

# University Senate Plenary

March 7, 2025



University Senate

Proposed: March 7, 2025

Adopted: March 7, 2025

## PROPOSED AGENDA

University Senate

Friday, March 7, 2025 at 1:15 p.m.

**International Affairs Building, Room 417**

### **Registration required**

**After registering you will receive a confirmation email.**

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of February 7, 2025
3. President's report and questions
4. Chair's report and questions:
  - a. Protocol for Potential Visits to Campus by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
  - b. Student Affairs Committee update
5. Old business
6. New business:
  - a. Resolutions:
    - i. Resolution to Rededicate Lerner Hall as a Student Space (Student Affairs, Campus Planning and Physical Development, Commission on Diversity)
    - ii. Resolution to Adopt Statement on Upholding our Community Standards and Values (Executive)
  - b. Committee reports and updates:
    - i. Elections Commission update
7. Adjourn

Attendees to this Plenary meeting are reminded not to post this meeting, or any portion of this meeting, online as such a posting could result in a violation of the University's Acceptable Usages of Information Resources Policy.

### **Minutes of the Meeting of February 7, 2025**

91 out of 110 Senators were present.

Senator Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S), Executive Committee Chair, called the University Senate to order at 1:16pm. Sen. D'Armiento welcomed Senators and guests to the fifth Plenary of the 2024-2025 session. Sen. D'Armiento reminded attendees of the Parliamentary procedures and that recordings are not permitted in Plenary meetings.

Senators adopted the [agenda](#) for the Plenary.

Senators then adopted the [minutes](#) of the December 13, 2024 Plenary.

Sen. D'Armiento then turned over the meeting to Interim University President Katrina Armstrong.

#### **Updates from President Armstrong**

President Armstrong began her updates by acknowledging the difficulties of the time, thanking the faculty and University Senate for managing challenges. President Armstrong stated that any question about the new federal administration in Washington should be sent to Sen. D'Armiento so that they can be followed up with later. President Armstrong acknowledged the unease and uncertainty given the changes occurring at the federal level. She reaffirmed the commitments to the University's educational mission. President Armstrong emphasized the work that her team of experts and the faculty in order to respond to these uncertainties. President Armstrong stated that she is working to keep everyone as informed as possible as the administration is creating more resources for students and faculty. She added that there have been resources created to deal with students and faculty being harassed online and that the Provost's Office will be giving more updated on these resources soon.

President Armstrong mentioned that she has been traveling to Washington, D.C. to talk to lawmakers and policymakers, including the Chairmen of the House and Senate Education Committees. She added that she was returning to D.C. next week to continue conversations. President Armstrong added that there were other members of the Columbia community in New York City that were committed to helping the institution as well. She added that these conversations have been candid and productive and that she continues to share the contributions that Columbia makes to society. President Armstrong added that University leaders like Jeannette Wing and Dean Shih-Fu Chang have been going to D.C. and that Dean Keren Yarhi-Milo has been working with the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) on these

issues. She added that these conversations have been opportunities to address antisemitism and discrimination on campus.

President Armstrong stated that she believes in a Columbia that can both have freedom of expression and prevent discrimination and harassment. She stated that the administration was committed to making sure that there were fair and equitable disciplinary processes at the University. President Armstrong stated that the administration is working on being effective to respond to disruption to academic activities. She ended by stating that she understands that the coming weeks and months are going to be full of uncertainty but that she believes that Columbia will have the strength of students, faculty, and staff to get through these difficult periods. She added that this is the opportunity for the Columbia community to come together and support each other. President Armstrong added that she is working with the Senate Executive Committee to continue working on these issues.

President Armstrong then left the meeting, and Sen. D'Armiento asked Senate members to send any questions for President Armstrong to Sen. D'Armiento, who will pass them along.

### **Chair's Report and Questions**

Sen. D'Armiento began her report by discussing the three resolutions for amendments to the University By-Laws. Sen. D'Armiento stated that, when she first became Chair of the Senate, there were 80 Senators for 108 seats and that she spent her early years recruiting members to the Senate. She added that, today, elections are competitive, indicating that the people understand the importance of the work being done in the University Senate and want to contribute.. She added that the Senate did not want its integrity to depend upon one person, which is why in 2020 Sen. D'Armiento put forth Chair term limits. Sen. D'Armiento stated that the resolutions today to include a Vice Chair come from a similar concern and that she hopes that the strong University Senate that exists now continue to occur.

