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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 it can 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
RESOLUTION CONCERNING SUMMER POWERS

BE IT RESOLVED that the Executive Committee be empowered to represent the University Senate in all matters within its jurisdiction from today until the first meeting of the full Senate in September 2018, and that the Executive Committee act, insofar as possible, on the basis of policies already established by the Senate, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in matters pertaining to Senate constituencies with no representation on the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee will consult with the senators from these constituencies.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that at the Senate’s first meeting next fall, the Executive Committee report fully to the Senate on any actions taken under summer powers.

Proponent:

Executive Committee
RESOLUTION TO ADOPT A REVISED POLICY ON ROMANTIC AND SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FACULTY/STAFF AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approve the attached revision of the policy on romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and students.

Proponents:
Student Affairs Committee
Faculty Affairs Committee
Commission on the Status of Women
REVISED POLICY ON ROMANTIC AND SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FACULTY/STAFF AND UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Background

Columbia University’s educational mission is promoted by the professionalism of its faculty-student relationships. This professionalism is reflected not only in the quality of the intellectual exchange between faculty and students but also in the nature of their interactions as members of a community of scholars. The academic freedom traditionally accorded to members of the faculty imposes a correlative obligation of responsible self-discipline, one which acknowledges the power they exercise over students and the importance of protecting against its abusive or exploitative use.

Romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and students pose a threat to academic professionalism as they compromise the faculty members’ judgment of students. More importantly, because of the power differential, romantic and sexual relationships between faculty and students are highly susceptible to being experienced as non-consensual or coercive.

Undergraduate students are particularly vulnerable to the power asymmetry of the student-teacher relationship. In recognition of that, this policy modifies the current policy of the University with respect to undergraduate students which states that no faculty member is to have a romantic or sexual relationship with any student over whom he or she has or might reasonably expect to have academic or professional authority. The current University policies with respect to romantic relationships between faculty and other students (including but not limited to graduate students, non-degree students, and/or executive students) remain in effect.

Policy Text

Rule

No faculty member may initiate or accept sexual or romantic advances or engage in a romantic or sexual relationship with any undergraduate student enrolled in Columbia College, the Fu Foundation School of Engineering and Applied Science, the School of General Studies, or Barnard College or other affiliate of Columbia, regardless of whether or not the faculty member has a supervisory role over the student.

These restrictions against romantic and/or sexual relationships with undergraduate students apply to all officers of instruction, research, administration, and the libraries. The restrictions also apply to graduate students with appointments as student officers of instruction and research and graduate
teaching assistants, graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants, and tutors, during any period of time they are teaching, advising or supervising an undergraduate student. “Undergraduate student” includes those enrolled in any program at the University or an affiliate as well as any undergraduate student employee or volunteer at the University. This policy is also applicable to any member of the Columbia community who has authority over a student such as directors of student organizations, athletic coaches, or supervisors of student employees, in addition to all staff and other members of the community who may mentor or evaluate students.

Sanctions

Failure to comply with this policy may lead to disciplinary action up to and including termination and may adversely affect decisions on promotion and tenure.

Reporting

Faculty or staff who observe, learn of, or otherwise know about a romantic or sexual relationship in violation of this policy must report what they know to the University’s Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) (eoaa.columbia.edu).

Students, faculty, and staff concerned about consensual romantic relationships involving others in their programs or classes are encouraged to speak with their dean, chair or other head of unit in which they are working to ensure that they are able to complete their academic and/or professional work without issue. Students concerned about romantic relationships involving others in their programs or classes are encouraged to speak with EOAA.

For advice regarding disclosure, reporting or assistance on the appropriate course of action, any faculty member, staff member or student may consult with EOAA, consistent with University policies and federal regulations. At all times, the institutional response shall keep the student’s educational aims and needs foremost.

