completion, will officially open next year.

—Two new Business School buildings will rise in the next four years. They will abut a central plaza, or quadrangle.

—Work is also starting on a project that may be a hotel or a residential facility for graduate students or faculty on Site Zero, as it's called, at the southwest corner of Broadway and 125th Street, where there is now a McDonald's. The president said such a project is financially feasible, and would provide vital support for all the activities on the new campus.

The president said it was still astonishing for him to say that in four years 4-6 thousand people—faculty, students and staff—will be populating the new campus. Planning efforts to integrate the Manhattanville campus with the Morningside and Washington Heights campuses are in full swing.

Other initiatives. The president said he expected to have an important announcement in the next month about a recruitment for the new cancer initiative based on the Irving gift. The precision medicine initiative continues to grow. The Global Centers are now a vital part of the life of the University, with grants for faculty groups who use the centers for research and for

undergraduates in the summer after their first year. Another major globalization initiative is Columbia World Projects, which the president first announced about a year ago. He appointed former Journalism School Dean Nicholas Lemann as director, and also engaged Avril Haines, a former deputy director of the CIA who also worked in the Obama White House. Prof. Ira Katznelson will return from sabbatical to organize seminars and conferences for CWP. Another new program linked to CWP will work with the Obama Foundation to bring one or two dozen young leaders from around the world to spend a year in residence at Columbia, to be lodged with CWP in the Forum Building in Manhattanville next fall. Much of the curriculum and involvement in the University for this group of leaders remains to be developed.

Another project involves the International Research Institute (IRI) at Lamont-Doherty led by Lisa Goddard. The president said the IRI does spectacular work on modeling for short-term climate change with ministries of agriculture around the world, to help farmers plan with better knowledge of soil and weather conditions over a five-year period.

Sen. Indira Martinez (Stu., SW) asked for more information about possible uses for funds raised in the capital campaign. Have the main decisions already been made?

The president said the capital campaign is built around a number of major university efforts bringing academic work to bear on practical world problems, such as climate change, just societies, and some other big themes. But the capital campaign must also raise money to support the basic work of the University. It's important to have an exciting set of initiatives to engage people with wealth, but these people must also be drawn in to support perennial needs, such as financial aid, professorships, research funds, etc.

The president said every school also has its own piece of the capital campaign. So Arts and Sciences is seeking well over \$1 billion for its needs, which the Columbia College Core to Commencement initiative is supporting. Two other schools—General Studies and the School of the Arts—urgently need financial aid funding. The Law School has its own priorities. So there are many different pieces of an overall effort to raise \$5 billion. Columbia didn't set out looking for a major cancer gift, but it came in and the University can put that toward something the Medical School already wants to build, but also for research on Morningside involving the Arts and Sciences and Engineering.

Sen. Daniel Savin said the Research Officers Committee, which he chairs, was concerned about having sufficient housing for the 4-6 thousand people coming to Manhattanville, particularly for post-doctoral research scientists and fellows. Post-doctoral work is a critical, vulnerable stage in the academic pipeline, and Columbia does not provide guaranteed housing for post-docs, as some peer institutions in New York City do. Sen. Savin said researchers were discussing this issue with various administrators, but he particularly wanted to bring it to the president's attention.

The president said the need for housing is acute—not only for post-docs but also for faculty and graduate students. Columbia must balance housing needs with all of its other needs. He said Manhattanville is an important step in providing more housing. He didn't want to provide numbers at this point, but said Site Zero (the McDonald's site) could make a difference. There's also another site just north of the Nash Building on the east side of Broadway at 133rd Street

where Columbia is entitled to put up a residential building under the terms of its master plan with the City. There's provision for still another residential building on the Manhattanville campus. The president said researchers may want to talk about these possibilities.

Sen. Yashshri Soman (Stu., SIPA) asked about the process for selecting the Obama Foundation. Are other foundations under consideration too for future projects? Also, will Columbia partner with the foundation in paying the costs that will be incurred for the fellows who will be using University resources, or is Columbia paying all of those costs?