Sen. D'Armiento stated that the Senate is still waiting on the updated report to the [University's Response to Robert Hadden](#). Sen. D'Armiento added that several members of the Senate were reading the [report](#) reflecting on the events from last year and that updates will be given to the full Senate soon.

Sen. D'Armiento addressed the White House Executive Order by stating the following: "Some of the numerous Executive Orders issues by the White House in the past few weeks have immediate impacts and potential implications for the University, its educational and research mission, and the Columbia community more generally. Many within our community have been alarmed and anxious about some of these actions: for example, freezes on federal grants and loans that although quickly repealed still seem possible; targeting of diversity, equity, and inclusive programs; new gender and transgender restrictions; giving U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement the authority to raid schools, medical facilities, and religious institutions; narrowing definitions for sexual and gender harassment under Title IX; establishing an ideological litmus test for banning entry to or removing non-citizens students from the country. Most recently, the federal administration issued an Executive Order targeting protesters and lays the

groundwork for potential deportation of students, faculty. The order directs government departments to devise policies aimed at monitoring and reporting on activities of students and staff, for the purposes of deporting individuals who, at most times in our nation's history, would be regarded as merely exercising their free speech rights to protest government policies. In fact, the University's own Statutes, particularly the Affirmative Statement, reaffirmed and demonstrate this community's commitment to and 'long tradition of valuing dissent and controversy and in welcoming the clash of opinions onto the campus' as part of the essential mechanics that make possible free academic inquiry and full dedication to finding, teaching, and publishing truth (even hard truths) to the world. Because the commitment to truth is so fundamental to all we do at the university, the Affirmative Statement declares that 'the University cannot and will not rule any subject or form of expression out of order on the ground that it is objectionable, offensive, immoral, or untrue.' Those values, in all our various fields of study at Columbia, are going to need to be reinforced constantly in the coming years, or the basic conditions that make higher education both possible and indispensable will themselves disappear. In addition to the executive actions targeting student protestors, the federal administration has also repealed the Temporary Protected Status of Venezuelans and is reportedly reviewing the status for Cubans, Haitians, and Nicaraguans. In fact, our large population of international students are especially vulnerable to these orders. All of these actions affect members of our community—our colleagues, students, staff, and patients—and some of them could have devastating consequences, not only personally for specific individuals at Columbia but for the vitality of our academic community and the fundamental mission and role of a great university in helping to create a more perfect union and democratic society. I want to remind the Senate and the Columbia community that in February 2017, this body responded to looming threats to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program (DACA) by adopting a resolution to affirm our commitment to DACA students, noting that President Bollinger had joined 600 college and university presidents on a public statement in support of the DACA program and that Provost Coatsworth had pledged to increase financial aid and other support to undocumented students if DACA ended. For its part, the Senate made a 'commitment to finding ways to provide support to DACA students if the program is terminated,' and as it was about six months later. In this moment of threats to the character and constituency of our academic community, the University Senate, which is the sole deliberative body representing the wide variety of opinion of the entire Columbia community, must continue to model the ideals of a democratic society, inclusion, and respectful debate, even (or most especially) on the most controversial topics of the day. The Affirmative Statement remains our guide. In that regard, this body, and this University, must be able to lead on our ethical principles. As I stated in the November Plenary, we must unequivocally condemn Anti-Semitism on our campus. We must condemn all forms of racism, bigotry, and expression of hatred. We must affirm that no person should be deported, doxed, or harassed for their political speech or beliefs, just as no person should be deported, doxed, or harassed based on some aspect or perception of their personal identity. Most importantly, we must come together as a community of scholars, educators, and students committed to the well-being of our University while providing a strong, moral example for academia and the world."

Sen. D'Armiento welcomed the Co-Chairs of the Student Affairs Committee, Senators Maria Martinez (Stu., CC) and Jaxon Williams-Bellamy (Stu., LAW), and the Vice Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, Senator Bruce Goumain (Stu., GS), to address the current issues.