Responsibilities

Should a romantic or sexual relationship with a student lead to a charge of sexual harassment or sexual assault against a faculty member, the University is obligated to investigate and resolve the charge in accordance with the Columbia University Employee Policy and Procedures on Discrimination and Harassment, Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking, a copy of which may be found online at: http://eoaa.columbia.edu/. Questions regarding the Consensual Romantic and Sexual Relationship Policies or the Employee Policy and Procedures on Discrimination and Harassment, Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence and Stalking should be directed to EOAA, 103 Low Memorial Library, 212-854-5918, eoaa@columbia.edu.
Exclusions & Special Situations

In certain unusual circumstances, where explicit written authorization has been obtained from the Provost (in matters involving faculty) or the Vice President of Human Resources (in matters involving staff) in consultation with Office of the General Counsel, romantic and/or sexual relationships with undergraduate students may be permitted.
RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A PROGRAM LEADING TO AN M.D./M.A. IN BIOMEDICAL INFORMATICS (P&S AND GSAS)

WHEREAS, many medical students wish to complement their medical education with research and training in the science of information and empirical discovery, the foundation of computational techniques, and the application of these techniques to medicine, biology, and public health; and

WHEREAS, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences master’s program in biomedical informatics offers a uniform foundation in the field with core courses in methods, techniques, and theories, while objectives and domain electives will enable medical students to apply these methods to and perform quality research in clinical informatics, public health informatics, or translational informatics; and

WHEREAS, modern medicine requires a cadre of professionals who can bridge the divide between medicine and technology, able to distinguish which interventions are both important and feasible from those which are neither important nor feasible; and

WHEREAS, Columbia’s medical students have expressed interest in such a combined program and a number have already enrolled in the master’s program; and

WHEREAS, there is only one comparable program in the Northeast and only three nationally; and

WHEREAS, graduates of the program will be qualified to work as clinical faculty, non-clinical faculty or research scientists;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Senate approve the creation of a joint program leading to an M.D./M.A. in Biomedical Informatics.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Education Committee review the program five years after its inauguration.

Proponent:

Education Committee
1. Purpose

The purpose of the MD/MA program is to integrate graduate-level training in Biomedical Informatics with the training of medical students. Information technology and methodology are critical to medicine. Medical students have continually shown interest in additional training in biomedical informatics, as complementary to medicine, because Informatics and Health Information Technology have become important components to healthcare. The combined MD/MA program in Biomedical Informatics will be geared to medical students who desire to broaden their medical training with a foundation, research, and practical experience in biomedical informatics. The content of the combined program will be similar to that of our MA program, consisting of core courses, educational objectives, and research in Biomedical Informatics. Our aim is to develop research and computational skills for medical students. This combined program will be greater than the individual programs, and will enable medical students the opportunity to contribute to and become innovators in improving health care with solutions involving information technology and data science.

b. How does the new program relate to ongoing programs? Will it replace any existing program(s)? Does the proposed program completely or partially duplicate (an) existing program(s) in any other unit of the University?

This MD/MA program is unique within Columbia University in that it will be a combination of the medical degree program and the MA program in Biomedical Informatics department in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It will be geared specifically to those medical students who desire to enhance their medical training with research and training in the science of information and empirical discovery, the foundation of computational techniques, and the application of these techniques to medicine, biology, and public health. Our discipline is motivated by the desire to make new biomedical discoveries, to enable safe and high-quality health care, and to improve the health of the population using computational and information science techniques. Our curriculum is designed to provide a uniform foundation in our field by including core courses, which provide a foundation in general Biomedical Informatics methods, techniques, and theories, while objectives and domain electives will enable medical students to apply these methods to and to perform quality research in one or more areas of specialization in clinical informatics, public health informatics, or translational informatics. Currently DBMI offers the following graduate-level programs: a PhD program, a combined MD/PhD program, a postdoctoral degree or non-degree program funded by the National Library of Medicine and an MA program. Except for the combined MD/PhD program, the other programs are standalone and medical students enrolled in the MA degree when they had already graduated from medical school. The missions of the Medical School and the Department of Biomedical Informatics involve training future leaders and scientists in each respective field. The proposed combined program furthers the mission of the Medical School and the Department of Biomedical Informatics by providing a multidisciplinary educational experience that is not available in either program alone. Upon successful completion of the program, graduates are expected to have a strong foundation in the fundamental techniques of
biomedical informatics as well as in medicine, and will have a stronger ability to face the current challenges in health care related to informatics, data science, and computational technology.