The president said Columbia has been jointly raising funds with the foundation to support the program.

As for the selection process for fellows, the president said there has been a process of trying to get some quick applications in. Both sides wanted to get the process started, and 10 or 12 fellows were selected. In his letter announcing the program, he had explained that there will be a more formal application process for the following year. Columbia is now trying to hire an administrator for the Obama fellows.

Sen. Ramond Curtis (Stu., GS) expressed appreciation for the president's remarks about fundraising as a priority for the School of General Studies. He said the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was pleased to learn in *Spectator* during the past week that Columbia World Projects will focus its inaugural initiative in part on food insecurity. He noted that SAC is a founding partner of the Food Bank at Columbia, a student-led initiative over the last two years to highlight and combat food insecurity on the Columbia campus. Sen. Curtis asked how the administration would increase its support for the Food Bank.

The president said many had worked on this hunger initiative, including EVP for Student Life Suzanne Goldberg and Columbia College Dean James Valentini. The president said the University does not want students to go hungry, and strives to provide strong financial aid for students who need it. The expectation is that this aid would prevent food insecurity; at the same time students sometimes make choices that leave them needier than they or the University want them to be. In such situations the University helps as much as it can.

EVP Goldberg thanked Sen. Curtis for his leadership of the Food Bank projects. She noted the good news of recent increases in funding for the Food Bank, and said the support will continue.

Preliminary discussion of revisions to the current policy on romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and students (Commission on the Status of Women, Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs). Executive Committee chair Sharyn O'Halloran (Ten., SIPA) said there would be preliminary presentations of the proposed changes in the policy from representatives of the three committees involved, with a chance for questions and comments. A final version would be circulated in time for the next (and last) plenary.

Student Affairs Committee co-chair Josh Schenk (CC) said the current policy places restrictions on sexual and romantic relationships between faculty and students only in cases where a faculty member has direct authority over a student. In such a situation the policy requires faculty members to recuse themselves from any academic decisions or activities affecting the student.

Sen. Schenk outlined SAC's three main objections to the current policy.

The first is about professionalism. Faculty members are entrusted with the education and mentoring of students. In SAC's view, the University's educational mission is broken when professors engage in sexual and romantic relationships with students. Faculty members hold a special position in the Columbia community, requiring all of them to serve as trusted mentors to all students regardless of whether or not the mentoring is direct.

A second problem involves the restriction on the prohibition of sexual relationships in the current policy to professors who have a supervisory role in students' lives. The dynamics of an educational institution—particularly the collaboration of faculty across departments—ensures that any faculty member may have some authority or influence on any students, who are all only one or two degrees of separation away.

Sen. Schenk said the third, and most important, problem concerns the power dynamic. Faculty inherently exercise power over their students, and sexual and romantic relationships can open the floodgates to abuse or exploitation. Because of this power differential, relationships between faculty and students will inevitably be perceived as coercive.

Sen. Schenk said a comprehensive ban on all sexual and romantic relationships between undergraduates and faculty members would align with policies at most peer institutions.

Sen. Greg Freyer (NT, Public Health), said his committee—Faculty Affairs—had discussed the proposed revision at length, and agreed at least that there should be more discussion about it. He said representatives of the three committees had postponed including graduate students in the policy to make sure they could get a policy on undergraduates passed this semester.

Sen. Freyer noted his own concern—despite the decision to leave them out of the policy for the time being—that doctoral students are the most vulnerable students because they unavoidably have intimate relationships with faculty. Sen. Freyer looked forward to a robust discussion of a policy for graduate students in the coming year. But he said a policy protecting undergraduates seemed to have the support of most of his colleagues and certainly of the students. He agreed that sexual relationships destroy the trust that is so vital to faculty-student relationships.

Sen. Freyer said the final piece of the policy is enforcement. Often department heads and other observers know when a sexual relationship between a professor and a student is going on, but turn a blind eye to it. Sen. Freyer said that that is a culture that needs to end.