Sen. Williams-Bellamy began the remarks by sharing the concerns that Sen. D'Armiento shared with the Senate. Sen. Williams-Bellamy mentioned that Columbia has a very large number of international students who were concerned with the recent federal administration rulings. He added that the Student Affairs Committee has heard the concerns and is working on a response but that anyone that has concerns at the current moment can reach out to the Senators for support. Sen. Williams-Bellamy stated that the student Senators wanted to make sure to be providing support and guidance for members of the community that feel at risk. Sen. D'Armiento added that the students have spent a large amount of time collecting these resources and that anyone who is concerned can email the Senate directly ([senate@columbia.edu](mailto:senate@columbia.edu)).

Sen. Martinez added that the Student Affairs Committee wanted to provide as many resources as possible to any student at risk and that the Student Affairs Committee is working a statement in support of all international students at the university. She added that students can feel free to reach out to herself, Sen. Williams-Bellamy, and Sen. Goumain at any time with concerns. Sen. D'Armiento then took questions.

Senator Abosede George (Ten., BAR) asked how the [International Students & Scholars Office](#) (ISSO) was assisting students with these concerns. Sen. D'Armiento responded that all international students have ISSO at their disposal for resources but that certain students that might need more resources or feel nervous can reach out to the Senate. Sen. George added that she felt that it was an enormous task for the student Senators to be responding to this. Sen. D'Armiento agreed and stated that the Senate was responding to a need in the community. She added that the students themselves chose to step up to respond to this issue. Sen. George asked if the Senate response reflected a distrust in the community. Sen. D'Armiento responded that this was not the case but that the student Senators felt that their response was a direct need from their community that needed to be addressed. Sen. Williams-Bellamy responded that they have full trust in the administrative resources but that, given the heightened uncertainty, the student Senators felt that they wanted to provide as much resources as possible.

Senator Melinda Aquino (Admin. Staff, Morningside-Lamont) thanked the Student Affairs Committee for the resources that they are providing to the student communities. She added that the Student Affairs Community should coordinate with other administrative entities that are offering support. Sen. Aquino stated that the Student Affairs Committee should make sure to have representative voices from those groups as well when providing these resources. Sen. D'Armiento responded that the Student Affairs Committee is coordinating with other entities at the University and that the goal is to provide a more personalized approach, especially in case students need resources that are outside of the University.

Senator Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/HUM) shared Sen. Williams-Bellamy's sentiment that these are unprecedented times and that the rate of Executive Orders is meant to put the University in a state of

uncertainty. Sen. Slaughter asked if the Senate statement from 2017 regarding DACA was from the Provost's Office and whether there would be an administrative response similarly for the current issues. Sen. D'Armiento responded that the student Senators are working with the administration and that she expects to come to the next plenary on March 7<sup>th</sup> with some more concrete conversation.

### **Resolution to Amend the University Senate By-Laws to Reflect the Number of Students on the Students Affairs Committee (Structure and Operations)**

Sen. D'Armiento introduced Senator Daniel Savin (Research Officers) from the Structure and Operations Committee to introduce the proposed Amendments to the Senate. Sen. Savin began by stating that in the October 2024 Plenary, the Structure and Operations Committee brought Amendments to the Senate for discussion and comments. Sen. Savin stated that, after robust discussion and email comments, the resolutions brought forth to the plenary today were the result of those conversations.

Sen. Savin then described the resolutions. The [first resolution](#) was a housekeeping resolution to reflect the number of students on the Student Affairs Committee after the approval of a new student member from the Climate School. The [second resolution](#) corrects typos in the language for the Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee. The [third resolution](#) expands the Executive Committee by adding a Vice Chair and a Research Officer spot. Sen. Savin added that the feedback received to the third resolution was incorporated into the final amendment version.

Senator Brent Stockwell (Ten., A&S/NS) stated his concern about only having one Vice Chair and that anointing the next Chair inadvertently and potentially having two Vice Chairs as a solution to having a default choice for assuming the Chair role. Sen. D'Armiento responded that she does not believe that the Senate can sustain the pace of the work that they do without the assistance of a Vice Chair.

Senator Jim Applegate (Ten., A&S/NS) stated that both the Vice Chair and Research Officer position would be a good idea, agreeing with Sen. D'Armiento about the workload of the Chair. Sen. Applegate stated that the Vice Chair doesn't necessarily anoint anyone to become the Chair because the Senate votes in the Chair.