2. Need:
a. Why is the proposed program needed locally, statewide or nationally?

The full potential of health information technology to improve patient outcomes and safety will require a cadre of professionals who can bridge the divide between medicine and technology. Development of usable and safe health IT requires oversight by physicians who also have a deep understanding of the potential and limitations of technology. These hybrid professionals, trained in both medicine and biomedical informatics, will be able to distinguish which interventions are both important and feasible from those which are neither important nor feasible. Furthermore, these hybrid professionals will focus on usability and workflow, two critical areas that often determine whether a health IT intervention will be useful and successful, that have largely been ignored. The goal of the MD-Masters dual program is to train these key participants so that they can oversee the development and implementation of useful, safe and effective technology into the complex medical space. The dual MD/MA degree is more beneficial for students than two separate degrees taken sequentially. When students with an interest in informatics take the MD and MA degrees sequentially, then they get less opportunity to do advanced research. When it is done sequentially, they get their MD research time before they have done their MA degree. As a result, their MD research addresses relatively trivial problems. If they take the MA during the MD, before the fourth year of medical school, they are better prepared for research, and then they can carry out advanced informatics research during their fourth year of medical school. There are also logistical benefits for them. If they apply for an internship after their degrees and they do them sequentially, then they would have to spend about a month of time on interviews in the first semester of the MA program, which is difficult to do with courses. If they do the combined program, then the interviews fall during their research time, which is more flexible to schedule.

b. Have students at the University or elsewhere requested this program? How many?

A number of current MD students at Columbia University have shown interest in a combined program, and some MD students are spending a month in our department during their research rotations to learn more about the field. In addition, students who have MD degrees from Columbia University or elsewhere have taken our standalone MA degree. Overall, there have been about 12 MDs who have graduated or are currently enrolled in our standalone MA program. Some of the MDs enrolled in our MA program shortly after finishing their MD degrees and others enrolled later. Some of them enrolled as part-time students and others enrolled as full-time students. Most of the full-time students took more than 1 year to finish the program because they required more time to complete their research and Master’s essay. We have also have had a continuous group of about 3-5 MDs each year enrolled in our MA program who were or still are postdoctoral fellows funded by the National Library of Medicine.
c. If the program is career or professionally oriented, have persons in the profession or career requested establishment of the program? Have the employment needs of professionals in the field been taken into account when designing the program?

MD students have requested establishment of the program. Our MA program is geared to train a broad range of career interests, and has taken into account training needs of MDs in biomedical informatics. The strength of our program in meeting the employment needs of MDs in the field is demonstrated by the productive careers of many of our graduates. 37 MDs have completed an MA degree from our program (as postdoctoral fellows or standalone students) who are now current leaders involved in health informatics positions in academia and industry, have faculty appointments in clinical departments, or are working in healthcare technology positions. These MDs would not have been as well prepared for leadership roles in biomedical informatics without training in our program.

d. What other institutions in the metropolitan area and in the Northeast offer similar programs?

The only other dual MD-Master’s degree program in Biomedical Informatics in the Northeast is offered by The Robert Wood Johnson Medical School in conjunction with the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey and the New Jersey Institute of Technology. This program is an MD/MS program and is available to Robert Wood Johnson Medical School students after completion of the second year and may result in program completion in 18 months. Students in the dual MD/MS program offered by the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School must complete at least 36 credits hours of which at least 30 are formal courses, which include: core courses, an area of specialization, electives, and directed thesis or project. Our proposed program differs from their program in that our program results in an MD/MA degree, and is intended for Medical School students at Columbia University who have completed 3 years of medical school, and who have taken their boards. These students take a leave from medical school for the fourth year and enter the MA program for a year, and then return to medical school in the fifth year. They are expected to complete the coursework for the MA program in one year and successfully complete 30 credits (6 credits of which they receive from the MD program) during that time. The courses required for the MA degree are the same as those for the standalone MA, and include core courses, a biostatistics course, at least one elective course, and directed research (which consists of a research project in Biomedical Informatics). These students may finish research that culminates in their Master’s essay during the year that they are in the MA program, but that would be unusual. Typically, they will be able to complete their research and Master’s essay as part of their scholarly project rotation in medical school subsequent to finishing their MA coursework. Only one school in the Northeast is offering this dual program as it is a new trend in the field of MD education because information technology is recognized as being increasingly important in medicine. Our program differs in content from the Robert Wood Johnson program in that our program is closely tied to real world healthcare environments. Many of our faculty members have leadership positions at Columbia University Medical Center (CUMC) or New York-Presbyterian Hospital (NYP), and
collaborate with our students to provide information services and innovations which become part of clinical workflows, changing the way medicine is practiced in real-time. The MD/MA students will also be provided an opportunity to become familiar with and/or interact with an operational clinical information system. There are two other dual degree MD/MS programs in the country: one is offered by Vanderbilt University and the other by Stanford University.
The Committee has begun to repurpose itself, although progress has been slow. Although the title of the Committee emphasizes “Planning,” it has historically received reports of campus building and facilities projects after they have already been implemented, without the Committee having had the opportunity to offer its collective wisdom in advance. Accordingly, the Committee has been attempting to prepare ourselves to adopt a more proactive role. Since the needs of the Morningside, Manhattanville and CUMC campuses are vast, and vastly diverse, we recognize the need to focus on a few major issues.