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S), chair of the Commission on the Status of Women, said her group agreed that undergraduates and graduate students should be separated because the case of graduates students is much more complex. She invited questions.

Sen. O'Halloran said the General Counsel was reviewing the present revision of the policy, particularly its handling of enforcement issues. She said a revised draft would be presented to the Senate after this vetting.

The President said the Senate would see the policy again after the General Counsel and other administration offices, including Title IX, are comfortable with it. The president could then sign off on the policy, and return it to the Senate in mid-April for final action.

Sen. O'Halloran said the Senate generated this issue, and now must make sure that the language is consistent with law and that can it be used to build a policy that can also accommodate graduate students.

In response to a question from Sen. Susan MacGregor (NT, Journalism), Sen. D'Armiento said the policy would count anyone overseeing a student as faculty.

Sen. MacGregor said this was a significant decision in the policy—to apply it even if the “faculty member” is also an undergraduate teaching assistant.

Sen. Regina Martuscello (Research Officers), a postdoc, asked about possible exemptions, such as for older undergraduates, or for individuals who had relationships before they came to Columbia.

Sen. D'Armiento said the commission imagined many potential exemptions. For example, a professor's partner could suddenly decide to enroll as an undergraduate at Columbia. But she said the general principle in the proposed policy is clear, and she was confident that the General Counsel could develop a process for ruling on unusual cases.

Sen. O'Halloran agreed that a procedure for disclosure and handling of unusual relationships would be left to the General Counsel.

Sen. Freyer thought the fundamental issue is not the age difference between the faculty and student, but the power difference. A 30-year-old faculty member with a twenty-something student in a different discipline still has power over that student.

Sen. James Applegate (Ten., Natural Sciences), a member of Faculty Affairs, said exceptions to the rule were only one of a number of problems with the present proposal. He objected that condemning a consensual relationship between a 30-year-old undergraduate in the School of General Studies and a 35-year-old professor in the Medical School is paranoid to the point of requiring serious professional psychiatric help.

Sen. D'Armiento said the commission had seriously discussed this issue, and agreed that the disclosure process must be able to address cases like the one Sen. Applegate had outlined. But she thought that, with a provision for exceptions, a policy banning any relationship with an undergraduate makes basic sense.

Sen. O'Halloran said it was sensible to have a broad statement based on a principle, but also to allow for flexibility under certain circumstances.

Update from EVP for University Life Suzanne Goldberg on her office's student well-being survey. Sen. Goldberg passed out buttons publicizing the survey, a university-wide instrument in three parts that is meant for all Columbia students. The first concerns student life and the campus climate, focusing on students' experiences, what helps students thrive, and what

the main stressors are, including issues related to immigration, national politics, and the search for jobs. The second part is a collaboration with the World Health Organization, which is studying mental health in 15 countries. The third part concerns gender-based misconduct, following up on the AAU survey that Columbia did a few years ago and providing valuable comparative data.

Sen. Goldberg said the well-being questionnaire is a state-of-the-art survey, with contributions from Columbia faculty, students and staff. The questions are all validated, meaning that the data in the survey will be of a high quality. The challenge will be to assure strong participation. One result will be a paper published by University Life. She said there will be student ambassadors in all of the schools, and she appealed to senators to encourage widespread participation. She said an early report on participation has been encouraging. The survey will run until April 30. She said her survey would be an important complement to the biennial Student Affairs Committee quality-of-life survey.

Apology for poor scheduling. Sen. O'Halloran apologized to the Senate for errors that resulted in scheduling the present plenary on the same day as Good Friday and the eve of Passover. She said that Faculty Affairs Committee co-chair Robert Pollack (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) wanted a statement to this effect since several committee members could not attend.