Sen. Aquino offered her general support for the Vice Chair. She read the following statement from a long-time administrative staff member: "I am concerned that both the Chair and Vice Chair can only be tenured faculty. To me, this is narrow thinking that other key groups that integral to the functioning of a university are somehow not qualified to Chair the Executive Committee. Further, the only group with representatives in the Senate that is transient by design are the students. The idea of stability by way of tenure is simply a way for tenured faculty to always hold power of Senate leadership, and we should not support systems that are designed to favor one group as always in power."

Sen. Aquino proposed an amendment to the third resolution, stating that: "The Chair and Vice Chair may be any duly elected member of the Senate elected to a term of service equal to or greater to the term of the

Chair or Vice Chair.” Sen. D’Armiento responded that non-tenured faculty are at-will and have limitations on their ability to speak at times, which is the reason why tenured faculty are put into the position of the Chair. She added that the tenured faculty are often the ones that speak up in difficult times due to the protections that they have. Sen. Aquino’s amendment was seconded.

In discussion of Sen. Aquino’s amendment, Sen. Savin moved that the language of the amendment be moved to Structure and Operations for a timely response, which was seconded. Senator Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., LAW) suggested that the better procedural approach would be to lay Sen. Aquino’s amendment on the table with a referral to the Structure and Operations Committee. Sen. Savin agreed to Sen. Gordon’s proposal. Sen. Stockwell agreed to table the motion until Structure and Operations could clarify what was being voted on. Senator Katherine Brooks (Libraries) asked to clarify if only a reelected Senator can be the Chair or Vice Chair, which Sen. D’Armiento confirmed was correct. Sen. Gordon’s proposal to table Sen. Aquino’s amendment was seconded. Sen. Gordon’s motion was passed 75-0-0 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Senator Richard Smiley (Ten., P&S) wanted to clarify if Structure and Operations had an obligation to report back on the amendment Sen. Aquino proposed. Sen. D’Armiento confirmed that the Structure and Operations Committee had an obligation to report back to the Senate about this proposed amendment to the resolution.

Sen. D’Armiento returned to the first resolution to reflect the number of student Senators on the Student Affairs Committee. There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The first resolution was passed 79-0-0 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

### **Resolution to Amend the University Senate By-Laws to Correct the Language of the Campus Planning and Physical Development Mandate (Structure and Operations)**

Sen. D’Armiento moved to the [second resolution](#). There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The second resolution passed 73-0-0 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

### **Resolution to Amend the University Senate By-Laws to Add a Vice Chair to the Executive Committee (Structure and Operations)**

Sen. D’Armiento moved to the [third resolution](#). There was a motion which was seconded to propose the resolution. The third resolution passed 79-1-0 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

### **Resolution to Combat Antisemitism and All Forms of Hate (External Relations and Research Policy)**

Sen. D’Armiento next introduced a [Resolution to Combat Antisemitism and All Forms of Hate](#). Sen. D’Armiento stated that, over the past year, the campus has grappled with tensions and discourse that have raised concerns of antisemitism and other forms of discrimination, both from within and outside of the University community. Sen. D’Armiento introduce Senator Howard Worman (Ten., P&S), Co-Chair of



the External Relations and Research Policy Committee, to lead the discussion on this resolution. Sen. D'Armiento thanked him for the work he put into the resolution.

Sen. Worman stated that, in October 2023, Hamas terrorists attacked Israel and that, ever since then, the reputation of Columbia has been harmed by the antisemitic hate and harassment reported on at the University. Sen. Worman gave examples of antisemitism cited at the University, including a faculty member praising terrorists, a faculty member being found guilty of harassing Israeli students, pro-Palestinian students hiding their identities and establishing encampment, falsely accusing Israeli students of carrying out a chemical attack, and pro-Palestinian students taking over buildings. Sen. Worman added that these students have faced little-to-no consequences, which have put federal funding, philanthropic donations, and faculty recruitment at risk. Sen. Worman stated that, as a result, the House of Representatives and Department of Education launched investigations into antisemitism at the University. Sen. Worman added that many people inside and outside of the University have expressed their concern about antisemitism. He added that the Senate Executive Committee held a panel at the uptown medical campus a few weeks ago, where constituents were told to bring their concerns. After that meeting, Sen. Worman stated that he received a draft of a resolution to combat antisemitism for the Senate. He stated that he brought the resolution to the External Relations and Research Policy Committee, where it was debated, amended, and passed. Sen. Worman added that the resolution as presented was less forceful than the version given to him originally but that it was a first step in procuring administrative actions. Sen. D'Armiento then opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Janie Weiss (Admin. Staff, CUIMC) stated that a group of Senators were tasked with drafting a resolution to address antisemitism against the Jewish community and that she originally did not intend to speak up, fearing that the resolution would not pass. Sen. Weiss expressed her concern to the changes made to the resolution in Committee. Sen. D'Armiento interjected to say that many resolutions change in committee and that committee discussions are confidential. Sen. Worman clarified that he was given a draft resolution that was deliberated to the External Relations and Research Policy Committee, where it was passed and sent to the Executive Committee, where it was passed as the final version presented to the plenary today. Sen. Weiss continued by stating that the original resolution was crafted to specifically discuss the targeting of Jewish and Israeli students, faculty, and staff. Sen. Weiss stated that the new version of the resolution diluted the focus on antisemitism specifically and removed examples of harassment that members of the Jewish community had received. She ended by saying that the current version of the resolution failed to specifically address antisemitism and the targets of antisemitism.