With this in mind, we invited the following persons to bring us up to date in regard to needs and opportunities for the present and future use of our campus facilities: Barry Kane, Associate Vice President and University Registrar; Scott Wright, Vice President, Campus Services; Colleen Lewis, Executive Director of Columbia Health; David Greenberg, Executive Vice President, University Facilities and Operations; and Jessica Prata, Vice President for Sustainable Development at Columbia. Our protocol has been to send our guests a list of questions we would like them to answer and discuss. As a format for our meetings, it has worked well. While many of these questions have dealt with specific immediate challenges to the existing campus infrastructure, others have attempted to elicit information concerning the present structure of decision-making at the University (who makes the decisions) and how the Committee might be made more aware of impending initiatives so that it could offer its own comments and recommendations prior to any final decision. The point here is that the Committee would like in advance to be helpful, rather than offering criticism or questions after the fact. As a stand-in for the faculty and staff, and representative of the Senate as a whole, the Committee would like at least to be aware of the important initiatives under consideration, and to be able to publicize them when appropriate. It recognizes that it must therefore focus on a limited set of concerns.

At its March meeting, the Committee decided to focus on five specific issues. Broadly defined, they are as follows: (1) access to and from the Manhattanville and Morningside campuses, (2) the inadequacy of Columbia’s classrooms both in number and operational excellence (e.g., suitable wifi), (3) the adequacy of existing HVAC systems, especially at the CUMC campus and especially as regards the cold storage of tissue samples, (4) quality of life issues in Morningside Heights and Manhattanville (e.g., dogs on campus, the planting, naming and care of campus and street trees), and (5) advocacy for a new campus health-care center. Many of our guests were asked to comment on the above five items, and their responses will guide us in the year ahead. Short summaries of our interviews are below.

(1) October 3, 2017, Barry Kane. Mr. Kane presented a detailed analysis of the need for additional classrooms as well as the unimproved state of many existing ones. He noted that movie production
companies like to rent Columbia classrooms because they closely resemble early 20th century ones!! As became apparent, Mr. Kane and the Registrar’s Office do not control many of the classrooms on campus but this proportion is gradually increasing. He also emphasized the strong preference faculty often have for specific classroom features such as multi-layer blackboards, and that some new renovations and classrooms (the Northwest Corner Building in particular) lacking these features were disliked by faculty. Later in the meeting, the discussion focused on evolving teaching methods and the need for classrooms to “keep up.” The issue of Manhattanville access as classes change was discussed as well.

(2) October 31, 2017, visit of Scott Wright. Mr. Wright outlined the challenges facing his operation. He emphasized the goal of less dense housing (in some dorm suites, the common room must be used as a bedroom), but acknowledged that there are at present no plans for a new dormitory. While progress is being made on revamping Lerner to make it more student-usable, he also recognized the need for a new health center. For instance, the number of counselors on the Morningside Campus has risen to 51. He also discussed the desirability of having a dining facility on the north part of the Morningside Campus, but no location has presented itself. His remarks concluded with a discussion of the challenges of tying the campuses together in light of the fact that currently only 10 minutes is allocated for students to change classes.

(3) November 28, 2017, visit of Colleen Lewis. Ms. Lewis discussed at length the need for suitable testing space of students with various disabilities and the fact that Chandler renovations would shortly be providing two such rooms. The Committee was informed that her shop administers over 200 exams per weekday. Recent improvements in ADA accessibility were also discussed, as well as the residual need for greater accessibility in the Mathematics building. The meeting concluded with her informing the Committee as to the extent of emotional support animals on campus, the restrictions placed on their conduct and, in general, the “dogs-on-campus” policy.