Staff director Geraldine McAllister then read aloud the following note:

Dear Senate Colleagues,

I'm writing to report on a discussion and vote that took place at our most recent meeting of FAC. We didn't have substantive issues with the proposal of freedom of expression that the plenary will discuss and vote on today. We did however wish to call attention to the ironic situation that some of our members and therefore likely some of the other members of the plenary also wouldn't be able to attend the discussion and vote because the plenary is convened on Good Friday, a day that this year ends with the celebration of Passover.

We resolved by a vote of nine to one with one abstention that we would ask the plenary to delay the vote so that a full attendance would not be in conflict with anyone's personal religious observations. Subsequently it has become clear that this would mean a delay until next academic year. Therefore I'm writing on behalf of FAC to ask the plenary and the Executive Committee to assure that the Senate will make every effort in the future to respect the diversity of religious observances of our wonderfully diverse University community. With that assurance FAC will not object to a vote at this plenary.

Bob Pollack, co-chair, Faculty Affairs Committee

Sen. O'Halloran said that as someone who celebrates both holidays she particularly appreciated that statement.

Resolution in Support of Freedom of Expression on Campus (External Relations Committee and Student Affairs Committee). Sens. Eli Noam (Ten., Bus.) and James Piacentini (Stu., GSAPP) presented the resolution. Sen. Noam resumed a discussion of the proposed resolution that began at the previous plenary. At that meeting the resolution met with

support as well as some helpful criticism from the president, who Sen. Noam said is not only Columbia's administrative leader, but also a global intellectual leader on issues of free speech. After the meeting the proponents pored over the record of the meeting and made all the revisions requested, except for one provision specifying the composition of the board that would organize town hall meetings on contentious issues—a provision the proponents considered premature.

Then the resolution went through further vetting in the Executive Committee and again in External Relations. There were also complaints about an apparent proliferation of whereas clauses, though this was a response to fresh concerns that arose in the vetting process. Sen. Noam estimated that for every committee meeting where the resolution was discussed, another 1.9 whereas clauses were added. There followed an editorial process in which 15 whereas clauses were compressed into six without making any substantive changes. The result was the document now before the Senate.

Sen. Noam said the proponents had made the substantive case for the resolution at the previous plenary. Now he added only that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. This realization comes periodically, usually after some big blow-up, such as the one 50 years ago that led to the creation of the Senate, a blow-up that Columbia is marking this spring. Only months after its inaugural meeting in 1969, the Senate passed a resolution to protect freedom of expression after a speech by an controversial invited speaker—University of San Francisco President S. I. Hayakawa—was disrupted by protesters.

Similarly, in October 2001, immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, a successful Senate resolution from Student Affairs supported Muslim groups facing the resulting backlash in the name of freedom of expression.

Now again, Sen. Noam said, the political climate is contentious, though there are no flare-ups on campus at the moment. That relative calm provides a good opportunity to let principles—not events—drive deliberations.

Beyond the whereas clauses, which are meant to show sensitivity to historically marginalized groups whose right to speak and protest must be protected, the resolution offers two governing ideas that have been absent from past resolutions. The basic message of most of those resolutions is, "We're in favor of free speech." Sen. Noam said everyone is in favor of free speech. The problem is that everyone has a few exceptions. The proponents wanted to make the present resolution more substantive, in two ways:

1. By establishing a standard against which determinations of relevant rights can be measured, along with such concepts as time, place, and manner, imminent danger, incitement, and so on. Under these conditions, the University could rely not on ad hoc administrative decisions, but on the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which has been interpreted by courts over decades, as a presumptive guideline, which it could in certain circumstances choose not to follow.
2. By founding a board, drawn from Senate constituencies, to convene town hall meetings to address controversial or unpopular topics on campus.

Sen. Piacentini said it had been a wonderful experience to draft the present resolution over the past year, and then to incorporate as many suggestions as possible from different groups. He expressed gratitude for all the comments that had been offered, above all from his fellow members of External Relations and Student Affairs.