Senator Susan Bernofsky (Ten., ARTS) expressed her gratitude for other Jewish faculty bringing forth a resolution to combat antisemitism. Sen. Bernofsky presented the following amendment to the resolution, noting that there is no definition of antisemitism attached: add the text "WHEREAS international scholars and experts on antisemitism define antisemitism as discrimination, prejudice, hostility, or violence against Jews as Jews or against Jewish institutions as Jewish;" to the second WHEREAS statement. The amendment was seconded and then discussion was opened for Sen. Bernofsky's amendment.

Sen. Smiley stated that he did not quite understand the point of Sen. Bernofsky's amendment outside of adding a definition to antisemitism. Sen. Bernofsky responded by stating that she does not want the definition to hand an opportunity for those who are eager to deport students to do so. She added that a proposal that was too broad without any guidelines is at risk of being misused against students and faculty. Sen. Bernofsky stated that this definition was the wording of around 350 scholars on the Holocaust and antisemitism and not her own language. Sen. Smiley stated that he did not have a concern about the definition given that the resolution has no force of law. Sen. Bernofsky responded that she still has the concern that this proposal could be used to target students.

Senator Andrew Einstein (Ten., P&S) expressed his gratitude for this resolution being brought to the Senate. Sen. Einstein stated that he shared Sen. Weiss's concern of the watering down of the document. He stated he agreed that a definition of antisemitism was important to add to the resolution. Sen. Einstein proposed the following amendment: add the text "WHEREAS antisemitism has been defined by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) as a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews, and manifests through various acts, including discrimination, harassment, and violence;". The amendment was seconded and then discussion was opened for Sen. Einstein's amendment.

Sen. Gordon stated that he believed that Sen. Bernofsky had not been fully transparent about her amendment. He stated that there are contentious definitions of what antisemitism consists of and that Sen. Bernofsky's proposal comes from a group of people who do not believe that criticism of the state of Israel counts as antisemitism. Sen. Gordon stated that not having a resolution is the appropriate way to go with the resolution so that picking one of the competing definitions of what antisemitism is doesn't detract from the point of the resolution to help the University. He ended by stating that he believed that the Senate should vote against both of the proposed amendments.

Sen. George stated that she felt that she was unable to vote on the resolution without a definition of antisemitism. She added that the debate around what antisemitism is since October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023 is precisely what makes the definition of antisemitism so important for a resolution like this. Sen. George stated that, while the resolution does not have the force of law, it does have a force on campus that can translate into a record. She felt that she did not feel the resolution as advancing the cause of fighting against discrimination.

Sen. Worman stated that he agreed with Sen. Gordon that the resolution should not be defining antisemitism. He stated that there are many different definitions of antisemitism and that he has his own definition of antisemitism. Sen. Worman expressed that his definition of antisemitism was obvious when it occurs and that it is easily recognizable as hatred. He added that he wanted to get a general resolution out first before worrying about the definition.

Senator Joseph Howley (Ten., A&S/HUM) mentioned that Sen. Einstein's amendment cites the IHRA definition of antisemitism. Sen. Howley expressed that the authors of the IHRA definition have expressed serious concerns that it should not be used as a guide to identifying or discussing hate speech, which was not its purpose. Sen. Howley added that the Jerusalem Declaration, which he believed Sen. Bernofsky's definition is based off of, is endorsed by scholars in the field. He also added that the IHRA definition does seem to indicate that criticism of a particular state may be understood as antisemitism. Sen. Howley said that he felt that it was inappropriate to label criticism of a state or government as antisemitism and that it may be a violation of the Affirmative Statement in the University Statutes. He stated that urged Senators to vote against Sen. Einstein's amendment.