(4) February 6, 2018, visit of David Greenberg. Mr. Greenberg’s discussion was wide-ranging, from the need for simple campus maintenance to plans for Manhattanville access and the progress of Columbia’s ADA-accessible compliance efforts. He encouraged the use of the special facilities telephone extension (42222) to report minor needs on the Morningside Campus. He acknowledged that his department had had its budget cut 5% for the 2017-2018 academic year. Sen. David Bickers took the opportunity to detail a number of problems on the CUMC Campus but this lay outside Mr. Greenberg’s purview. On several minor matters, such as the naming of trees on the Morningside Campus, he expressed openness and invited written requests from the Committee.

(5) April 17, 2018, Jessica Prata. Ms. Prata informed the Committee as to Columbia’s progress in its sustainable environment initiatives. These range from reduced energy use, particularly in residential buildings, to cooperation with New York City on the composting of vegetable wastes from University dining facilities. Members of the Committee emphasized the need for further investment to encourage bicycle use such as the acute lack of protected bike racks, especially on the Manhattanville campus. She also detailed the need to tie the campuses together in a sustainable way and noted that electric buses had been purchased for the intercampus shuttle service.
Among the regular responsibilities of the Committee is reviewing a large number of capital improvement projects prior to their presentation to the Trustees. Committee member James Wang, Vice President, Facilities, always provided a careful description of the projects and their rationale. On a few occasions, specific members of the Committee expressed the view that anticipated costs were likely to be severely understated.

The Committee met on six occasions, in addition to a joint meeting with the Housing Committee. One meeting was cancelled due to the last-minute unavailability of the speaker. We are exploring the possibility of holding one additional meeting in early May.

A number of general themes became clear during these meetings. First, decision-making is diffuse in the University, so it will be a challenge for the Committee to have a long-term impact on policy. The only way to deal with this problem may be to try to be “way out in front” on specific issues. Second, it is clear that additional long-term planning is needed, especially as regards Manhattanville. Frequently the Committee was told of the enormous expense of retrofitting existing buildings for new purposes, especially the engineering facilities and science-related spaces in general. We are confronted with the possibility that building entirely new facilities for these areas of the University may be less expensive in the long run than continued improvements to the existing spaces. Old engineering buildings might serve less capital-intensive areas of the University extremely well.

Respectfully submitted,

John Donaldson, chair
Patrice Derrington, and Teresa Zhao, vice chairs

---

**Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee 2017-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten.</th>
<th>David R. Bickers</th>
<th>P&amp;S</th>
<th>sen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>John B. Donaldson, CHAIR</td>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>Andreas Hielscher</td>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonten.</td>
<td>Patrice Derrington, VICE CHAIR</td>
<td>GSAPP</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonten.</td>
<td>Lisa K. Northrop</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu.</td>
<td>Omar Khan</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu.</td>
<td>Aidan Quinn</td>
<td>GSAS/NS</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu.</td>
<td>Teresa (Hanzhi) Zhao, VICE CHAIR</td>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Aline Locascio</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. Staff</td>
<td>Barbara Han</td>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Officers</td>
<td>Stefaan Van Liefferinge</td>
<td>Research Officers - Professional</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Janet Horan</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>James Wang</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum.</td>
<td>Julia Lewis</td>
<td>Alum.</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The committee met nine times this year, including its annual joint meeting with the Information Technology and Libraries committees.

**New programs**
Much of the work of the committee involves reviews of new program proposals. Once a proposal has passed its reviews by the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Programs and by the Council of Deans, it is forwarded to the Education Committee, where it is assigned to a subcommittee. In the absence of unanswered questions or controversial issues, the subcommittee usually completes its work in time for the next monthly committee meeting, where the proposal is discussed and, if approved, forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee and Senate plenary for final approval. If the subcommittee requires more time to resolve questions, it submits its questions to the contact person for the program proposal or meets with other contacts to resolve remaining issues. In such instances a subcommittee review may take two or three months. The following programs were reviewed in the past year (Senate approval dates in parentheses):

- M.S. in Genetic Counseling (P&S) (2/2/18)
- Dual Master’s in Public Health and a Master of Science in Bioethics (MSPH and SPS) (2/23/18)
- M.D./M.A. in Biomedical Informatics (P&S and GSAS) -- pending 4/27/18
- Certificate in Comparative Media (GSAS) (under review)

**New program not requiring full Senate approval**

**Five-year reviews**
The five-year reviews are conducted by a standing subcommittee of the Education Committee. The subcommittee consisted of Jim Applegate, Mary Byrne, Irving Herman and Chuck Basch.