President Bollinger said he would never have drafted the whereases as the two committees had done. Because he is an expert on free speech issues, it is a challenge for him not to pick words apart throughout the resolution. He said there were a dozen places where his First Amendment hackles went up. But he said he would put all of those reservations aside, because of two valuable basic points made in the resolution, and because he admired the effort.

The president said the University Senate has an important role to play in understanding principles of free speech and academic freedom on campus. He said the office of University Life was created to deal with such issues as well, but the Senate is an appropriate body.

The president said freedom of expression is a complicated issue, which often starts with general agreement followed by contention about specifics, as Sen. Noam had outlined. The president said this will be a perpetual problem for the University, which is appropriate because it's a core issue.

The president reiterated a few basic points. One is that Columbia, unlike public institutions such as Berkeley or Michigan, is not bound by the First Amendment in its handling of outside speakers. As a private university, Columbia is not engaged in state action within the meaning of the First Amendment. The key point is that Columbia has nevertheless chosen to embrace policies on academic freedom and freedom of speech on campus that largely match the requirements of the First Amendment. Every single year, student groups at Columbia invite speakers to campus whose messages are deeply offensive and inflammatory and hurtful to other members of the community. Schools and deans and departments also invite speakers to campus who say the most outrageous things we can imagine—denying the Holocaust, advocating the destruction of Israel, etc. Columbia chooses to protect such speech. At this same time, the university makes room for protest, and must make carefully calibrated judgments about when protest—itself a form of speech—becomes disruption of other speech and therefore outside the bounds of protection under the principle of free speech. Such judgments, which the University is making all the time, are closely based on the First Amendment.

The president therefore accepted the resolution's statement that the First Amendment is a baseline reference point. But he also opposed making Columbia's guideline an exact copy of the First Amendment, because it could be interpreted differently in the future from the way it is interpreted now, as it has been interpreted differently in the past.

The president noted that some major First Amendment scholars take the opposite position—that the First Amendment should *not* be the reference point for private universities. He said this is a legitimate debate. But Columbia has chosen the current understanding of the First Amendment as its reference point.

A second point was that the effect of free speech and academic freedom in real life is to anger and upset a lot of people on all sides, and it would be valuable for the Senate to set up a standing committee with a mandate to provide forums in which such feelings and views could be

expressed and debated. The president said the university already tries to do that, with town hall meetings and discussions around the campus. But the president thought having the Senate take some responsibility for this effort is a valuable idea. As he had said at the previous plenary, he could not endorse the resolution's call for University financial support, as he could not endorse the idea that the Senate can vote the budget of the University. But he said that he would be content with the provision if it included the word "reasonable" before "financial support." He concluded that the resolution was a good thing to vote for.

Sen. Indira Martinez (Stu., SW) said that the president's comments were thoughtful, but that she had a question about protest—the issue she thinks about the most when she considers freedom of expression. She said the power of protest is in its function as a mechanism for change and for holding power accountable.

The president asked Sen. Martinez if she recognized that the institution has to draw a line setting a boundary on acceptable protest. Sen. Martinez said she did. But she also asked for clarification of the president's use of the term "disruptive" to describe protests.

The president offered the example of a highly controversial speaker. If demonstrators stand in the back of the room and hold up signs protesting the speaker, that's considered an acceptable, protected form of protest. But if the demonstrators walk to the front of the room and put the signs in such a way as to block the view of the speaker, that's problematic from the standpoint of the University. If the demonstrators come up on the stage, take the microphone from the speaker, or take over the event and won't let the speaker back, that's a level of violation of the speech that the university can't allow. He agreed that the right description of such conduct may not be "disruptive," but something like "denial of speech by other parties." He said these examples show the range of dissent that the university has to address.

Sen. Ramond Curtis (Stu., GS) focused on "disruptive" as a term to describe certain controversial outside speakers on campus. Sometimes a speaker's entire purpose is simply to be inflammatory and disruptive rather than educational. He appreciated the idea that the Rules could reduce that kind of disruption.

The president said he wasn't sure he understood Sen. Curtis's point.