Senator Heidi Allen (Ten., SSW) stated that she had three tenured faculty members reach out to her in concern that there was no definition of antisemitism in the resolution. One faculty member asked for the following statement to be read: "Dear Senators, I understand that you are or soon will be tasked with the responsibility of choosing or forming an operational definition of antisemitism. This is no small undertaking, and I deeply appreciate the thoughtful work that you do on behalf of the university. While I am no expert in crafting such definitions, what I can speak to with absolute conviction is my deep concern about any definition that can be weaponized to punish those who express opinions critical of a government or a state, any government or state. The idea that criticism of a government could be criminalized chills me to the core. This should alarm anyone who values free speech, participatory democracy, and academic freedom. Yes, we must take a strong, unequivocal stance against antisemitism and all forms of hate. The university is dedicated to education, inquiry, and intellectual growth, so we must also fiercely protect open critical dialogue, including criticism of government, and, again, any government. Shielding a specific government or state from scrutiny sets a dangerous precedent of exceptionalism. I am sure that the dangers of state exceptionalism are as clear to you as it is to me. In summary, I believe that the resolution will be its strongest when it strikes the right balance – protecting our community from hate while upholding academic freedom. I urge to work toward this win-win scenario. Our community and the principles we stand for deserve nothing less. Thank you for your service and consideration."

Sen. Worman made a motion to table both amendments, which was seconded. The motion passed 59-12-4 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

Sen. Howley stated that, in light of the concerns about passing this resolution and the concerns of students believing that passing the resolution would be seen as endorsing political deportations, he proposed the following amendment: adding the text "Nothing in this resolution shall be construed by the university or any of its members to facilitate or condone the deportation students, staff, or faculty for their political speech or opinions." This motion for the amendment was seconded.

Sen. Worman motioned to table Sen. Howley's amendment, stating that this resolution did not have anything to do with deportations. Sen. Worman's motion was seconded.

Senator Lydia Goehr (Ten., A&S/HUM) stated that, if the Senate passes a resolution that does not have a definition of antisemitism and then in a few weeks times if the University adopts a definition of antisemitism that incorporates criticism of Israel, then the Senate resolution will be seen as retrospectively supporting that definition. Sen. Goehr stated that, for this reason, she believed that Sen. Howley's amendment was important to pass.

Sen. Stockwell stated that he is in favor of Sen. Worman's motion because that the procedural attempts to kill the resolution will be seen as hurtful to the Jewish community at Columbia.

Senator Henry Ginsburg (Ten., P&S) stated that he was in favor of tabling the amendment because the resolution with the amendment would result in anyone who is deemed to have committed acts of antisemitism will not be able to have anything happen to them.

Sen. Howley reiterated that his intention is to make sure the resolution can pass and that the current circumstances require an acknowledgment of deportation.

Sen. George stated that all of the amendments have been toward strengthening the resolution and making the resolution more clear and less vague. She believed that none of the amendments have been intended to dilute the statement and that the amendments were in the spirit of improvement.

Sen. Worman's motion to table Sen. Howley's amendments passed 39-14-8 (in favor-opposed-abstained).

The resolution, as originally presented to the Plenary, was passed 62-0-5 (in favor-opposed-abstained)

#### **Update on FLI Space (Campus Planning and Physical Development, Commission on Diversity)**

Sen. D'Armiento introduced the [FLI Space resolution](#) that was passed last school year. Sen. D'Armiento introduced Sen. Martinez, who would be giving an update on the resolution coming from Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee and the Commission on Diversity.

Sen. Martinez introduced the rationale behind the FLI Space. Sen. Martinez introduced the Vice Co-Chairs of the Subcommittee, Karla Camacho and Anamika Sharif.

Camacho gave background to the FLI Space and the community that defines itself as FLI through the Columbia schools. Camacho gave the history of the project and what other resources exist on campus for this community. Camacho stated that they were working on finding a director for the FLI Space that would be able to help coordinate resources at the FLI Space and support FLI students.

Sharif detailed the physical space plans that are being worked on for FLI Space. Sharif stated that the key aspects for the space include having a flexible lounge space that can work for both relaxation and studying but also community events and programming, private spaces for students to meet, and a private office for

the FLI director. Sharif also described a learning hub, FLI closet, and the Food Pantry as physical aspects of the floor space.

Senator Adrian Brügger (Research Officers), Co-Chair of the FLI Space Subcommittee, thanked the students for their leadership and stated that there has been a lot of activity with the administration to coordinate the project so far. Sen. Brügger stated that the group working on the initiative have made significant progress on the initiative. He stated that the next steps are to work with the Offices of the Provost and President to secure a funding path to bring the project to fruition.

Sen. Allen stated that she was in full support of the project as someone who was a FLI student in college.

Senator Henning Schulzrinne (Ten., SEAS) asked if there was any indication from the administration if a venue or location had been identified for the space or if a specific donor was interested in the project. Sen. Brügger agreed that the FLI Space was a great fundraising opportunity and that there would be more information soon about a potential location for the FLI Space.

Sen. Aquino stated that she encouraged that the resources going into the FLI Space are dedicated to the entire University community and not just students in Columbia College and the undergraduates in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (SEAS). Sen. Brügger agreed with Sen. Aquino and stated that they envision that the FLI Space can be a first stopping place for students at the University.

Sen. Howley thanked the subcommittee for its work, noting that he has been involved in committees that have seen the [FLI Library](#) expand, and that he hopes the administration continues to support students through initiatives like the FLI Space.

Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Senate staff

## PROTOCOL FOR POTENTIAL VISITS TO CAMPUS BY U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT (ICE) AGENTS

### Can ICE agents access campus or University buildings without a warrant?

- In general, ICE agents must have a judicial warrant or subpoena to access non-public areas (areas not open to the public such as classrooms, housing, and areas requiring CUID).
  - Exigent circumstances may allow for access to University buildings or people without a warrant. Faculty/staff should not interfere and should immediately contact Public Safety as described below. Faculty/staff should document the activities they observe, if possible without obstructing the agents.
- Areas open to the general public are similarly accessible to ICE agents, and they may enter without a warrant.

### What should faculty/staff do if ICE agents ask to enter non-public areas of the University or approach for information about another individual?

- **Ask for credentials.** In a professional and courteous manner, ask for i) the agents' credentials (full name, agency/organization, badge number, etc.); ii) a business card; and iii) any legal documents (warrant, subpoena, etc.).
- **Ask them to wait.** Ask the agents to wait to enter any non-public areas until contacting Public Safety at the numbers below. Public Safety will contact the Office of the General Counsel and will help coordinate the University's response.
  - It is preferable for faculty/staff to first call Public Safety directly. If this is not possible based on the circumstances, faculty/staff may connect an ICE agent directly to Public Safety.
- **Do not accept service** of a warrant or subpoena.
- In response to questions or the attempted service of a warrant or subpoena, you can say: ***"I am not authorized by the University to grant permission to enter non-public areas, provide information about individual students or employees, or accept service of documentation on behalf of the University,"*** then refer the agents to Public Safety and the Office of the General Counsel.

### What should faculty/staff or others do if they observe ICE agents conducting enforcement activities on campus?

- Immediately contact Public Safety.

#### **Public Safety**

Morningside: **212-854-5555**

Manhattanville: **212-853-3333**

Medical Center: **212-305-7979**

University Senate

Proposed: March 7, 2025

Adopted: March 7, 2025

70-0-0: In favor-opposed-abstained

## **RESOLUTION TO REDEDICATE LERNER HALL AS A STUDENT SPACE**

WHEREAS Lerner Hall, named for Alfred Lerner 'CC55, was designed as a student center to create a space to facilitate informal interactions while also serving as an anchor for campus business and activities of all types<sup>1</sup>; and

WHEREAS Lerner Hall is Columbia University's Student Center, a space in the heart of the Morningside Campus for students to meet, socialize, dine, and study during the academic year<sup>2</sup>; and

WHEREAS the building features 250,000 square feet of diverse meeting, performance, and event space, and includes a large cinema, dining hall, and auditorium<sup>3</sup>; and

WHEREAS as brought to the plenary of February 23, 2016 by the Student Affairs Committee, as "a hub of student life, Lerner Hall is the most appropriate physical space in which to build community"; and

WHEREAS we value the University's commitment to student quality of life through its provision of a range of services and resources to support students' academic and personal success; and

WHEREAS we seek to reinforce Columbia's mission to promote a sense of belonging and community citizenship among its students;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate requests that the University rededicate Lerner Hall, restoring the original intention of the building, to uplift our student community by providing dedicated social space for students, the means by which the University can fulfill its commitment to students and their quality of life.

Proponents:

Student Affairs Committee

Campus Planning and Physical Development

Commission on Diversity

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://lernerhall.columbia.edu/content/history>

<sup>2</sup> <https://eventmanagement.columbia.edu/content/lerner-hall>

<sup>3</sup> <https://eventmanagement.columbia.edu/content/lerner-hall>

# Rededicating Lerner Hall

## History of Lerner as a Student Space

- **Opened in 1999** as a student center.
- Over **26 years**, increasing allocation of spaces in Lerner toward administrative use:
  - Administrative offices (**USL, Chaplain's Office, CPS, etc.**)
  - **CC/SEAS Student Advising**
  - **Event Management**
  - **Classroom spaces**
- **Need for student-centered space** has grown exponentially, especially **post-pandemic**.

## Motivations

- ❖ **Growing Demand for Student-Centric Spaces**
  - Increasing **student group activities** → Need for **dedicated spaces**.
  - **Challenges** with booking and managing student rooms due to administrative usage.
- ❖ **Rising Student Population**
  - Growth from **10,000 to 12,000 students** since Lerner's opening.
  - **Major expansion in graduate programs**.
- ❖ **Evolving Undergraduate Experience**
  - More **student groups** → Need for **specialized spaces**.
  - Students seek **stronger community-building spaces**.
- ❖ Growth in **Columbia's three undergraduate schools (CC, SEAS, GS) and Barnard College** → Need for a central, all-accessible space.
- ❖ **Limited Access to Spaces**
  - Many offices/spaces are **only used from 9 AM - 5 PM**.
  - Some spaces are **restricted to CC/SEAS students**, limiting student inclusivity.

## Plan Details

- ☐ **Step-by-step rededication** of Lerner Hall, starting from the **3rd Floor** and moving upward.
- ☐ **Gradual phase-out** of administrative offices.
- ☐ **Increased student awareness** through visual/physical updates.
- ☐ **Eventual renovation of Floors 1 & 2** to optimize student space.
- ☐ **Ultimate goal: Full student-dedicated space, available 24/7.**

## Future Impact

- ★ **More student-centric spaces** for academic, social, and extracurricular activities.
- ★ **Stronger sense of belonging** within the Columbia community.
- ★ **Enhanced community-building opportunities**.
- ★ **Improved student quality of life & satisfaction**.
- ★ **Positive impact on alumni engagement & experience**.



University Senate

Proposed: March 7, 2025

Adopted: March 7, 2025

66-0-4: In favor-opposed-abstained

**RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE STATEMENT  
ON UPHOLDING OUR COMMUNITY STANDARDS AND VALUES**

BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate adopts the statement on upholding our community standards and values, as set out, below.

**Statement on Upholding Our Community Standards and Values**

As a campus community, we are deeply concerned about actions taken by individuals or groups to actively share publicly the names of Columbia students, faculty or staff with the intent to dox. This harmful behavior can further enable and amplify harassment. Harassment, cyberbullying, and the unauthorized sharing of personal information are violations of privacy and forms of aggression, which are unacceptable. These actions undermine the core values of respect, integrity, and accountability that define our community.

Columbia University is a place where academic integrity, respect, civility, and diversity are paramount. Our ability to engage in rigorous discourse and uphold our values depends on fostering a community built on mutual respect and accountability. Harassment—whether online or in person—has no place here. It is incumbent upon each of us to be considerate of our peers and colleagues, hold one another accountable, and affirm that such behavior will not be tolerated. In so doing, we reaffirm our commitment to ensuring the safety and well-being of every member of our diverse university community.

At the forefront of Columbia's values is a dedication to community support, access for all, and inclusivity. We must actively work to uphold these principles, ensuring that every student, faculty member, and staff member feels a sense of ownership and belonging at Columbia. As a community, we must take a stand against harassment and discrimination in all their forms and reaffirm our shared responsibility to uphold the highest standards of conduct and behavior. Only through collective accountability can we preserve the integrity of our institution and create an environment where all members can thrive.

Proponent: University Senate Executive Committee