- Dual M.I.A./M.P.A. (SIPA and London School of Economics) -- approved
- Advanced Certificate in Psychoanalytic Studies (GSAS) -- continues under review
- The scheduled five-year review of 25 statutory certificates (MSPH) has been postponed at the school’s request because the school was reviewed for reaccreditation this year. Provost Begg has advised the school to do one report covering all 25 certificates, which should be submitted shortly.

**New degree**
- Master of Professional Studies degree (SPS) (9/15/17)

The School of Professional Studies has proposed to offer a Master of Professional Studies degree in addition to the M.S. degree currently offered, to help differentiate the school’s programs of study from those of other schools of the University. Programs of study in the School of Professional Studies that have previously been duly approved for fulfillment of the degree of Master of Science
may, subject to Office of the Provost approval and any necessary governmental approvals, be accepted for fulfillment of the degree of Master of Professional Studies.

**New department**
The committee completed its review of the proposal for the establishment of a new Department of Medical Humanities and Ethics in the College of Physicians and Surgeons:
Dr. Anne Taylor, Vice Dean, Academic Affairs, College of Physicians and Surgeons, and Dr. Rita Charon, Professor of Medicine at the Columbia University Medical Center and prospective inaugural chair of the department, had visited the committee on April 7, 2017, to explain the reasons for the establishment of the new Department. Following additional reviews during the summer of 2017,
- A Resolution to Create a Department of Medical Humanities and Ethics at the College of Physicians and Surgeons (9/15/17) was approved with the required supermajority of senate votes.

**Guests of the Education Committee**
- Maneesha Aggarwal (Executive Director, Academic IT Solutions) (12/1/17) presented a follow-up on the introduction of Canvas, the new learning management system and successor of Sakai in CourseWorks. The transition appears to have been smooth. Online tutorials are available for the faculty and specific requests for additional tools are being considered.
- Soulaymane Kachani (Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning) met with the committee to discuss the findings presented by Sen. Shelley Saltzman (SPS) of English proficiency requirements upon enrollment in the different schools of the university. A few schools state on their web sites that there is no minimum score on required exams for English proficiency. Some professors require new students to take English over the summer before starting a graduate program, but there are programs that begin their year in the summer and some require summer math boot camps. It is difficult for students to study English at the same time as they began a graduate program.

The annual Joint meeting of Education, Information Technology and Campus Planning committees was held on April 2, 2018. Main topic: classrooms, with presentation by Barry Kane, the University Registrar.
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L. Moss-Salentijn  
J. H. Applegate  
*Co-chairs*
### Education Committee 2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ten.</th>
<th>James Applegate</th>
<th>Co-Chair</th>
<th>A&amp;S/NS</th>
<th>sen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>Charles Basch</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>Irving Herman</td>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>Hope Leichter</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>W. Ian Lipkin</td>
<td>SPH</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>Letty Moss-Salentijn</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>CDM</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten.</td>
<td>Samuel C. Silverstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonten.</td>
<td>Mary Byrne</td>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonten.</td>
<td>Shelley Saltzman</td>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonten.</td>
<td>Joseph Ulichny</td>
<td>A&amp;S/NS</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu.</td>
<td>Izzet Kebudi</td>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu.</td>
<td>Hanzhi (Teresa) Zhao</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td>sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu.</td>
<td>Luna Koizumi</td>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>James T. Crocamo</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>sen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Melissa Begg</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Catherine E. Ross</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum.</td>
<td>Tao Tan</td>
<td>Alum.</td>
<td>nonsen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee observer</td>
<td>Anna Longobardo</td>
<td>Trustee observer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>Jim W. Glover</td>
<td>Adm</td>
<td>observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Affairs Committee 2017-2018
April 27, 2018

The 2017-2018 Student Affairs Committee (SAC) of the University Senate, led by Co-Chairs Joshua Schenk (CC’19) and Sonya Nanda (BUS’18) and Vice Chair Izzet Kebudi (SEAS’19), is excited to report on a productive and successful school year. We are proud of our work on behalf of our constituents and progress made in creating real and lasting change that will benefit students across all schools for years to come. Among the most exciting developments this year:

**Lerner Hall Renovations**
SAC was pleased to announce the grand opening of the Food Bank at Columbia in newly rededicated space in Lerner Hall, as well as oversee the relocation of the computer lab in Lerner and the creation of new student reservable and lounge space. This major update, the continuation of a SAC project from the previous academic year, will benefit Columbia students for many years.