Sen. Curtis said he was thinking of the Rules as a way to curb the disruption caused by outside speakers such as the anti-immigrant activist Tommy Robinson, who spoke by Skype to a meeting organized by the Columbia University College Republicans last October.

The president repeated that he may not have understood Sen. Curtis's point.

Sen. D'Armiento said Sen. Curtis might be referring to the last part of the resolution's second resolved clause, which said the Senate steering committee setting up town hall meetings would "consider proposals for such meetings from campus groups, including those aggrieved by the inclusion or exclusion of a public speaker or event."

Sen. Curtis said the students who protested the Tommy Robinson event were not disruptive during his speech. They were seen as disruptive because of certain technical aspects of their

protest. If there had been a more informed discussion, of the kind called for at the end of the second resolved clause, the troublesome situation with Tommy Robinson would not have arisen, and the community could have held a much deeper discussion, without people who come to campus to disrupt the pursuit of knowledge.

Sen. O'Halloran said that such a town hall meeting would not necessarily prevent that controversial guest speaker from coming to campus. It would just be a way for people to hold an additional discussion about issues raised by that speaker.

Sen. O'Halloran asked if Sen. Martinez's questions had been addressed.

The president offered his own formulation. When controversial speakers come to campus and many Columbia people feel very upset about the messages of the speaker or the setting in which the speaker is invited, the present Senate resolution provides an opportunity to express their views in opposition to the speaker in a separate town hall meeting. He supported this aim. He recalled that when Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad came to campus in 2007, the university provided a very large forum for dissent on campus outside the event, as well as (to a limited extent) inside. The president said it is important to facilitate counter-speech.

The president expressed dissatisfaction with the term *exclusion* in the very last phrase of the second resolved clause. He said the university would only exclude a speaker if it determined that the threat of violence was too great. Any other grounds for exclusion sounded too much to him like censorship.

Sen. D'Armiento said the reference to people "upset" by an outside speaker was really an attempt to acknowledge people who feel deeply threatened by that speaker. She said the "exclusion" clause recognized a possible future occasion in which the University could decide not to invite some outside speaker.

Sen. Noam explained that the word *exclusion* was in the resolution because of a comment at the last plenary from Sen. Irving Herman (Ten., SEAS), that sometimes outside speakers cannot come not because of the threat of a particular disruption but because of pressure on the inviting organization to disinvite the speaker. When this situation occurs (as it has on campuses around the country), disappointed people could request a discussion of those controversial views at a town hall meeting.

The president recognized this point.

Sen. Omar Khan (Stu., CC) said he supported the principles underlying the resolution, but had a question about a matter of process in the handling of the Rules of Conduct. He asked whether the resolution's proponents or the President could speak about policy reforms that may have been made in response to a petition last fall from faculty members to the Rules Committee about the administration's handling of the protests at the Tommy Robinson event. One issue raised in that petition was the provost's decision to issue a preemptive ban on participation in future demonstrations by students who had been accused of Rules violations in the Tommy Robinson protests but had not yet been tried.

Sen. Khan said another issue raised in the faculty petition was a possible conflict among the multiple roles that Sen. Suzanne Goldberg plays, as EVP for University Life, as Rules Administrator, and as primary investigator in Rules cases.

The president recalled that the initial ban on participation in future events imposed on certain students who had been involved in the demonstration against Tommy Robinson was reversed. He asked Sen. Goldberg for a more detailed recollection.

Sen. Goldberg said the Rules prohibit her, as Rules Administrator, from speaking in detail about that episode. But she said she had added some relevant material to the question-and-answer section of the Rules of Conduct page on the University Life site in response to related questions that had come up. She noted that some of the questions from the community were not based on what had really happened. She said a fuller answer to Sen. Khan's question would take some time, and might be better saved for another meeting. But there were some thoughts on her Rules page about her own multiple roles, which Sen. Khan had characterized as conflicted. She said she had assured the Student Affairs Committee that she was prepared to share information about the Rules to make them less mysterious, even though she is prohibited from talking about particular cases.