**Quality of Life Survey and Report**
The Committee relaunched the survey in the fall semester and collected a record number of responses from students across all schools and demographic groups. In the spring semester, the data was analyzed and compiled into the 2018 Student Quality of Life Survey Report, which was presented to the full Senate at the March plenary. Findings showed that students were overall more satisfied with their Columbia experience overall, though still unhappy with fitness services, space on campus, and some aspects of mental health.

**Subcommittee on Students with Disabilities**
For the second consecutive school year, SAC operated the Subcommittee on Students with Disabilities, led by Senator Ramond Curtis (’18GS). Since the creation of the subcommittee, students with disabilities have reported higher rates of satisfaction with their Columbia experience. After thorough investigation, the subcommittee recommended the creation of dedicated testing space for students with disabilities as well as an online portal through which accommodation requests can be processed.

**Dodge Fitness Center and Mental Health Investigation**
A team of senators and staffers investigated the connection between the condition of Dodge Fitness Center and the mental health condition of students on campus. After meeting with administrators in the Department of Physical Education, the team developed a list of recommendations for the improvement of Dodge Fitness Center.

**Cuthere! Expansion**
A joint project between SAC and the Columbia Alumni Association, Cuthere! is a new program which allows Columbia students and alumni from all schools the opportunity to interact with each other during the summer, all over the world. This year, the program completed its successful inaugural run and the infrastructure to ensure its future success, including a new website, was built.
Academic Freedom Resolution
SAC, in conjunction with the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented to and passed through the full Senate a resolution reaffirming the principles that govern academic freedom on campus. This important document continues Columbia’s legacy as a place where ideas can be freely exchanged with respect and compassion for all viewpoints and sides of every issue.

Resolution in Support of Freedom of Expression on Campus
SAC, in conjunction with the External Relations Committee, presented to and passed through the full Senate a resolution in support of freedom of expression on campus. This important document reaffirmed Columbia’s commitment to remaining a venue for free and open dialogue.

Faculty-Student Relationship Policy Update
In partnership with the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Commission on the Status of Women, SAC presented to and passed through the full Senate an amendment to the Faculty-Student Relationship Policy placing a complete ban on relationships between faculty and undergraduate students. This important update preserves the academic integrity of the University and allows undergraduates to focus fully on their coursework without the risk of romantic overtures from their instructors.

2018-2019
SAC is pleased to announce that in the coming academic year the committee will be co-chaired by Senators Kira Dennis of Barnard and Art Benoit of the Business School, with Senator Indira Martinez of the School of Social Work as Vice Chair. The new committee leadership will continue with projects born of the 2018 Quality of Life Survey Report, help guide conversations surrounding the ongoing issue of graduate student unionization, and pursue exciting and necessary new projects of their own. We wish the new chairs well and are glad to be leaving SAC in such good hands.

It has been our true honor to serve our constituents and the entire Columbia community in our capacity as SAC chairs this year. We would like to thank our esteemed colleagues, the Senate staff, and our own SAC student staffers for their assistance and support in helping our committee reach its goals. We are proud of our accomplishments this year and confident as ever in the future of SAC and the Columbia University community.

Joshua Schenk (CC’19)  Sonya Nanda (BUS’18)
Co-Chair, SAC 2017-2018 Co-Chair, SAC 2017-18

Izzet Kebudi (SEAS’19)
Vice Chair, SAC 2017-18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Benoit</td>
<td>BUS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:abenoit19@gsb.columbia.edu">abenoit19@gsb.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Boyd</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ajb2268@columbia.edu">ajb2268@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Bradley-Perrin</td>
<td>SPH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ifb2105@cumc.columbia.edu">ifb2105@cumc.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Cheng</td>
<td>GSAS/HUM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yu.cheng@columbia.edu">yu.cheng@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krystal Marie Cruz</td>
<td>TC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kmc2247@tc.columbia.edu">kmc2247@tc.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramond Curtis</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhe2140@columbia.edu">rhe2140@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira Dennis</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kd2480@barnard.edu">kd2480@barnard.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Hull</td>
<td>CDM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sah2207@cumc.columbia.edu">sah2207@cumc.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izzet Kebudi</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ik2339@columbia.edu">ik2339@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar Khan</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:osk2104@columbia.edu">osk2104@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indira Martinez</td>
<td>SSW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:idm2112@columbia.edu">idm2112@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel McConnell</td>
<td>P&amp;S</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dm2798@columbia.edu">dm2798@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna Koizumi</td>
<td>SPS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lk2708@columbia.edu">lk2708@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya Nanda</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SNanda18@gsb.columbia.edu">SNanda18@gsb.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiago Ornaghi</td>
<td>JOURN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:to2317@columbia.edu">to2317@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Piacentini</td>
<td>GSAPP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.piacentini@columbia.edu">j.piacentini@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidan Quinn</td>
<td>GSAS/NS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:saq2106@cumc.columbia.edu">saq2106@cumc.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Rappaport</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwr2128@columbia.edu">jwr2128@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Schenk</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jms2430@columbia.edu">jms2430@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yashshri Soman</td>
<td>SIPA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ys2987@columbia.edu">ys2987@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric D. Tang</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td><a href="mailto:edt2109@columbia.edu">edt2109@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Yoshimachi</td>
<td>NURS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jy2519@cumc.columbia.edu">jy2519@cumc.columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanzhi Zhao</td>
<td>SEAS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hz2356@columbia.edu">hz2356@columbia.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie Hartnett</td>
<td>UTS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbh2123@utsvyc.edu">cbh2123@utsvyc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault
Annual Report 2017-18

The Presidential Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault (PACSA) is one of several Columbia University initiatives to address gender-based misconduct and is charged with advising the president on issues related to the prevention of and response to gender-based misconduct, including sexual assault. The Committee continually works with partners and experts across the University to evaluate policies and procedures and solicit feedback from the Columbia community with the goal of eliminating sexual assault and other forms of gender-based misconduct from our community.

Membership

The Committee is comprised of faculty, staff, and students from both the Morningside and CUMC campuses. This year, several new members were appointed to the Committee by President Bollinger; their two-year terms will conclude in spring 2019. A full membership roster is attached.

Ruby Drake, Columbia College

Ramond Curtis, General Studies

2017-18 Discussions

Over the course of the 2017-18 academic year, the Committee was briefed by partners across the University about services and programs that support gender-based misconduct prevention and address and administer the University’s response to gender-based misconduct.

Specifically, the Committee discussed following topics:

- Sexual Violence Response programs and services
- Gender-Based Misconduct Office’s services
- Policy updates and changes
- Gender-based Misconduct Prevention Task Force
- Sexual Respect and Community Citizenship Initiative
- Faculty and TA Briefings
- SHIFT Survey
- Student Well-Being Survey
- Sexual Harassment

Recommendations

As in previous years, the Committee recommends that offices across the University work to increase student engagement and participation with ongoing prevention efforts. This will deepen the impact of existing programs and foster a cultural shift on campus.
Presidential Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault
Committee Membership – 2017-18

Co-chairs

Suzanne Goldberg, Executive Vice President for University Life; Herbert and Doris Wechsler Clinical Professor of Law; Special Advisor to the President for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

Dennis Mitchell, Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion; Associate Professor of Dental Medicine (Community Health and Periodontics) at the Columbia University Medical Center; and Senior Associate Dean for Diversity, College of Dental Medicine

Membership Ending 2018
Melanie Bernitz, Associate Vice President/Medical Director, Columbia Health Services; Assistant Clinical Professor (in the Center for Family and Community Medicine)
Marjy Fisher, Associate Vice President & Title IX Coordinator
Marj Berman, Student, Public Health

Membership Ending 2019
Ramond Curtis, Student, General Studies
Jewelnel Davis, University Chaplain, Director of Earl Hall
Ruby Drake, Student, Columbia College
Bruce Kogut, Sanford C. Bernstein & Co. Professor of Leadership and Ethics
Sharyn O’Halloran, George Blumenthal Professor of Political Economy and Professor of International and Public Affairs
Scott Wright, Vice President, Facilities

Ex-Officio
Donna Fenn, Associate General Counsel
Jeri Henry, Associate Vice President, Student Conduct and Community Standards
La’Shawn Rivera, Executive Director, Sexual Violence Response/Rape Crisis Center