Sen. Eric Tang (Stu., Law) said he supported the resolution. He particularly appreciated the provision for town hall meetings, as a way to assure that opinions of those who are not in the majority are heard and considered.

Sen. James Rappaport (Stu., CC) spoke briefly in support of the resolution.

The president invited his colleague Sen. Vincent Blasi (Ten., Law) to comment. Sen. Blasi said he supported the resolution.

The president determined that the Senate was ready to vote. By voice vote, the Senate unanimously approved the resolution, without abstentions. There was applause.

Sen. Noam offered thanks to External Relations Committee chair Howard Worman (Ten., P&S), SAC leaders Josh Schenk (CC) and Sonya Nanda (Business), Sen. Piacentini, Sen. James Applegate (a conversation with whom a year ago eventually led to the present resolution), and the Senate staff. He also thanked President Bollinger for establishing a climate on campus that made it possible for the Senate to come together and adopt such a resolution unanimously, and also Columbia students who, unlike some of their counterparts at other universities, are working with the faculty and administration to make their campus a place where reason rules.

The president returned the thanks. He also expressed appreciation for the resolution on academic freedom from the Faculty Affairs and Student Affairs committees, particularly its affirmation that having principles on academic freedom and freedom of expressions doesn't mean we have to be rude, uncivil, etc. He said the academic community strives within its own environment to reserve a sense of commitment to reason and facts and truth.

[Report on the Student Quality of Life Survey 2017-2018](#) (Student Affairs Committee) Sen. O'Halloran thanked Ashli Carter and Prof. Modupe Robinson—both from the Business School—

for their help with the preparation of the SAC report, as well as Columbia College student Thet Naing for his work on the data analysis.

Sens. Izzet Kebudi (SEAS), SAC vice chair, and Ramond Curtis (GS), co-chair of SAC's subcommittee for students with disabilities, then presented the report, flanked by Mr. Naing; Columbia College student Dante Mazza, the SAC chief of staff, and Soo Lee, a GS student and co-chair of the subcommittee for students with disabilities. The presenters referred closely to the report's slides.

At the end of the report, SAC co-chair Sonya Nanda (Bus.) announced that SAC would soon be providing the full report, including a school-by-school breakdown, which has been useful in past years in developing policy recommendations.

The president thanked the students for the presentation.

Report on NROTC (Jeffrey Kysar, Faculty Advisor to NROTC). Prof. Kysar, a former senator, introduced Captain Heedong Choi, commanding officer of the Naval ROTC program on campus. He said the headquarters for the local NROTC program is at SUNY Maritime University, under the Throgs Neck Bridge in the Bronx, where Capt. Choi is responsible for 146 students enrolled through Columbia, SUNY Maritime, Malloy College, and Fordham.

Columbia contributes 11 students to this Naval ROTC program. It arranges for students to travel to SUNY Maritime once or twice a week. The 11 students represent Barnard, Columbia College, General Studies, and the Engineering School. It is now a May tradition that graduating NROTC students are commissioned into the Navy or the Marine Corps in Low Library on the day after Commencement. This year three students will be commissioned, two from Barnard and one from Columbia College. One of the Barnard students will be commissioned as a Surface Warfare Officer, the other as a flight officer. The CC student will be commissioned as a naval aviator and go to flight school.

Prof. Kysar noted that last May the first NROTC graduate from Barnard was commissioned into the Navy. He said it was wonderful to have cadets from all over the university.

Sen. Kysar said Columbia's Naval ROTC program is in good hands and at steady state, with its students flourishing. He said NROTC is continuing the mission it was intended to pursue when it was brought back to Columbia in 2012—to provide opportunities for Columbia students who want to pursue military careers, especially in the Navy. He was also proud to say that Columbia NROTC students are again excellent ambassadors within the military and in the broader society.

The president thanked Prof. Kysar and Captain Choi. He adjourned the meeting at around 3 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff