

# University Senate Plenary

July 19, 2024



University Senate

Proposed: July 19, 2024

Adopted:

PROPOSED AGENDA

University Senate

Friday, July 19, 2024 at 1:15 p.m. via Zoom

**Registration required**

**After registering you will receive a confirmation email with meeting details.**

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of April 26, May 3, and May 24
3. President's report and questions
4. Chair's report and questions:
  - a. Update on the work of the Rules Committee
5. Old business:
  - a. Update on Resolution Addressing Current Events (April 26, 2024)
  - b. Update on Resolution to Address Concerns Related to Student Disciplinary Processes (May 8, 2024)
6. New business:
  - a. Morningside Campus access: comments (Campus Planning and Physical Development)
7. Adjourn

## MEETING OF APRIL 26, 2024

Executive Committee chair Jeanine D’Armiento called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm on Zoom. Eight-seven of 98 current senators were present during the meeting, with about 680 additional spectators.

Sen. D’Armiento welcomed all present, with a reminder that only senators have a voice and a vote at plenaries. She said the Senate plays a vital role in governance with all academic constituencies represented. It is a deliberative body that does most of its work through its committees, and some of the results were evident in the present agenda, which two committee updates and two voting resolutions.

Sen. D’Armiento said this was a challenging and distressing time for the Columbia community, a time when coming together to discuss difficult issues—a key Senate activity—takes on particular importance. She thanked all senators for their commitment to the Senate’s work, including the suddenly scheduled meeting two days earlier, on April 24.

**Adoption of the agenda.** The [agenda](#) was adopted as proposed (April 26 Plenary Binder, p. 2).

**Adoption of the minutes.** The [minutes](#) of March 22 were adopted as proposed (Binder, 3-14).

**President’s report.** Sen. D’Armiento said President Shafik was unfortunately unable to attend the present meeting. As usual, Sen. D’Armiento offered to convey any questions to the president.

**Executive Committee chair’s report.** Sen. D’Armiento said academic freedom is a fundamental principle of the University Senate. At a time when external forces were challenging American higher education, the Senate must stand strong in defense of the University. Sen. D’Armiento took a moment to acknowledge the contribution of the Senate’s student leaders this year: Minhas Wasaya (Business), Cheng Gong (SEAS/Grad), and Bruce Goumain (GS). Despite sometimes divergent views, these leaders worked together under difficult conditions with poise and professionalism, Sen. D’Armiento said. Sens. Wasaya and Gong would be graduating this spring, but Sen. Goumain hoped to be reelected this spring.

Sen. D’Armiento also praised what she called the heroic work of both University and Senate negotiators in discussions with student protesters, particularly during the past week. She said they worked with the utmost integrity. The three student leaders were heavily involved, along with Sens. Jaxon Williams-Bellamy (Law) and Jalaj Mehta (SEAS/Undergrad) of the Rules Committee.

### Old business

#### *Committee Reports and Updates*

Update on the Proposal for the Creation of Dedicated Space for Columbia University’s First-

Generation, Low-Income Students (Commission on Diversity, Student Affairs, Campus Planning and Physical Development).

Sen. Adrian Brugger (Research Officers), who chaired the subcommittee that presented the *proposal* (Binder, 16-22) that the Senate approved on March 22, reported on progress since then.

He said the goal was to create a permanent space for FLI students, with a director and staff. The space would serve as a nexus, a meeting place where FLI students could network with each other, but also with the University. He said Columbia has a complex, decentralized structure, and it is not simple for new students to orient themselves and find the resources they need.

Sen. Brugger reminded senators that undergraduate FLI students comprise 21 percent of the combined student bodies of Columbia College and SEAS and 34 percent of the General Studies student population (FLI data on the graduate schools could be found in the proposal).

The hope was to find a space of about 2,000 square feet in a central campus location. Scott Wright, Vice President for Campus Services, helped find potential space in Lerner Hall. And Sen. Ann Thornton, Vice Provost and University Librarian, and her team identified spaces in Butler Library. Sen. Brugger appreciated the responses of both administrators. The next step was to find the funding to secure and renovate a space. The project was off to a good start.

## **New business**

### *Resolutions*

Resolution Addressing Current Events (Executive). Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate has a responsibility to understand what happened in the last few months that led to the University's current difficulties, so that the Senate could help to prevent a recurrence.

She said the Senate's approach is careful and deliberative. Process is important, and the administration found itself in the current situation largely because it did not adhere to process.

Preamble to the resolution. Sen. D'Armiento asked Sen. Wasaya, a member of the Executive Committee, to present the preamble to the resolution that the committee had shared at the closed April 24 plenary. She said it identified a number of critical errors by the administration but did not jump to any summary judgments. Sen. D'Armiento said she would invite discussion and then present a resolution based on the preamble.

Sen. Wasaya then began reading the *preamble* aloud (Binder, 23-24).

Sen. D'Armiento interrupted to say that Sen. Wasaya was not reading the latest revision of the preamble. In the final draft, the Executive Committee had agreed not to name names, but the version Sen. Wasaya was reading named some names starting at item #6. She asked him to read the final version of the preamble, starting at #6: "[F]ailure to defend our institution in the face of external pressure, including revealing confidential information about ongoing investigations concerning faculty."

Sen. Wasaya read the rest of the final version of the preamble.

Sen. D'Armiento invited discussion.

Sen. Henry Ginsberg (Ten., VP&S) said he was particularly troubled by item #7, the “hiring of an aggressive private investigation firm,” which he had not seen before the April 24 meeting. He asked if there was documentary support for this claim.

Sen. D’Armiento agreed that this was a serious allegation, and that was why the investigation called for in the appended resolution was so important. She said the confirmation of these allegations in the preamble would have to await the completion of the investigation. She said there would be at least a partial report on these allegations at a plenary in May.

Sen Tiffany Bryant (Alumni) asked for clarification of preamble item #6, and also of references in the preamble to breaches of due process and of privacy.

Sen. D’Armiento said these references were expressions of opinion about things that had happened in the past few months. Like the item raised by Sen. Ginsberg, they must await the completion of the impartial investigation.

Sen. Carol Garber (Ten., TC) thanked Sen. D’Armiento for that clarification. She also asked why the statement paid no explicit attention to students’ right to learn and be safe on the Columbia campus. The statement seemed to her to be focused entirely on the rights of students to engage in civil disobedience and protest. Sen. Garber recognized these rights, but she did not see why the statement seemed to ignore the rights of non-protesting students, and the impact of hostile and aggressive language and actions against Israeli and Jewish students, faculty and staff. She said the preamble also failed to address conditions in classrooms that shut down expression of ideas and perspectives about Israel that differ from those with the loudest voices. Finally, she said, the report failed to address the limits needed for speech that prevents others from speaking freely. Sen. Garber hoped the report would address some of these missing issues.

Sen. D’Armiento replied that the preamble was not really a statement. Rather, it listed a number of complaints and allegations that the Executive Committee believed needed an impartial investigation. The committee thought, for example, that refusing to use the University’s long-established disciplinary process established in the Rules of University Conduct to address a number of demonstrations in the fall of 2023 may have led to some of the problems that Sen. Garber had described.

She said there were no conclusions in the preamble, but a starting point, a set of questions to be answered through deliberate investigation. She said senators could add questions to this list.

Sen. Gordon said he understood that the factual claims in the report were based on the knowledge of the Executive Committee members who would be signing the report.

Sen. D’Armiento interrupted Sen. Gordon to say that the document was not a report. It was a set of statements that were discussed at length at the closed plenary on April 24. People made comments and proposed additions, and the Executive Committee made revisions. She said this was not a report, but the beginning of a process the Senate would be entering. She could not say whether the allegations in the document were factual or not. The answers would have to be determined by investigation.

Sen. Gordon said the first paragraph of the preamble purports to make a number of factual statements: “The university administration has taken many actions and decisions that have harmed the university....[T]he following is a non-exhaustive list of these actions and decisions.” Sen. Gordon said it was fair to ask about the factual basis for these statements. He said the Executive Committee might just be expressing its own views here, but it speaks with a broader voice, in the Senate and the University.

He said it sounded as if the Executive Committee was listing some allegations to be investigated. But that’s not how the issue was framed at the start of the document. And this point was directly related to Sen. Ginsberg’s concern about the need for proof of the grave claims made about an aggressive private investigation firm.

Sen. D’Armiento said many of the issues in the document were taken directly from the minutes of prior plenaries. She said the present plenary was not the occasion to ask whether the University did, for example, hire aggressive private investigators. The resolution calls for an independent task force to answer such questions.

Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) called attention to a typo in the text of the preamble.

Sen. Margaret Corn (Stu., GSAS/Humanities) spoke in support of Sen. Gordon’s main point. She said the focus of the preamble was clearly on one side of the issue.

Sen. D’Armiento interrupted to say that Senate had been discussing facts about the actions of the administration. The Executive Committee document did not address differences of opinion among students.

Sen. Corn recognized that multiple parties were involved in these issues. She said it was perfectly fair to focus on ways in which the administration had contributed to campus tensions, but protesters and social media also contributed.

She understood that the resolution called for an investigative task force to determine the truth of allegations against the administration, but the language of the resolution seemed to accept the allegations as factual.

Sen. D’Armiento said the first order of business was to investigate the allegations to determine whether they were factual. She also said the Senate was now discussing the preamble, not the resolution. Senators could comment on the resolution later in the agenda.

Sen. D’Armiento said the Senate was bound to monitor the conduct of the administration and leadership. She recognized that a variety of groups and individuals had been inflaming campus tensions. She said that at the April 24 meeting she specifically asked senators not to talk to the press. But someone not only spoke to the media but also self-identified. That would not help the Senate come together. Sen. D’Armiento said some people might now think the idea of an investigative task force was a way to break them apart. But the point was to bring them together, at a time when there were many calls to terminate administrators.

She said the Senate's current approach was an attempt to settle things down, to determine what happened here, and to move forward. She said some of the contents of the preamble had been outlined, presented and discussed at several plenaries. The Rules Committee held three listening sessions as part of its current review of the Rules, and reported to the plenary four times.

Sen. D'Armiento said that as the parliamentarian pointed out on April 24, the Senate has a duty to report on the administration's handling of major events on campus. She said it is not the Senate's responsibility to patrol social media.

Sen. Steven Chaikelson (TTOT, Arts) associated himself with the statements of Sens. Gordon and Corn. He said he applauded the proposal for an investigation of what were presented as mistakes by the administration. But the Executive Committee document presents these concerns as factual. So there was a discrepancy in the rhetoric of the allegations. He thought the Senate should correct the language the Executive Committee was using to describe the problem.

Sen. D'Armiento said the resolution could be revised to make clear that Senate discussions of these issues had been preliminary and that their truth remained to be determined. At the April 24 meeting, she had asked senators to propose additions to the document, and the Executive Committee had spent the last two days trying to account for these requests.

She added that some facts really *are* known: Columbia did hire private investigators; about 100 students were arrested in the encampment on April 18. But rather than assert these herself, she wanted to hear these facts stated precisely in the report of an independent investigation.

She said the fundamental disagreement seemed to be about whether the administration's actions identified in the document were the main cause the present problem. And senators would be joining that discussion

Sen. Nachum Sicherman (Ten., Bus.) said the preamble, in item 8a, said the administration called in the police "without consulting the University Senate." He said that should be changed to "without appropriately consulting," because the administration did meet the minimal terms of its obligation to consult.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed with this point. She said this change should have been made earlier.

Sen. Sicherman also said that some of the more outrageous behavior on campus was not by current Columbia affiliates. He said one of the failures of the administration to date was its failure to check IDs properly.

Sen. D'Armiento said that could be added.

Sen. Susan Bernofsky (Ten., Arts) appreciated all the extra work that the Executive Committee had put into the preamble. Speaking as a Rules Committee member (but not speaking *for* that committee), she said she had seen more than one attempt by the administration to get around Senate leaders, as well as established rules (including the University Statutes) and practices. She called on the Senate not to get distracted by current political issues on campus. She expressed strong support for putting the Executive Committee resolution forward.

In response to concerns that the statements in the preamble had been presented as statements of fact, Sen. Bernofsky said proponents could say the actions described in the preamble were alleged to have occurred, adding that the mere fact that allegations like these existed was seriously problematic, and required Senate attention.

She noted that the Columbia chapter of the American Association of University Professors had produced a much stronger statement, including censure of President Shafik. This could not be brought to the Senate floor because of procedural issues. But the Executive Committee resolution looked relatively mild to her, and she strongly favored acting on it now.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate had been pressured by many people to adopt a resolution of censure, but it would not proceed with such a resolution without carefully considering the evidence first, as a number of senators now expressing doubts about the Executive Committee preamble were asking it to do.

Sen. Howard Worman (Ten., VP&S) said that the present crisis had been a nightmare for the Committee on External Relations and Research Policy, which he co-chairs. He said everyone he had talked to, here and abroad, was asking him what the hell was going on at Columbia.

He worried that producing the proposed resolution at this time might send the wrong message. To many people, including the U.S. Congress, to half of the world, the message seemed to be that Columbia can't manage itself, and the president must resign.

On the other side, Sen. Worman said, many of the protesters seemed to be peaceful. They were eating pizza, living in tents—he didn't really care. But he said seriously that there is a small minority of vocal antisemitic people who want the destruction of Israel, and who praise Hamas. He said the present resolution might embolden those people. He said this moment might not be the right time to reveal divisions among the Senate and the administration and the students. He urged the Senate to think through this resolution and back off.

Sen. D'Armiento replied that it was the Senate's obligation to bring this resolution without delay. She said the community was in trouble, and she believed the investigative process would help people understand what was going on, and feel more trust, which was now being lost.

She said the risk of public embarrassment for Columbia would be much greater from hasty resolutions of censure and no confidence that were not based on evidence; the intention of the present resolution was not to do that. She said the Executive Committee chose not to include a number of items that were proposed for the preamble. She added that contrary to a statement in the chat, the Executive Committee did vote on each item included in the preamble.

She praised the Executive Committee, which she said had been ready all semester to turn on a dime to meet and deliberate.

Sen. Savannah Thais (Research Officers) said she didn't think the document should be changed to say that all the points in the preamble were allegations. She said many of them had been discussed all year in plenaries, and were really beyond doubt at this point. She mentioned items #1 (not



using the established disciplinary process) and #2 (making changes to the disciplinary policy without consulting the Senate) as examples.

She also said the remarks President Shafik made in her Congressional testimony are all on record.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Executive Committee document did not mention her Congressional testimony. Item #6A ("Revealing confidential information about ongoing investigations concerning faculty") was not about the president's Congressional testimony, but a summary of other documentary material that the committee saw.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed with Sen. Thais that an independent task force would not be reinvestigating what the plenary had already established at length. She said a report from the Rules Committee later in the meeting would clarify some of the claims in the preamble.

Sen. Thais said that contrary to a lot of what she was hearing and seeing, the present discussion was not about student behavior or the content of present political disputes. It was about whether Columbia's shared-governance structure was being taken seriously or not.

Sen. Ovita Williams (TTOT, Social Work) said she thought item #3, "Opaque processes of discipline under the CSSI-Dean's Discipline," which included the suspension of student groups, deserved stronger language. She also expressed a broad concern about problems of access to a closed-down campus.

Sen. Eduardo Moncada (Fac., Barnard) said the Senate had affirmed the priority that it doesn't want external forces dictating policy for Columbia. But it also didn't want to shirk its responsibility to investigate the serious issues raised in the present resolution in a careful way. Beginning a process of investigation was a constructive step that the Senate could take.

Sen. Wellington Soares (Stu., Journalism) thanked the Executive Committee for the present resolution, which he said differed significantly from some other recent documents about the current crisis. He thought the Senate document was better suited to the current context and to the need for more evidence. He seconded Sen. Moncada's remarks, noting that the current Senate was unfortunately in a situation of some conflict with the administration now, but that was the result of actions that the administration—not the Senate—had taken. Sen. Soares said he looked forward to voting for the resolution.

Sen. Benjamin Orlove (Ten., SIPA) understood the concerns of some senators that the proposed resolution might undermine the University, reinforcing those who seek to take the institution down. But he said the Senate could not acquiesce in administration actions which may need further investigation but which are clearly more than mere speculation or hearsay. He said the current resolution was a strong, forward-moving statement that deserved discussion. He thought it built on the Senate's best traditions and would not undermine the president, but offer a correction.

Sen. Ruth DeFries (Ten, Climate School) said she understood that the intent of the document was just to call for an investigation, but someone would have to read it very carefully and to know all of the context that the Senate had just been discussing to get to that point, because the resolution sounded accusatory and one-sided.

Sen. D'Armiento said Sen. DeFries was discussing the resolution, but the Senate was now discussing the preamble. There would be no vote on the preamble. She said the Senate had been talking about all but the last three items of the preamble since November.

Sen. DeFries said important items were missing from the preamble, including an allegation that the administration hadn't adequately investigated complaints of intimidating speech.

Sen. D'Armiento said that issue was covered in item #1, "Not utilizing long-established disciplinary processes in Fall 2023, including the Rules of University Conduct...."

Sen. DeFries said this issue would come across as very one-sided when the press got hold of it.

Sen. D'Armiento said the press was already getting hold of what the Senate was saying in a closed meeting because some senators were leaking. And the press routinely twists what it gets.

She said she had recently talked with someone about adding to the preamble the issue of intimidating speech that Sen. DeFries had raised. Those were cases in which following the known Rules and prosecuting these allegations early on would have reassured people that there was a process in place. If this problem was not covered under item #1, how should it be listed?

Sen. Vishal Manve (Stu., Climate School) thanked the Executive Committee for its report. He said the past week had been difficult for everyone at Columbia, including students who were suspended. A number of them were close to graduating including some speakers at graduation ceremonies. Sen. Manve said their concerns must be addressed.

Senator Erick Zent (Stu., CC) said his own preference was a vote to condemn and censure. But he recognized that some senators thought the present resolution was accusatory. Perhaps the very fact that it was at least somewhat unsatisfactory to many was an indication that it might be a suitable compromise. He thought the Senate should investigate, and *then* censure.

He recalled that at the February plenary, President Shafik said she would try to rebuild the trust of the Senate and the Columbia community, but she had then done the exact opposite. The administration had completely neglected its duties of shared governance.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate was not yet discussing the conclusions of the preamble. She said modifications could be made later by the Executive Committee. She invited senators to propose needed additions to the document then. She said she now wanted to move to the resolution.

Sen. Bernofsky said that because there were many people tuned in to the present meeting, student senators might not feel safe speaking about this issue. She also reminded senators that a Rules Committee report would be coming up shortly on the agenda. And she called for discussion of the resolution now.

Sen. Margaret Corn (Stu., GSAS/Hum) addressed the lack of clarity in item #1, which Sen. D'Armiento had said was intended to cover instances of intimidating speech under the category of violations that were not prosecuted under the Rules of Conduct in the fall of 2023. Sen. Corn said

the context of #1—the failure to follow longstanding disciplinary processes—seemed closely linked to #2, “Changes made to University policies in Fall 2023 without consulting the University Senate.” Perhaps #1 could be revised to make explicit the full range of violations subject to established disciplinary procedures, including discriminatory speech.

After further discussion, Sen. D’Armiento understood Sen. Corn’s point, and said the Executive Committee would account for it at their next meeting.

#### Discussion of the Resolution Concerning Recent Events.

Sen. D’Armiento read the proposed [\*resolution\*](#) aloud (Binder, 25-28) and invited discussion.

Sen. Minhas Wasaya (Stu., Bus.) said the Senate needed to pass this resolution because students who for months felt unheard by the University for subverting process and fairness decided to take a drastic action in a peaceful way. While they may have been breaking university rules with their encampment (which had not yet been established), the University still made an unprecedented and illogical move by calling in police, subverting process to arrest students.

He said reasonable people could disagree on the content of their speech, but it was clear that they were peaceful, as an NYPD officer in authority affirmed in a pointed statement about the arrests of participants in the first encampment on April 18. Sen. Minhas said those arrests inflamed the situation. Non-affiliates of all stripes then descended upon the university, using this issue for their own gain, dividing the Columbia community and creating chaos.

Sen. Wasaya said there were also real concerns about fear, hate speech, and harassment. Undeniably there were anti-Semitic incidents, both on and—more severely—off campus. He said any Columbia affiliates responsible for such acts should be held accountable, and non-affiliates should be reported to the police. It is critical to make sure that people feel safe. He said the University did not do that.

For all of these reasons, Sen. Wasaya said, the Senate needs to investigate, to figure out who did what, and to hold people accountable, without fear of external pressures.

Sen. Rosalba Savage (Stu., SW) commented on a range of issues, offering her perspective as a Jewish Social Work student about to graduate, an older scholar, and a mother soon to be a grandmother. She condemned antisemitism and also sympathized with students protesting Israel’s campaign in Gaza.

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (Stu., SEAS/Undergrad) said there was no doubt that the administration had done something wrong over the past several months. These actions were responsible for the encampments. The outcome of the current demonstrations was irrelevant to the proposed resolution.

Why did the senior administration do what it did? Sen. Mehta said he had spoken up at the April 24 plenary, arguing for a resolution of censure against the senior administration. But the counter-arguments he had heard at the present meeting had made him think again about the right course of action. Some were saying that the Senate should not make statements that might prompt unfavorable news coverage, or jeopardize government funding.

Sen. Mehta proposed that the best way to weigh these arguments was to form a task force to investigate these issues fully, and assess the result at a plenary in May.

Sen. Sophie Gasparian Chinchilla (Stu., Bus.) asked whether the goal of the resolution was to investigate Columbia's failure to protect students across the political spectrum, or to focus only on the administration's failure to respect established disciplinary processes, or to address all the points in the preamble document that had been discussed? Sen. Gasparian Chinchilla said people were asking these questions because the resolution was not clear on these points.

Sen. D'Armiento said she would take a few more comments, and see if answers to Sen. Gasparian-Chinchilla's questions emerged from those exchanges.

Sen. Gasparian-Chinchilla said she would put her question in the chat.

Sen. Akash Kapoor (Stu., VP&S) said Columbia had established an environment that for decades fostered debates with high levels of emotional charge. But administration decisions this academic year not to follow established written protocols, as Sen. D'Armiento had mentioned, had enabled conditions that make both Jewish and Muslim students feel unsafe and unwilling to engage in discourse with each other. He said one goal for him and his fellow students at CUIMC was to restore an environment where they could feel comfortable joining debates that may last for decades. He said the Senate had a responsibility to investigate the decisions that made these students feel unsafe.

He said these administration decisions had had a particular impact on students of color, who feel more unsafe with the increased presence of NYPD on campus. He said these administrative decisions had affected not only student protesters, but the entire student body.

Sen. Nachum Sicherman (Ten., Bus.) asked senators to vote against the resolution, regardless of their political views. He appealed even to senators who agreed with every word of the resolution to vote against it.

Borrowing a familiar expression, he urged the Senate not to cut off its nose to spite its face—that is, to react to a problem in a needlessly self-destructive way.

Sen. Sicherman said the University was under attack and in serious crisis. Although Title VI was mentioned at the April 24 plenary, he worried that many senators did not understand the gravity of the fact that that Columbia was now in violation of that law. He didn't see how weakening the president, who was now under attack from the right and the left, would help to resolve the crisis.

For decades, he said, Columbia was run by an administration that did not really include the faculty in decision making. He had raised this concern many times, only to be told that it wasn't entirely true, that the administration had to consult with the faculty on certain issues. He said it was interesting to see at the April 24 plenary how senators found out what the word "consulting" means. He said he would be happy to join any task force expanding the role of the faculty in governance. But he appealed to fellow senators to wait until the present crisis was over first. In the meantime, he called for helping the president and the administration as much as possible to resolve the present crisis, regardless of senators' feelings about them.

Sen. D'Armiento replied that the Senate resolution had nothing to do with whether the Senate likes people or not. It raised serious concerns about the activity of individuals, and the idea of allowing defective processes to continue during the present crisis seemed to her a strategic mistake. After all, the Senate has a duty to oversee these processes.

Sen. D'Armiento said she hoped to hear from the parliamentarian on this issue presently.

Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) said the issue before the Senate was extremely charged. Many senators would be asked to vote on the present resolution without the security of tenure. Many of them were also concerned about being doxxed by people outside the University who don't have the best interests of the institution at heart. For that reason, at the appropriate time, he would make a motion for a secret ballot on the present resolution.

Sen. Margaret Corn (Stu., GSAS/Humanities) counted herself among the supporters of a plan to investigate the administration. But if the point was to investigate, how could the resolution already be condemning the administration in the second whereas clause: "Whereas current events and the University administration's responses thereto have made studying, teaching, and research increasingly difficult for many students"? She said that is not a neutral investigatory request, but a highly partial position. Since the point of the resolution was to investigate before reaching conclusions, she said the language of the resolution should be revised to keep it neutral before the Senate votes on it. Otherwise, the object of the investigation looks like a foregone conclusion: "Therefore be it resolved that we unreservedly condemn...."

Sen. D'Armiento repeated her previous explanation that in earlier plenaries dating back to the fall semester much of the factual basis for the items in the preamble and the resolution was laid out. The facts that were missing involved explanations of how and why some of these actions occurred and who did them, and those facts would be the subject of the investigation that remained to be carried out. The answers to these questions would be a first step toward regaining trust in the administration. And it made no sense to censure or vote no confidence without these answers.

She said the intention was not to weaken the president, but to carry out Senate duties that were outlined in the Statutes.

Sen. Corn asked to follow up; Sen. D'Armiento told her to wait until other senators had had a chance to speak.

Sen. Seth Kimmel (Ten., A&S/Humanities) said that as a sign of how seriously the Senate was taking the administration's misconduct over the course of this academic year, he thought the word "censure" should appear at some point in the resolution, perhaps not directed at the president but at the senior administrative leadership more generally.

Sen. Wellington Soares (Stu., Journalism) said the present moment was difficult for everyone, but especially for students, who had been harmed the most. He said the present resolution was fundamental to the goal of protecting the rights of students, particularly their right to an education and to safety.

Sen. James Applegate (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) endorsed the resolution. He said everyone, including himself, had strong opinions about what should be done now. He thought the most important thing to do now was to find a way to step back and lower the temperature of the disagreement, and get beyond this in a healthy way. He praised the idea of creating a task force, and hoped its members would be people who view themselves as members of the Columbia community first and as passionate partisans second. He also hoped the task force would interpret its mandate broadly, investigating not only bad behavior by the administration, but also how the community got itself into the present situation. He said there had been extensive discussion of the relation of the events policy to the Rules of Conduct, but little about the discomfort of Jewish students and possible harassment under Title VI. He repeated his emphasis on proceeding with calm deliberation. Where does the University want to be on these issues a year from now? Five years from now?

Sen. Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., Law) said he thought the most important step the Senate should take now was to respond to key events of recent weeks. One of those was President Shafik's congressional testimony on April 17 (item 2a among the "resolved" clauses of the resolution), which seemed to violate norms of academic freedom that are vital to the University community; a second one was calling in the police in such a precipitous way on April 18 (item 2c). In both of these cases, the facts of the matter were not at issue.

Sen. Gordon said he would move to amend the resolution by striking item 2b from the present resolution ("Breach of privacy and due process") because it required a factual examination that remained to be conducted, perhaps by an investigative task force.

Sen. Gordon said he thought all senators could agree about the president's Congressional testimony, as well as the administration's decision to call in the police despite unanimous advice to the contrary from the Senate Executive Committee. The point was not that there was no consultation (there *was* consultation) but that the administration disregarded the committee's collective wisdom about the Columbia community.

Sen. D'Armiento objected that many students and community members had reported breaches of privacy and due process to the Executive Committee, which felt that it must investigate. She said there are social media and press accounts of these kinds of police misconduct. She asked why such an investigation was something to fear. The committee might find these allegations to be baseless, which might calm the community.

Sen. Gordon said that the resolution could say "Students have told us...", which could identify the subject of an investigation later.

Sen. D'Armiento said she understood what Sen. Gordon was saying. She proposed to proceed with discussion and, with the parliamentarian, figure out a way to offer Sen. Gordon's idea in an amendment. She also invited Sen. Gordon to draft something.

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (Stu., SEAS) agreed with Sen. Gordon's amendment. He pushed back on the idea that the Senate would be hurting itself if it established a task force to investigate the senior administration. He said it's always possible that the media could twist the Senate's intentions, but if there were a fire, someone would have to find its source to put it out, and begin to rebuild.

Sen. Susan Bernofsky (Ten., Arts) expressed gratitude for the present resolution, but also disappointment that it wasn't even stronger. She said it offered the least that the Senate should be doing. For the Senate to do nothing now, in the face of everything that had been happening, would be a huge mistake. She said the Senate's authority had been challenged to a dire degree.

She said it was urgent to pass the resolution. She also called for keeping item 2b in the resolution, because she said the Rules Committee had received multiple complaints from students about breaches of privacy and due process. She said the president had disregarded the due process rights of faculty when she agreed in the Congressional hearing to have a faculty member removed from a committee. Sen. Bernofsky proposed that the Senate move to a vote as soon as possible.

Sen. Margaret Corn (Stu., GSAS/Humanities) provided the follow-up that had been deferred during her previous remarks. She argued for splitting the resolution, to give senators a choice between a statement calling essentially for censure based on actions known to have occurred, and another one calling for an investigation of allegations reviewed by the Executive Committee. She thought that many senators would not vote for a censure resolution. She thought two separate resolutions would provide a true compromise.

She recognized that some of the items in the Executive Committee resolution were factual, but said her constituents would not support a censure resolution based on them. For example, they would reject a characterization of inviting a terrorist to speak as an expression of academic freedom. She said that since censure seemed far more controversial than investigation, the Senate could fulfill its obligation by calling for an investigation. It shouldn't avoid one action because it was seen as linked to another, more problematic one.

Sen. D'Armiento said Sen. Corn seemed to be moving the Senate toward a censure vote. She pointed out that the Executive Committee had no desire to censure anyone, particularly the president. She said the Senate does not act in that way. It investigates. Certainly in May it could come back with some conclusions.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate had to vote on the resolution soon because there was other business to address, and people would have to leave soon.

Sen. Jennifer Manly (Ten., VP&S) said the actions listed in the Executive Committee preamble were very serious, and her understanding was that censure was the action that many student and faculty groups were calling on the Senate to take. She asked why censure was not part of the document now before the Senate. She wondered whether the Executive Committee might have chosen to avoid that word in order to achieve a broader consensus.

Sen. D'Armiento interrupted Sen. Manly to say that the Senate needed to vote on the resolution in five minutes. She said the Executive Committee wanted to think about the censure option, but not to take that step now.

Sen. Henry Ginsberg (Ten., VP&S) asked for confirmation that the Senate would be voting only on the resolution, not on the contents of the Executive Committee report. Sen. D'Armiento said that was correct.

He also asked about corrective action called for in some of the items in the resolution. Sen. D'Armiento said the resolution required that the Senate task force be a full partner in the determination of any corrective actions.

Sen. Greg Freyer (TTOT, Public Health) said he went to the closed plenary on April 24 prepared to vote for censure, but he heard a lot of opinions and arguments from faculty and was persuaded that censure went too far and would play into the hands of hostile outside forces. He thought the resolution to investigate was a strong statement, but also a sound compromise.

Sen. D'Armiento said it would also provide time for thought.

*Amendments.* Sen. Shelley Saltzman said the second whereas of the resolution drew objections because it blamed the administration in one of its premises. She proposed to amend that clause by deleting its first 10 words (in italics) and adding two more (in bold): “WHEREAS *current events, and the University administration's responses thereto, have made* Studying, teaching, and research **have become** increasingly difficult for many students, faculty, and other members of the Columbia community....”

Sen. D'Armiento asked Sen. Brendan O'Flaherty, the parliamentarian, for procedural help.

Sen. O'Flaherty said any amendments would need a second and then could be voted on.

Sen. Saltzman asked to postpone the vote on the amended resolution until May. Sen. D'Armiento said that was impossible. To have a chance to report in May, a Senate task force had to be created immediately.

Sen. Saltzman then made her motion to amend. It was seconded. The Senate then approved the amendment by a vote of 61-5 with no abstentions.

There was talk of an amendment from another senator, but it never materialized.

Sen. Daniel Savin then made his motion calling for a secret ballot in the vote on the Resolution Concerning Recent Events. The motion was seconded, and the Senate then approved it by a vote of 66-3 with three abstentions.

Senators then voted by secret. electronic ballot on the amended resolution. After several minutes all senators present had received a ballot and had a chance to vote. During the voting Sen. D'Armiento read the amended resolution aloud.

Sen. D'Armiento announced the postponement of the last two agenda items: an update from the Rules Committee on the current Rules review, including a [letter](#) (Binder, 30-32) from the committee to the Office of the General Counsel asking questions about the disciplinary process run by the Center for Student Success and Intervention (CSSI), and a [letter](#) to Law School Dean Gillian Lester (Binder, 33) about 10 law students who had been disciplined for their participation in a demonstration on February 29, 2024; and an annual report from the Senate Structure and Operations Committee.



She said the Senate did not vote on [summer powers](#) (Binder, 29) at the present meeting, because the full Senate would be meeting in May. A date for that meeting had not been set, partly because there was a lot going on presently, and it was preferable to retain some flexibility in scheduling.

Ms. Mc Allister then announced the results of the vote on the amended Resolution Concerning Recent Events. It was approved, 62-14 with three abstentions. She said 79 votes were tallied, with 78 percent in favor, 17 percent opposed, and 4 percent abstaining.

Sen. D'Armiento thanked the Senate for sitting through such a long meeting. But it was important for the Senate to have covered such a serious issue carefully and thoughtfully.

She said the results of the vote were now public. Senators could notify their constituents. She joked that, based on the leaking that had already occurred, senators might be seeing the results in the New York Times before they leave their offices.

*Statement from Sen. Martinez on academic accommodations.* Sen. D'Armiento recognized Sen. Maria Martinez (Stu., CC), who spoke briefly about academic accommodations for students during the current crisis. She read a letter from a journalist friend proposing a formal policy of academic leniency for student journalists involved in coverage of the current campus events.

She said this policy might mean facilitating conversations between student journalists and their professors, or even something as major as exemptions from finals. Student well-being would depend on some adjustment of academic expectations. Without these, student journalists would be unable to keep up with their expanded obligations to their peers.

Sen. Martinez said many of her constituents, and those of fellow senators at Barnard and General Studies, had expressed the need for academic accommodations. She had learned that the Engineering School was already offering a pass-fail option.

In response to a question from Sen. John Donaldson (Ten., Bus.), Sen. D'Armiento said the Executive Committee would oversee the selection process for members of the proposed investigative task force.

**Adjourn.** Sen. D'Armiento said these were difficult times, with opinions on all sides. She urged senators to tune out the outside forces that were trying to inflame situations. It was disturbing to see the Proud Boys at Columbia.

She urged people to come together, to support the students and each other. She said they don't have to agree with each other on the issues. She said it was embarrassing what people in the Columbia community were doing to each other and their institution.

She adjourned the meeting at around 3:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff

### MEETING OF MAY 3, 2024

Executive Committee chair Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., VP&S) called the Senate to order shortly after 10 am on Zoom. Fifty-two of 77 current senators were present during the meeting, along with about 850 spectators.

**Adoption of the agenda.** The [agenda](#) was adopted as proposed (May 3 Plenary Binder, p. 1).

**Adoption of the minutes.** The minutes of April 26 were deferred.

**Chair's report.** Sen. D'Armiento said the last few days had been sad for everyone. A few days after the April 26 Senate plenary, the Columbia community suffered the violent presence of the New York Police Department on the Morningside campus. Regardless of the content of the protests, she said, these events had profoundly damaged the community, particularly the students, in a manner that would require a long time for recovery. The bonds of trust had been broken.

Sen. D'Armiento said the recovery would need not only time, but also a fundamental shift in the institution's interactions and engagements with its students. They, with the faculty, are the reason why Columbia exists and why the Senate was now meeting.

She sensed a broad mistrust of the student body and also, apparently, of the non-instructional officers, since a majority of these individuals had been excluded from campus with no notice at a critical moment in the academic year.

She said access had been restored earlier that day for Morningside faculty, yet the administration continued to exclude students as they entered the final exam period. There was now a lot of anger, hurt, suspicion, and distrust across the community. She said it was imperative for the Senate to provide a path forward, no matter how painful current conditions were. She said the Senate represents a broad constituency and can guide the community into the future by finding ways to create new bonds of trust and understanding.

Sen. D'Armiento said that at the April 26 plenary, a week earlier, the Senate had resolved to form a task force to undertake an investigation of recent events. The goal was to understand how the University had ended up where it was now, so that it would never repeat the mistakes it had made, and to offer recommendations on how to move forward.

The Executive Committee had met since April 26 to pursue this plan, despite the events of Tuesday, April 30, when police locked down the campus and arrested dozens of people involved in the occupation of Hamilton Hall. At the present meeting, Sen. D'Armiento wanted to talk more about the investigative task force and about what everyone was now feeling.

She asked Senate director Geraldine McAllister to post in the chat a brief statement with three actions that the Executive Committee had proposed as next steps for the Senate. Sen. D'Armiento also read the [statement](#) aloud (Binder, 2).

Sen. D'Armiento understood that she would hear requests for a statement of no confidence in President Shafik. She said she could not urge senators strongly enough to take the time to understand the full range of potential missteps, not just by President Shafik but by a number of administrators, and to resist moving too quickly to a no-confidence vote

Sen. Susan Bernofsky (Ten., Arts) thanked Sen. D'Armiento for her words to describe the trauma that Sen. Bernofsky and others had been experiencing. She said it was not possible to save the chat, so senators would be unable to retain the list of three actions that Ms. McAllister would be posting.

Sen. D'Armiento said that list would also be emailed to senators.

Sen. Bernofsky asked for a Senate resolution requesting that the bullet fired by a police officer into a door frame in Hamilton Hall during the bust be preserved there, unless it had already been removed. She said it could become an important memorial to this moment.

Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) said the last update from Chief Operations Officer Cas Holloway, about the shutdown and restoration of campus operations, spoke about faculty, but said nothing about research officers. When can research officers return to their labs and offices?

Sen. Savin also asked how undergraduate seniors could finish their capstone projects if they were not allowed on campus. Did they qualify for the carve-out for practice-based work in their disciplines that the COO had mentioned in other announcements?

Sen. D'Armiento assured Sen. Savin that the Executive Committee had been pressing these points. The committee did not understand why faculty had not been allowed on campus. She said that as a researcher herself, she understood the importance of access to one's lab. Researchers had such access even during Covid. She had done her best to convey the seriousness of the present situation to the administration.

Sen. Ben Orlove (Ten., SIPA) thanked Sen. D'Armiento for her Senate work. He also expressed unease about the effort involved in carrying out Sen. Bernofsky's proposed resolution to memorialize the bullet lodged in Hamilton Hall.

Sen. D'Armiento suggested worrying about the bullet later.

Sen. Orlove echoed Sen. Savin's question about capstone projects: How would these students finish the semester if they couldn't finish their projects?

Sen. D'Armiento noted the large number of comments calling for a vote of no confidence in President Shafik, and for her resignation. Sen. D'Armiento said some people seemed to believe that the president alone was responsible for every bad decision in the current crisis. Sen. D'Armiento repeated her opinion that an investigation must take place before anyone should make a final decision about current events.

Sen. Jeffrey Gordon asked how much the Executive Committee was consulted before the police action of April 30. He said it was clear from press accounts that the president did not act alone, but in consultation with the Trustees.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed.

Sen. Gordon understood that the administration did consult with the Executive Committee as required by the statutes. What advice did the Executive Committee give?

Sen. D'Armiento said that on the morning of April 30 the committee was not consulted. But it sent an email to the administration identifying two options: One was to negotiate with the students to seek an understanding about the encampment on the South Campus lawn and the Hamilton Hall occupation. The other option, which the Executive Committee did not recommend, was to call in the police.

At around 8 pm on April 30 the Executive Committee was notified that the administration was invoking the emergency provision in the Statutes for bringing in the police. The committee was notified but not consulted about this decision.

Sen. Gordon understood Sen. D'Armiento to be saying that the Trustees, acting with the president, made the decision to bring in the police.

Sen. D'Armiento again agreed. She said an administrator contacted the police and asked them to come to campus. The NYPD made clear that it was not their decision; they were asked. President Shafik indicated it was a decision by Columbia's senior leadership, including the Trustees.

Sen. Gordon asked if there was consultation about how long the police would remain on campus.

Sen. D'Armiento said no. The committee wrote to the administration on May 2 to ask about this situation; the reply was that the matter was under review.

Sen. Aarsh Ray (Stu., CDM) seconded Sen. D'Armiento's earlier remark about the importance of investigating the history of the current situation before making a decision.

Sen. D'Armiento said some people were expressing no confidence in leadership, but she added that the Senate might be able to work with the 17-member Deans' Council.

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (Stu., SEAS/Undergrad) said the last few days had been miserable. He agreed with previous speakers who had said it was too early to decide what to say about the president.

*Motions to suspend the rules.* Sen. Greg Freyer made a motion to suspend the Senate's procedural rules to allow senators whose terms had ended but whose successors had not yet been elected to speak (but not vote) at the present meeting. The motion was seconded.

Sen. D'Armiento explained that the Senate was now in transition. The motion would allow people who had been active in the Senate but were no longer senators to participate in current plenary discussions, to provide a voice for their former constituencies.

Sen. Bernofsky offered what she hoped was a friendly amendment to Sen. Freyer's motion, to extend speaking privileges further to include non-senator members of Senate committees.

Sen. Richard Smiley (Ten., VP&S) objected. He said the Senate had never allowed non-senator committee members to participate in plenaries in that way before.

Sen. Bernofsky said she thought non-senator committee members are really invested in the work of the Senate, and they are allowed to speak in committee meetings.

Sen. Smiley said that had been true for more than 50 years.

Sen. D'Armiento consulted the parliamentarian, Prof. Brendan O'Flaherty (Ten., A&S/Social Sciences), on the proper procedure for these motions. He said the Senate would first have to vote on Sen. Bernofsky's amendment by simple majority, and then on Sen. Freyer's motion to suspend the rules, with or without the amendment, by a two-thirds majority.

Sen. D'Armiento said there were now many comments in the chat by people saying they were suffering and not being heard. She said there is suffering and pain everywhere. She acknowledged the fear and pain and sadness of Jewish students over the last few months and emphasized that such problems could not be solved in the chat. She called for acceptance of the fact that the Columbia community was now suffering. No one's suffering was greater than anyone else's. The point was to bring people together at this moment to decide how to move forward. She said the current back-and-forth in the chat would not be helpful to anyone.

The Senate approved Sen. Bernofsky's amendment by a vote of 26-11, with 5 abstentions.

The Senate then approved Sen. Freyer's motion, as amended, by a vote of 33-1, with 5 abstentions.

Sen. D'Armiento again asked people in the chat to stop arguing.

Sen. Shelley Saltzman (TTOT, SPS) asked to have Sen. D'Armiento's three points posted again in the chat, and Sen. D'Armiento restated them.

*Discussion resumed.*

Sen. Henry Ginsberg (Ten., VP&S) set aside the issue of what to say about the president. But he said the current campus shutdown was just another example of the chaos caused by the administration's frantic response to the current situation.

His sense was that the administration and the Trustees seemed to be focused on saving Commencement, to the exclusion of every other priority. He said it would be a major embarrassment to the University not to have this graduation, particularly after everything that had happened. He said the administration was making drastic maneuvers, and then backing down. He urged senators to consider this situation, and how the administration had mishandled it. Prof. Joseph Slaughter (Ten., A&S/Hum), a member of the Rules Committee and a former senator, said he was standing for election to the Senate again. He cited a colleague's remark that the senior administration had shattered the trust of the University for students and faculty and staff, and had then left the task of putting the pieces the pieces back together to the same groups.

He said the Senate must claim this moment and provide a way forward, as it had at its founding after the crisis of 1968. He said that whether or not one thought that the occupation of Hamilton Hall during the previous week required police action to end it so quickly, the fact that the situation had deteriorated to that point demonstrated a colossal failure of management. That failure began not with the encampments but with terrible decisions made by senior administrators going back to October. He had been privy to some of those discussions, and he hoped that any investigative task force would call him as a witness. He would happily hand over his evidence.

Prof. Slaughter said he believed that Senate committees—certainly the Rules Committee, but also Student Affairs—had clear evidence to support a vote of no confidence in the president and her senior vice presidents and leaders, who were named in the document presented to the Senate by the Executive Committee at the closed plenary session on April 24.

Prof. Slaughter said he had no confidence that the senior administration and trustees would find a way forward. In various meetings and press conferences, they had been repeating statements that were later disavowed by the police or shown to be false by the excellent reporting of students from campus radio station WKCR, the Columbia Daily Spectator, or Bwog.

Prof. Slaughter said that if he were able to vote now, he would support the creation of an investigative task force, although he personally thought there was already sufficient evidence to support a vote of no confidence.

Sen. Marco Tedesco (Research Officers) proposed creating a task force to help students and parents during this difficult time.

Sen. D'Armiento said the University needs a task force that can engage rapidly with the student protesters, to be guided in part by the Senate, so that negotiations can resume. It was critically important to show students that they don't need an encampment or a building occupation to start a serious negotiation.

Sen. Marco Tedesco said his second idea was to think of a course of action less severe than an immediate no-confidence motion. He suggested setting a timeline till the next meeting, providing for an open dialogue in the interim, and a period to prepare to decide on a course of action.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate is a deliberative body. It had not approved summer powers for the Executive Committee on April 26 because it was still working. It could meet again in a week or two to act on resolutions on some of the issues now before the Senate. But it would not take action now because the Senate does not work that way. It gathers the facts, presents them, and then decides on the action to take. It avoids the kind of rash actions that had brought the University to its present predicament. She said the Senate should also engage with the Council of Deans, another governance body of senior leaders whose involvement in addressing the current crisis is sorely needed. She said there is no Senate resolution on the table now aside from the one the Executive Committee presented on April 26.

Sen. Carol Garber (Ten., TC) expressed appreciation for the Senate's commitment to pursue an independent examination. She called attention to another issue that had not arisen in Senate

discussion—the persistent problem of polarization on campus. She said she was seeing a lot of language that was truly disturbing for many at the present meeting. She recognized that many Columbia people were deeply upset about the police, but she also wanted to raise the issue of security on campus. She said a number of people with known ties to terrorist organizations were able to pass through tight security to get onto campus.

Sen. D'Armiento interrupted Sen. Garber, and there was cross-talk, including some from a spectator without speaking privileges.

Sen. D'Armiento said she had had to mute Sen. Garber because the Columbia community had no evidence of terrorist involvement in the Columbia protests, and it was unfair to bring that up without evidence.

Sen. Smiley disagreed with Sen. D'Armiento. He said senators say a lot of things at Senate meetings, and Sen. Garber should be allowed to speak.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed that Sen. Garber had a right to speak but could not make such inflammatory statements at a time like this without presenting evidence. She said the Senate works through committees, and if a committee provided evidence for Sen. Garber's statement, it could be presented, but the University was now in a difficult moment, and such unsubstantiated claims were inappropriate. She said she had had to mute Sen. Garber because Sen. Garber had not let *her* speak. She then unmuted Sen. Garber.

Sen. Erick Zent (Stu., CC) said statements like the one Sen. Garber was making are dangerous.

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento said Sen. Zent was speaking out of turn. She said she was in charge of the present meeting—it was her meeting, and she had not called on him.

She agreed that there was danger in Sen. Garber's statement, but said Sen. Smiley was correct, and Sen. Garber could speak now. She repeated that there was no evidence of terrorists, and that that word would not help to calm the meeting down, as she needed to do. She acknowledged that she might have broken the rules, but she could not allow that kind of statement at a time like the present. She asked Sen. Garber to speak.

Sen. Garber said the question of who was involved in the occupation of Hamilton Hall needed to be investigated. Speaking generally, she said there was evidence that there were groups who were influencing campus groups in this country to behave in certain ways, and this evidence needed to be addressed. She said many people were afraid because of this. She said she did not discount anyone else's perspective, or intend to suggest that anyone on Columbia's campus was affiliated with such groups. She stressed that the security of Columbia's campuses is a vital priority.

Adrian Brügger (Research Officers) said his Senate term had just expired, and he hoped to be reelected in the coming week. He spoke for his constituency and as the director of the largest lab on the Morningside campus. He said he wanted to find solutions for some major current problems, which had been exacerbated by the continuing presence of the NYPD. He said that if the police would be staying for some time, they should at least be providing some level of response and safety. Did the University have a plan to move forward during this period, or would it just hold its breath

until the police were supposed to leave on May 17? He said students were begging him to come back to his lab so they could finish their capstone projects, which they'd been working toward for four years. Here again, he said, Columbia had no process in place, and was making it up along the way. It took him two days to get inside the lab he directs. He said access seemed to be randomly determined.

Dr. Brugger said he had seen vague emails from COO Cas Holloway and President Shafik. It was still unclear whether students finishing capstone projects whose dorms were off campus could get into their labs. Research officers also faced problems of access.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed that researchers urgently had to get back on campus.

Dr. Brugger said Columbia needed a system to make that possible.

Sen. William Hunnicutt (Research Officers) recommended turning off the chat, which he said was now impeding Senate business.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed, and said she had asked for exactly that to happen. She said the same people were again arguing with each other.

Fouad Habib, a former student senator, a 2023 graduate from the Mailman School of Public Health, and currently a nonsenator member of the IT Committee, thanked the Senate for allowing people in his position to speak. He associated himself with Prof. Slaughter's remarks. He said Columbia's encampment had spurred similar actions at campuses across the U.S. and other countries as well. How would history remember this episode? Would Columbia resolve it equitably and peacefully, or would it fail to do so? He urged the University to follow the example of some other American universities that had reached agreement with their students and de-escalated dangerous situations.

Mr. Habib agreed with Sen. D'Armiento's point that both sides in the chat debate could legitimately claim to have suffered, but that wouldn't help to resolve the current conflict. There was now a humanitarian crisis in Gaza that must be addressed. He saluted activism on American campuses across the decades, which he said had led to important social changes.

Sen. D'Armiento said she was seeing comments in the chat about shutting down the chat. She said she welcomed comments in the chat, and was considering setting up a forum for an exchange of this kind. Her intention was not, as some were claiming, to suppress freedom of speech, or to shut down the chat because, as some had claimed, the Senate allows students to disrupt the University but not the Senate. But she said the community was in a crisis now, and the Senate was in an important business meeting, looking for a way forward.

Sen. Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., Law) said the current round of protests was very different from the ones he remembered from earlier days. In past protests against the Vietnam War, or South African apartheid, or fossil fuels, there were three main groups to account for: active student groups, disengaged student groups, and the University administration. The post-October 7 situation, by contrast, had pitted major student groups against each other, sometimes resulting in intense antagonism. Another difference was the effect of these conflicts on the University. In earlier protests, the University could say it doesn't get involved in politics, but then offer modest



concessions, without seriously compromising its claim to neutrality. But this time any accommodation for either side could stir fierce blowback from the other and in the public realm. Sen. Gordon said this is partly why it's hard to figure out a resolution in this case.

Sen. Gordon said many people say that the University's ability to affect the situation on the ground in the Middle East is small, and that protesters should direct their political energy more broadly. He said analogies from past protests did not really apply to the current situation.

Prof. Susan Witte (Ten., Social Work), a recent senator and a member and former chair of the Commission on the Status of Women, supported the statements of Prof. Slaughter, Mr. Habib and others who were calling for more action sooner to allow the Columbia academic community, including faculty, students and staff, to share power. She said the military-style NYPD operation to end the occupation of Hamilton Hall on April 30 terrorized the campus and the 10 surrounding blocks, including part of the Harlem community. She said there is clear historical evidence of the lasting effects of trauma, especially on black and brown communities, from operations of this kind.

She said the Senate must act now to take back faculty governance though she acknowledged that she wasn't sure what form that action should take.

She identified herself as a social worker, proud that the International Federation of Social Workers had joined the calls for peace and a solution of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, as thousands of people were being slaughtered with weapons supplied partly by American tax dollars. Columbia is an academic community that studies these issues, and must do more.

She said she supported the proposed investigative task force, but added that there had been a colossal failure of administration, as many had pointed out, and the Senate must find a way forward. She had received calls from constituents at the Social Work School for no-confidence votes.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate fully acknowledged these considerations, and would remember them in its efforts to assure good governance, but would not make quick, rash moves. She said it was a critical time, and the University needed leadership and stability.

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (SEAS/Undergrad) said he still didn't understand the rationale behind the recent no-confidence vote of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, or the conviction that the vote must be rushed. He said that, as a member of the Rules Committee, he was aware of many of the administration's missteps in recent months, and had spoken out about them. But he said a no-confidence vote, to be legitimate, must follow an investigation that demonstrates the need for such an action.

Sen. D'Armiento agreed, and added that the Senate needed to put a plan in place for next steps. Prof. Seth Kimmel, whose term as a senator representing tenured A&S faculty in the humanities had just ended, said he was profoundly disappointed in the Senate. He said he was hearing essentially the same discussion that he had heard at the last plenary a week before, despite everything that had happened in the last week. He said the Senate now had a lot of the information it needed, and should act quickly.

Sen. D'Armiento pushed back on this point. She said the Senate could no-confidence everybody. But what plan was Prof. Kimmel—or any other proponent of a no-confidence vote—recommending for going forward afterwards?

Sen. Susan Bernofsky (Ten., Arts) said it was imperative for the Senate to act swiftly in response to what was done to the Columbia community in public. The entire world saw the spectacle of the University sending in an army of police to discipline students. She said the University was fully capable of disciplining its own students.

She said the administration's decision to end negotiations at the end of the previous week was not necessary. Other universities ended their student protests through negotiation. It was a sign of weakness that Columbia ended its protests with violence.

Sen. Bernofsky supported a Senate vote on a motion of censure, if only to separate the Senate from the process that allowed this bust to take place.

She said someone earlier in the meeting had described the NYPD function on campus as providing safety. But she had been hearing reports from WKCR, Instagram, and her own students that some of the first- and second-year students in the dorms on campus now had been sexually harassed by police officers. She had also heard of students in jail being harassed. Some arrested students had spent two nights in jail and were deprived of water for up to 8 hours at a stretch. There were multiple reports of students getting kicked in the face by police officers, and a report of a broken ankle. The last students were released on May 2, the day before the present meeting, and there might be more reports to come. When she met with students on May 2, she was horrified by the level of trauma that she saw.

She repeated that the Senate should act now, if only to affirm that what happened on the night of April 30 was unacceptable.

Sen. D'Armiento said a Senate motion of no confidence would require the approval of the Executive Committee, which had already recommended against such a vote. During the coming week the committee hoped to meet with administrators, trustees, and possibly the deans to get a fuller understanding of the current state of affairs, and to prepare a plan, in addition to the investigative task force that it had proposed.

Sen. D'Armiento said one key question was why most of the Columbia population was not allowed on campus. She said it was possible that the administration had information that might justify such a restriction. So her sense on this day, May 3, was to wait a bit for more information. She said she might decide that the Senate must meet in the coming week.

Erick Zent (Stu., CC), whose Senate term had just ended, said that after 1968 the University Senate was created to be a check on administration. At the closed plenary meeting on April 24, the Senate had discussed a vote of no confidence. A number of people at that meeting were concerned about the impact of such a Senate action on the prestige and reputation of the institution. They worried that such a change would be playing into the hands of conservatives. Sen. Zent said this reaction alienated students, and led to the occupation of Hamilton Hall. The Senate failed to meet its

responsibilities at the April 24 and April 26 plenaries because it kept harkening back to further deliberations, but doing nothing as the threat of a return to campus by the NYPD loomed.

Mr. Zent said the Senate should recognize this failure. He acknowledged the importance of deliberation and process, but said that when conditions are changing rapidly, the Senate must also adapt. He said the Senate should consider this challenge again now. He himself did not support a vote of no confidence at this point because he thought the consequences were too unpredictable. If President Shafik were to decide to resign in response to such a vote, the administration might replace her with another person who would not respond to student or faculty needs.

Mr. Zent's own view was that the Senate should focus more on structural changes. The encampments and the Hamilton occupation happened because students and faculty did not feel heard by the administration. He said the Senate has only symbolic power. One productive change would empower the Student Affairs Committee to conduct university-wide referendums on important issues, instead of having to hold separate votes by more than a dozen Columbia schools.

Sen. D'Armiento said Mr. Zent had begun by saying the Senate had failed by choosing not to vote no confidence, with one of the results being the Hamilton occupation. But later he had asked, What good would a no-confidence vote do? Sen. D'Armiento thought that was the key point.

Mr. Zent said that at the time of the April 24 plenary a no-confidence vote was important because it would have neutralized President Shafik. But now there was no benefit in conducting such a vote.

Sen. D'Armiento said Mr. Zent seemed to believe that the decision process was entirely in the president's hands. But that understanding needed to be tested by the independent investigation that the Senate was seeking. She said the second part of Mr. Zent's statement included valuable insights about limitations on the Senate's power, which should be evaluated and addressed. She said identifying and correcting weaknesses like these could help the Senate move forward with better governance.

Mr. Zent said he had also prefaced his current statement by saying the Senate needed to adapt better to changing circumstances. At one moment, he said, the correct step was censure, but then conditions changed and that action was no longer the right one because there was no longer a looming threat.

Mr. Zent said the fundamental reason why the encampments and the Hamilton Hall occupation occurred was that there is no transparency in the operations of the University. He said a booklet or manual of some kind was needed to explain how Columbia really works. Mr. Zent thought his four years in the Columbia College Student Council (two as class president, two as senator) would teach him what he needed to know about governance at Columbia. But he still didn't know how this labyrinthine, decentralized beast functions.

Sen. D'Armiento said the search for transparency requires thorough investigations by a neutral party. She completely agreed with Mr. Zent about the importance of that search.

*A statement from the Columbia College Student Council.* Sen. Wena Teng (Stu. CC) said the Columbia College Student Council (of which all College senators are members) had unanimously endorsed a [statement](#) on the current crisis, which she then read in full (Binder, 3-4).

Sen. Teng then said the Senate was created in response to the protests of 1968, and she asked what restructuring must take place now to ensure that the brutal outcome of this spring's protests would never happen again. How could the University Statutes be strengthened to ensure that the administration is held accountable when it has broken the rules? She said the NYPD would be on campus until May 17th: What was being done to protect students from the NYPD before the situation escalates again?

Speaking separately and individually now as a senator who had reminded the Senate last fall of the parallels between campus conditions in 1968 and in November 2023, when the administration had suspended the activist groups Students for Justice in Palestine and Jewish Voice for Peace; and as a history major who had written her "Why Columbia?" essay about student activism here, she said it was wrong for Columbia to exploit its history of student protest to elevate its credentials as an institution, and boast an archive on 1968 in the Libraries called "Columbia in Crisis," when it was failing to navigate a new crisis characterized by police brutality. She said current faculty and students are the only ones who have truly inherited the spirit of activism from 1968. She said it was important to look back into Columbia's archives, but also to think about how Columbia's history can figure in its future healing.

Sen. D'Armiento thanked Sen. Teng for identifying crucial issues: student access to food and the facilities they require. Sen. D'Armiento said she would use the present forum and the rest of the current day to stress to administrators the urgent need to meet these responsibilities.

She also recognized the need to understand why this shared-governance body had been unable to stop what happened this time. Such an understanding would help the Senate to change, and to move forward with better governance.

She said the purpose of the present meeting was to address the problems that needed to be addressed immediately with the administration. She made a commitment to hold a plenary meeting the following week to report on progress with these problems. The Executive Committee also wanted to meet with Trustees and the Council of Deans. There might also be a new resolution to vote on.

Margaret Corn (Stu., GSAS/Humanities), whose Senate term had just ended, said Senate constituencies are deeply divided about the current crisis, with mutually exclusive viewpoints. Because one of the two groups had been more heavily represented in the Senate discussion so far, she would focus on the other group, including a number of her own GSAS student constituents, particularly in connection with the second of Sen. D'Armiento's three points, calling on the administration to engage with the student protesters immediately.

Ms. Corn acknowledged a number of the criticisms of the administration she had heard over the course of the meeting, but she took issue with the claim that the University did not engage in good-faith negotiations with the protesters, and thereby enabled the occupation of Hamilton Hall.

She said that, to the contrary, the University really did negotiate with the students, a point that she said was corroborated by the Senate, and it was the student groups that stopped negotiating because they did not like the terms that the University was offering. She said either side in talks has the right to cease negotiating, but the idea that students hadn't been listened to, at least at that stage, was on the record false. She added that it was disingenuous to imply that being heard requires the acquiescence of the University, and that the student protesters made clear that they were not going to be satisfied with anything less than 100 percent of what they were asking for. That is not good-faith negotiation. And that meant that the Hamilton occupation was not a logical or inevitable consequence of these negotiations.

She said the University had already taken steps to engage in good-faith negotiations again, and the students had already rejected that effort. Under these conditions, how could the University fulfill action #2 on Sen. D'Armiento's list of three actions items—an immediate resumption of negotiations? She said a further complication was that the push for divestment in this case clearly did not meet one of the criteria that former President Bollinger had set for a divestment decision—a broad consensus in support of it. She said it was obvious from the debates in the chat at the present meeting that there was no consensus on divestment. She was also skeptical about claims that divestment had majority support in the Columbia community. Her sense was that a large, mostly silent segment of the Columbia population opposed divestment.

Sen. D'Armiento noted that Ms. Corn had not been in the negotiating room, so she could not speak authoritatively about the facts of the negotiations. At the April 26 plenary, Sen. D'Armiento had said that negotiations had been held in good faith but, according to public statements from both the University and student protesters, had now ended. She said that the question of what happened in these negotiations should be revealed in an investigation.

Ms. Corn said she was relying on statements Sen. D'Armiento had made more than once on the record about the negotiations.

Sen. D'Armiento's response was partly drowned out by cross-talk from an unmuted microphone.

Ms. Corn said one such statement was made at the previous plenary on April 26. She recalled Sen. D'Armiento acknowledging that there had been good-faith efforts to negotiate.

Sen. D'Armiento confirmed saying in a letter, possibly on Monday, April 29, that the negotiations had been conducted in good faith. The police came the next day. She said again that the need to settle matters of fact about the Hamilton episode was another key reason why the Senate was calling for an investigation. She also said negotiations or discussions with students would be important at a time like this regardless of the failure of past negotiations.

Sen. D'Armiento said both she and Ms. Corn had made their points in this disagreement.

A spectator with no Senate affiliation complained about the closing of the chat, which prevented her from sharing a statement. Sen. D'Armiento said the spectator could try to contact a senator for help conveying her statement.

Mr. Habib disagreed with Sen. Gordon's remark earlier in the meeting that the present crisis was different in important ways from previous crises arising from student protests.

Mr. Habib also supported Sen. D'Armiento's remarks about the Senate's need to find a way forward. He asked what the timeline was for her plan. When would the investigation start? He hoped it could begin soon, so the Senate would not be repeating the same statements from one plenary to the next.

Sen. D'Armiento said she had already mentioned requests for meetings with Trustees and the Council of Deans, as a first step in planning efforts. The reason for the present meeting was to assess the situation, including the limitations of the Senate's capacity to respond to a crisis like this one that a few senators had identified, as well as the pressing practical needs on campus that were not getting addressed.

Sen. Bernofsky said she would not repeat her previous arguments in favor of a no-confidence vote, although she had not changed her mind. She asked to have the statement Sen. Teng had read distributed to all senators. She thanked the Columbia College Student Council for putting together that document.

She expressed concern that the framing of the first of Sen. D'Armiento's three action items might allow the senior administration too much discretion in assigning seats on the investigative task force. She thought the phrasing should make clear that the Senate and not the administration would be choosing the bulk of the members.

Sen. D'Armiento appreciated the reminder.

Ms. Rosalba Savage (Stu., SW), whose Senate term had just ended, said she was moved by the statement Sen. Teng had read. She said that given the significant divisions among senators over the current crisis, it was important to look for points of agreement. She said the main one of those appeared to be about the importance of student safety and well-being, which she said the Senate should focus on.

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (SEAS /Undergrad) said he had personally attended and helped to pull together dinners for students every night in the past week or so. He said these efforts had brought people together as a community to take care of students as the administration had failed to do.

His second point was that Student Affairs Committee leaders had put out an email saying that the administration had not always acted in good faith with students. He expressed concern about this phrasing in the email because the Senate Executive Committee was working closely with administrators and such an expression of doubt might undermine that collaborative effort.

Sen. Mehta said he agreed with Sen. Zent's point that it seemed clear that students wanted to negotiate. He said there had been little communication on why negotiations were discontinued. But he said it was unfair to assume, as some have, that the student protesters cut off negotiations.

Sen. Smiley supported Sen. Corn's statements about the negotiations, partly because she seemed to be a lone voice on that side of the issue, and that seemed to him unfair. He agreed with most of what

she said. He said the criticism that she didn't have the facts also seemed unfair, because she had referenced statements she had heard from Sen. D'Armiento at the previous plenary.

He also thought that the main focus of the question of what people should be doing now was made clear in Sen. Teng's statement about students' pressing needs

Sen. Smiley's final point was that he was from the Medical Center, and the medical faculty, for a variety of geographic, economic, and other reasons, is a little more conservative than their Morningside counterparts. He said they tend to view the Morningside faculty as monolithically opposed to the administration and, frankly, monolithically in favor of the protesters. His own sense was that most of the Senate was on one side of these issues, and he was a bit uncomfortable to find himself on the other side.

He said it was worth remembering that the Senate has many constituencies, and not all of them agree with what appeared to be the prevailing sense of opposition in the Senate to the administration's response to the occupation of a building on campus. Sen. Smiley's final thought was that the Senate should be a bit more balanced.

Sen. Lalitha Vasudevan (Ten., TC) thanked Senator Teng and her fellow Columbia College students for their statement. She said she and her colleagues at Teachers College were talking about ways to support students, and about how to move the whole University forward. She asked whether there could be regular updates on current events from the Senate Executive Committee.

Sen. D'Armiento said the purpose of the present meeting was to provide such updates, particularly in a moment of rapidly changing circumstances. The Senate also could not provide regular written updates of, for example, the events as complex as the past week's. But she said she would try to communicate more information more regularly.

Sen. Ulrich Hengst (Ten., VP&S), newly elected, thanked the Executive Committee for the three action items. He proposed a revision of the second point: Instead of saying the administration should engage immediately with the student protesters, Sen Hengst thought it should say the administration should engage with all students, including those who shared Ms. Corn's views.

Sen. D'Armiento partly agreed with Sen. Hengst on this point, which she said had been the Senate's mantra since October. She said she would revise point 1 accordingly. But she added that it was also important to stress the need to engage immediately with the protesters because people on the different sides needed to talk to each other.

*Statements from Union Theological Seminary and Morningside Neighbors.* Sen. Andrea White (Ten., Union Theological Seminary), a member and past faculty chair of the Senate Diversity Commission, read aloud a [letter](#) signed by 300 UTS students, faculty, and alumni declaring support for the student protesters (Binder, 5-6).

Sen. White said the letter was sent by Michelle Alexander, a student at UTS, to President Shafik, COO Cas Holloway, and Provost Angela Olinto, copying Sen. D'Armiento.

Sen. White also read an [invitation](#) from Morningside Neighbors, a community group, to join a daily neighborhood walk (Binder, 5-6) to protest the continued presence of police in the community.

Sen. Alex Roman (Stu., TC) appreciated the CCSC statement, as well as the dedication of many senators to ensure that all constituents were being included in present discussions.

He asked for specifics on the timeline for the proposed investigation. He had also heard repeated requests for rapid information to enable senators to understand current developments.

Sen. D'Armiento said she didn't yet have that communication mechanism, but was working on it.

Sen. Gabriella Ramirez (Stu., SIPA), newly elected, introduced herself. She agreed with previous speakers who said that increasing police presence is designed to build a sense of safety and security, but often has the opposite effect for many students. What would promote a sense of security, she said, is better communication between students and administrators.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Executive Committee was requesting information on the reasoning behind the increased and continuing police presence, but Senate access to information was limited, as several senators had already pointed out.

Minhas Wasaya (Stu., Bus.), whose Senate term had just ended, reminded senators that there had been months of maladministration leading up to the crisis of the past few weeks. Deficient communication played a major role in the culmination of events on April 30. He said the only words he could use to describe what he had seen from outside of the gates on that night were "militarized state fascism."

He said people may disagree with what the protesters said and did, but he urged them to consider how the civil-rights, anti-war and anti-apartheid movements functioned at Columbia. There were certainly differences among them, including the constituencies involved. But the methods are not that different.

He mentioned some action items to consider now.

1. Open the Morningside campus up as quickly as possible. The current situation is untenable.
2. The NYPD needs to leave campus. The Columbia community saw on April 30 that the police do not keep them safe; they are here to keep property safe.
3. The first medium-term step is to investigate and hold accountable everyone in the administration who is responsible for the current state of affairs. A lot of information was already emerging: a report that a SIPA professor was involved in the work of an NYPD intelligence division; reports of suspensions meted out to students of Muslim or Arab descent who weren't even in the encampments; a Dept. of Education investigation.
4. A second medium-term step is to understand the boundaries of academic freedom, the First Amendment, the civil rights provisions of Title VI, the Rules of University Conduct and any other disciplinary codes and proceedings now in use. Most importantly, there must be transparency about how Columbia works.
5. Finally, despite major efforts, the Senate failed to prevent the events of April 30. Earlier in the meeting this failure had been attributed to a structural rot in the way power is wielded in the University. He said the Senate does not have real power. Structural



reforms are needed to empower the Senate, and to enable it to hold people accountable, and fulfill its purpose as a check on administration. Those reforms must also empower the Senate to respond more effectively to the needs of students and other constituencies.

Mr. Wasaya concluded his remarks by saluting a few key actors in the current crisis:

Power to the student voices.

Power to people who are working to serve our student community and meet their basic necessities. Finally, power to the brave student journalists who stood firm to bear witness to the brutality that our university administration unleashed upon us, with fear in their voices, trembling hands typing on their laptops. They showed us who we are.

Sen. D'Armiento noted a number of attempts by other universities to negotiate with their students. Some of these did not reach an agreement, but some did. One University agreed to a process which required trust from the students. Unfortunately at Columbia this trust does not exist.

She said that if students can trust the Senate and the University, agreements may be possible. Negotiations require individuals to keep working together and trusting each other. Columbia's efforts were hampered by the lack of that trust; rebuilding that is essential.

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (SEAS/Undergrad) read a statement from the student spectator at the present meeting (Layla Saliba), who did not have speaking privileges.

The idea that negotiations are in good faith is false. Columbia suspended one of our negotiators for no reason. When asked what rules he broke, Columbia could not find anything.

A large concession that students have asked for is financial transparency. Currently only 0.66 % of Columbia's investments are public knowledge.

Columbia has made no effort to meet with Palestinian student organizations such as Students for Justice in Palestine. Meanwhile they met with students supporting Israel on October 17, 2023.

The concessions given, such as aid to education in Gaza, are not things we asked for. Investing in education 10 years from now means little, when every university in Gaza has been destroyed.

Students are protesting because they want to end the mass death in Gaza.

Ms. Corn said she thought the student's statement might have been drafted in response to her remarks earlier in the meeting about the negotiations.

Sen. Mehta said he had received the student's statement before Ms. Corn's earlier remarks.

Ms. Corn accepted the point, but said the statement demonstrated what she had been saying before—that the negotiations couldn't have fallen apart for the sole reason that the University refused to negotiate. She also said that the statement's complaint about bringing requests and offers to the table that were not in the original bargaining positions did not seem to understand that that's how negotiations work—neither side should expect to get everything they demanded at the outset. She said it was clear from the statement that the University did respond to student demands, though the responses may not have satisfied students.

She added that Spectator had reported that the student group Columbia University Apartheid Divest (CUAD), perhaps on Twitter through SJP, had said they were the ones to call off negotiations. She acknowledged that correct answers to these factual questions would have to await the investigation the Senate was calling for. Sen. D'Armiento agreed.

Mr. Zent said he had posted an angry face on his screen earlier because he was frustrated with discussions about facts that were not yet available.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate did not need any more hearsay.

Mr. Zent asked if the Senate could vote on a motion of censure against the president and/or the administration. He said he had just read one of the no-confidence motions that had been publicly discussed in recent days, and he considered it a good statement.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate would not do that. The Executive Committee had already decided not to recommend that course of action now.

Recalling Sen. D'Armiento's statement earlier in the discussion that conditions might change in the coming week, Mr. Zent asked if the Senate could debate a no-confidence motion on Monday, May 6. He noted that he was no longer a senator and could not vote.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate would spend the rest of the present day trying to get campus opened up to get some food to students. She also hoped to speak to members of the Council of Deans and the Board of Trustees and report back to the Senate in the coming week.

She said decisions about censure had been made rapidly and under pressure. The Senate does not function that way. It moves slowly, deliberately, and thoughtfully, and will have gathered the necessary facts when it makes decisions.

Sen. Bernofsky wanted to highlight one of the points Mr. Wasaya had made in his last remarks—about the rot in the Columbia system. She said she had observed during her two terms in the Senate that the biggest problem the Senate faced was the refusal of the upper administration and the Trustees to comply with University Statutes or to respect the power vested by them in the Senate. She said the Senate had been watching a slow-motion coup in which its power was being taken away. She said the Trustees could always simply decide to write the Senate out of the Statutes, so that the Senate would no longer exist.

Sen. Bernofsky said this was a dangerous trend that had only accelerated, and that the Senate must counter this power grab. She identified the Senate as one of Columbia's three governing bodies, along with the administration and the Trustees. The Senate is the voice of the entire community, she said, but it has been disregarded.

Sen. D'Armiento said Sen. White of UTS had had to leave the meeting, but she had appealed for reopening access to dining services, the libraries, and the gym. Sen. D'Armiento said those items were on her list.

Mr. Wasaya said he thought it was clear that the Senate's discussion of the need for a larger share of power in university governance was not a bid for self-aggrandizement. He said the Senate is supposed to be the voice of the people, and that's why it needs respect and power. It needs a two-pronged approach—grabbing back the power, but also responding effectively to people's needs. He said the Senate needs to be a body that represents the people, and for the Senate to do that effectively, the people must have the power.

Sen Ellen Marakowitz (TTOT, A&S/Social Sciences) agreed that the Senate needed to look at its structure and understand what happened. Why *doesn't* the Senate have power, or authority? She wanted to confirm that there would be a plenary during the coming week.

Sen. D'Armiento said there would be. She said the Executive Committee was not prepared to take on summer powers yet. She had gotten the message loud and clear that she needed to come back to the Senate with answers, and she would do that.

In closing, Sen. D'Armiento offered deep thanks to the student senators who had helped other students—protesters and non-protesters alike—in recent days. She said it was valuable for her to be around these young people. Future leaders would emerge from this group, and that prospect encouraged her at an otherwise sad and disappointing moment. She had seen kindness and dedication in this group of students, who got little sleep in the past week, but stepped up in a time of crisis for Columbia and did what they had to do.

**Adjourn.** Sen. D'Armiento adjourned the meeting shortly before noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff

### MEETING OF MAY 24, 2024

Executive Committee chair Jeanine D’Armiento (Ten., VP&S) called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm on Zoom. Sixty-seven of 98 senators were present during the meeting, and 186 additional spectators.

Sen. D’Armiento welcomed everyone. She reminded the many spectators present that only senators have a voice and a vote at plenaries, adding that she didn’t expect any voting at this one. She said this is a challenging time for many members of the Columbia community, and it is particularly important in such moments to come together and look for a way forward through dialogue. She thanked senators again for their commitment to the work of the Senate, especially as the year wound down. She reminded senators that she was committed to meeting regularly during the summer to share news and continue discussion. A number of Senate committees would also continue to meet through the summer.

She welcomed newly elected senators. She said they would all be introduced in September, but in the meantime they were free to raise their hand icons to speak.

**Adoption of the agenda.** The [agenda](#) was adopted as proposed (see May 24 Plenary Binder, p. 2).

**Adoption of the minutes.** Sen. D’Armiento explained that the minutes of April 26 and May 3 were not ready. They would be provided as soon as possible. [Minutes](#) of May 8 had been distributed for the present meeting (Binder, 3-12).

**Report of the President.** Sen. D’Armiento announced that President Shafik was unfortunately unable to attend, but the president, who was not visible on Zoom, announced that she was present to listen, but not to speak at the present meeting.

**Report of the Executive Committee chair:** Sen. D’Armiento said the Senate would not function under summer powers this year, so at least one additional plenary would be necessary.

*Misuse of media.* Sen. D’Armiento then gave a short [report](#) (Binder, 13-19) showing how an excerpt from a surreptitious recording of the May 3 plenary led to a distorted New York Post story, a hostile tweet from a Columbia colleague, and a volley of online abuse (both verbal and visual) directed at herself. Sen. D’Armiento said she was an adult and could manage the insults, but worried about the impact of this kind of abuse—especially doxxing—on students. She said that senators who disagreed with her management of the May 3 meeting spoke up at the time or emailed and talked with her about it later—perfectly appropriate ways to address differences collegially. She said there had been too much of the other kind of communication among Columbia people this year. She appealed to senators and the larger community to reflect on how they conduct themselves, and to be sure to align their messages with their values, above all when they disagree.

*Current Senate committee efforts.* Sen. D’Armiento briefly outlined efforts of the Student Affairs and External Relations committees to address the crisis the community has undergone.

*Update on the Senate’s April 26 resolution.* Sen. D’Armiento reminded senators of its successful April 26 resolution calling for a task force to address the causes and implications of the campus crisis. She had few details to add at this point, but senior leadership and the Trustees were on board with the idea, and were discussing it and making plans.

*Recent actions of other University bodies.* Sen. D’Armiento said the Arts and Sciences and Social Work faculties had issued statements expressing their concerns about University leadership. The A&S faculty is looking forward to the independent external review that the Senate has proposed.

*Update from the Rules Committee.* Rules Committee co-chair Jaxon Williams-Bellamy (Stu., Law) said the committee would be wrapping up its review of the Rules over the summer, with a view to submitting any revisions to the Senate in September or October. There may be another listening session, which might delay the timeline somewhat. Sen. Williams-Bellamy also alerted committee members that the group would be meeting at least once during the summer. Sen. Richard Smiley, a Rules Committee member, asked for updates on three recent Senate attempts to communicate with the Office of the General Counsel:

1. A mid-April letter asking how the Center for Student Success and Intervention (CSSI) was being used.
2. An April 29 letter asking for a correction of an erroneous administration statement that the Senate was responsible for *administering* the Rules.
3. A Senate resolution approved on May 8, insisting on a response to the earlier letter about the CSSI, and calling for the suspension of the activities of the CSSI in the absence of such a response.

Sen. D’Armiento said she was unclear on the question of whether the use of the CSSI had been suspended. She asked Sen. Williams-Bellamy to address the letter.

Sen. Williams-Bellamy said he and his Rules Committee co-chair Angela Nelson had received a response from the OGC on May 23. They expected to share the letter with the full Rules Committee later in the afternoon, and discuss next steps. Sen. Williams-Bellamy said there had been no communication from the administration about the status of the CSSI, which was concerning.

Sen. Smiley asked what would happen to the resolution that the Senate adopted on May 8. How would the administration respond to it? Sen. D’Armiento said the president and the provost are members of the Senate and were certainly aware of the concerns expressed in the May 8 resolution. She said the administration normally takes Senate concerns seriously. She said she did not know whether CSSI operations had been suspended. The answer may lie in the current exchange between the Rules Committee and the OGC. She noted that the Senate moves deliberately, working through its committees.

Sen. Joseph Slaughter (A&S/Humanities) said he happened to know that there had been a CSSI proceeding the day before involving someone who had been in the protests.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate now knew whether CSSI proceedings had been suspended.

Sen. Slaughter asked Sen. D'Armiento to say a little more about the task force of inquiry that the Senate had asked for in the resolution of April 26. He said there was considerable interest in this plan. After the 1968 campus rebellion an independent commission, chaired by Archibald Cox, published a full report after several months of investigation.

Sen. D'Armiento said she had made a request to the administration in early May for resources to conduct an independent investigation. She had discussed with them the possibility of a collaborative effort involving the administration and the Trustees. She said the Senate had pressed for a fully independent investigation by an outside firm, agreed upon by many parties. She said many have emphasized the need to use this investigation to "move the University forward." But she has maintained that Columbia cannot move forward without looking back at what has happened.

Sen. D'Armiento apologized for the vagueness of her account. She had hoped to announce a concrete decision to proceed with an investigative task force at the present meeting. That request was still under discussion, and she expected to announce a decision to proceed in the coming weeks. If the final answer turned out to be no, she would announce that promptly as well.

Sen. Abosede George (Ten., Barnard) recalled the Resolution to Endorse the Policy for Recording Classes that the Senate had adopted in March. She asked whether the surreptitious recording of the May 3 plenary that Sen. D'Armiento had reported on earlier in the meeting constituted a violation of that policy.

Sen. D'Armiento understood that the policy discussed in the March resolution was concerned only with the unauthorized recording of classes. The recording that took place at the May 3 plenary was more a violation of an understanding within the Senate community. What she found shocking was that its only purpose seemed to be online harassment. She repeated her concern that this kind of conduct was keeping Columbia people from sitting down and discussing their differences responsibly.

Sen. D'Armiento said another problem was that in a meeting with 600 or more people, with many more non-senators than senators, it would be difficult to find out who made the unauthorized recording. She added that the conditions were different for another Senate plenary held on April 24—a closed, confidential, unrecorded meeting attended only by senators and some guests from the administration, but some of the deliberations there were also leaked to the press. Sen. D'Armiento said she did not take any action on that breach of confidentiality.

## **New Business**

a. *Statement Regarding the Presence of NYPD on Campus* (Commission on Diversity). Sen. Natalie Voigt (TTOT, Nursing), faculty co-chair of the Diversity Commission, read the [statement](#) (Binder, 19-21), which she explained was an update of an identically titled statement that the Diversity Commission had presented at the December 8, 2023 plenary.

When Sen. Voigt finished reading the statement, Sen. D'Armiento invited discussion.

Sen. Andrea White (Ten. UTS), a former co-chair and current member of the Diversity Commission, underscored Sen. Voigt's statement. As one of the authors of the Commission's April 2021 Report to the Senate on University Public Safety and Restorative Justice, Sen. White was trying to educate the community on the very points Sen. Voigt had just outlined, above all about the myth that Public Safety makes everyone safer, whether that comes in the form of the NYPD, the regular Columbia security force, or the private security personnel that had recently been visible on campus.

Sen. White mentioned the current Dialogue Across Difference grants sponsored by the provost's office. She feared that summoning the NYPD in huge numbers, as the University did in April, runs exactly counter to the spirit of Dialogue Across Difference. She called for more expansive and creative thinking about that effort.

Sen. Maria Martinez (Stu., CC), a Diversity Commission member, thanked Sen. Voigt for her leadership in producing the letter. She said many of her constituents had expressed discomfort with the presence of police on campus. For some their presence evoked years of difficult experiences with law enforcement; for some others it evoked trauma. This spring there was a particular problem with cat-calling by police on campus, which is evident on a number of videos on social media, including highly inappropriate statements and general harassment. Sen. Martinez characterized this treatment as horrific.

Sen. Joseph Howley (Ten., A&S/Hum) said he was on a train, and had kept his camera off to preserve the connection. He thanked Sen. Voigt and the Commission for their statement. He then spoke at some length. Some of his words were lost on the recording, but he later submitted his remarks in a written [statement](#) (Binder, 22-23).

Sen. Jalaj Mehta (Stu., SEAS/Undergrad) said he was a current member of the Committee on Inclusive Public Safety that was founded in 2021. He said that he had tried several times to raise agenda items relevant to the present discussion, but had succeeded no more than once in starting a real discussion. Overall, he said the work of the Inclusive Public Safety Committee was entirely unfruitful. He said the members of that group—the chairs are a Social Work dean and the VP of Public Safety—don't seem to have much of an impact on University policy. He said this committee had not been effective in addressing the issues the Senate was discussing now.

Sen. Mehta said he himself felt unsafe, living on campus isolated from his friends, with more police on campus than students for two weeks. But beyond that the University was not using measures that shared governance provides to address these issues.

Sen. Jeffrey Gordon (Ten., Law) asked whether the police actually left campus on May 17, as President Shafik had said they would do.

Sen. D'Armiento said she had received pictures and reports of police on campus on May 23. She asked Cas Holloway, Chief Operating Officer, whether police were still on campus.

Mr. Holloway said police left campus no later than May 17.

Sen. Oren Pizmony-Levy, a newly elected tenured representative from Teachers College, introduced himself. He is a professor of international cooperative education, now on sabbatical in Tel-Aviv.

He sympathized with Sen. D'Armiento about the attacks she had experienced on social media. But he added that he was addressing the Senate for the first time with a sense of disappointment about the statements from Sens. Voigt and White of the Diversity Commission.

He said that as he listened to the statement, he couldn't help thinking that Jews, Jewish students and Israeli students on campus also have suffered exclusion, nasty comments, and a hostile climate over the past 7 months—a set of experiences that was totally missing from the statement.

He felt that the experience of Jewish students was being erased and ignored by the people who are commissioned to lead efforts on diversity. He appealed to the Commission to take that experience into consideration, particularly when it calls for expansive definitions of diversity and inclusion. Otherwise Jewish students will be left out again.

He asked what the Commission would do about this issue. Was there an opening to revise the statement before it reached University leadership? He thought it was essential to include all members of the Columbia community in conversations about inclusion and climate. He didn't see that the statement as presented had much potential to change the discourse. He asked the committee to think about how to make the statement truly inclusive of all members of the Columbia community who have suffered over the last seven months.

He regretted having to express disappointment in his first statement to the Senate, but he was encouraged by the belief that the Commission could do better.

Sen. D'Armiento thanked Sen. Pizmony-Levy for his comments. She said Sen. Voigt would respond, but she first wanted to stress that the Diversity Commission statement was meant to focus on the police presence on campus, an issue that the Commission had addressed several times in recent years. They tried to avoid any mention of individuals in this statement, but they also have been considering letters from students on both sides of the present issue, and are considering a response, which may come to the plenary later.

Sen. Voigt said Sen. D'Armiento had addressed the main issues. She welcomed Sen. Pizmony-Levy to his first plenary, and appreciated his comments. She said the Diversity Commission's charge is to create an inclusive space, to invite all voices to join the conversation, and to use its power—however soft or influential—to protect all members of the community.

She said Sen. D'Armiento was also correct that the Diversity Commission was taking up issues that have impacted all students. She invited Sen. Pizmony-Levy to come to a Commission meeting. But she also underscored Sen. D'Armiento's main point—the statement she had read directly addressed the issue of police on campus. She said this priority did not negate any other students' experience. She said the last few months have been distressing to many in the Columbia community, and the Commission had heard from students on all sides of the issue. She said the Commission was committed to supporting all Columbia students.



As to Sen. Howley's statement, she appreciated the data that he had provided on the impact of the police presence on the Columbia campus. She added that as academicians, the community should be able to resolve current conflicts through discourse and mediation, instead of aggression and violence.

Sen. Pizmony-Levy said he would be more than happy to join a meeting of the Diversity Commission. But he wanted the Commission to reflect on why it decided to prioritize this present statement and not to write another statement earlier on the issue of the harassment of Jews and Israelis on campus. Did it want to minimize that problem? Did it want to separate the two issues, when there's really only one? Why did the Commission prioritize one issue over the other? Why not tackle both? Both groups are suffering.

Sen. D'Armiento asked to step back. She said that for five years, the Senate had taken up the police issue, and was embedded in the culture of inclusive public safety. She said the Commission and the Student Affairs Committee also now had some documentation that she had sent to them about harassment of Jewish students on campus, which they would address.

Sen. D'Armiento said another important issue, which was not included in the Diversity Commission statement, concerns foreign students who had to leave for the summer because they felt their visas were at risk with police on campus. One student who had a job in Sen. D'Armiento's lab, with free Columbia housing, gave that up and left.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate is the institution that a former Columbia provost stood before and said, when former President Trump had called for reporting all DACA students, that no Columbia administrator would report a Columbia student. She said the Senate is the institution that expresses the culture that Columbia people came to, and work for.

Sen. D'Armiento said she appreciated Sen. Pizmony-Levy's remarks, and said the Diversity Commission and Student Affairs Committee would think about ways to bring issues forward for all sides, because Columbia students were suffering. She did not want to minimize these issues.

Sen. Susan Bernofsky wanted to redirect the discussion to police on campus. She appreciated the work of Sen. Voigt and the Commission, and thanked Sen. Howley for the facts and figures he had supplied. She agreed that the key problem of the police presence was not feelings of unsafety but actual conditions of danger.

She had two more questions: The police are apparently not on campus now, but are they still at the gates when people are screened to enter campus?

The other question was about the private security contractors on campus that Sen. White had identified. How many private contractors are on campus now? To whom do they report? Are they accountable to the Columbia community in the same way as Public Safety?

Sen. Jeanine D'Armiento relayed these questions to COO Cas Holloway. He said the NYPD is responsible for policing outside the campus gates, and covers any protests that arise there. He said he wasn't sure whether they were posted there permanently. But they would be there for any

protests. He said the new security guards were hired and managed by Public Safety, and accountable to them.

Sen. Howley noted that the administration had already established a task force focusing on antisemitism and the current experience of Jewish members of the Columbia population, so this subject had not been neglected. He also pointed out that a substantial portion of the students who had already suffered police violence on campus this year were Jewish students involved in the protest movement. Finally, he stressed that prejudice and climate were real concerns for everyone at Columbia, but the University couldn't begin to address these issues if it continued to welcome organizations that inflame prejudice.

b. *Statement on Campus Access* (Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee)

Committee chair John Donaldson (Ten., Bus.) summarized the [statement](#) (Binder, 24). He said Campus Planning did not know what long-term rules will govern access to the Morningside campus going forward. But the CPPD statement made clear that the committee wants to participate in the deliberations that determine those rules.

Sen. Donaldson said that Campus Planning, as the Senate's space committee, views the entire Columbia campus as a space that falls under its mandate. Perhaps the University could return to the open campus that Columbia used to have, and that most people enjoyed. But if that didn't happen, what would the new rules be?

He asked Sens. Ben Orlove (Ten., SIPA) and Adrian Brugger (Research Officers) to provide the details underlying the committee's statement.

Sen. Orlove thanked Sen. Voigt for the Diversity Commission report. He mentioned one connection between the Campus Planning statement and hers: the Diversity Commission was concerned with the problem of police on campus; Campus Planning was concerned with the problem of Columbia people unable to get on campus. He said Campus Planning was troubled by the lack of transparency on both of these issues. The alignment of the University's physical space with its research and teaching mission was a top priority for the committee, he said, and so was the sense of well-being of Columbia community members, including the feeling and the reality of a lack of safety with a police presence on campus.

Sen. Orlove said access was a long-standing issue for Campus Planning, which had focused on the return to full campus operations since the pandemic. He understood Sen. Donaldson's reference to the idea of an open campus as a signal that Columbia has a commitment to its surrounding communities as well as its many internal stakeholders. He said there was a lack of clarity about current restrictions on campus access, and uneven communication. He listed some of the points of interference: researchers couldn't get on campus (or get their materials on and off campus) to conduct their experiments; Barnard and Teachers College affiliates didn't know whether they could come to meetings or use the library; the Wien Hall gate was available for the disabled, but it was a long trek from the subway.

Sen. Orlove briefly reviewed the committee's statement, adding one new point: the vital importance of the open spaces on campus, not only for free speech, but also for community well-being, and for joy. He found it painful to see the Low Library steps empty.

Sen. D'Armiento said senators understand that the campus crisis had been a difficult time, and the University had to make quick decisions under difficult conditions. She said many senators also lived through the Covid shutdown, when researchers faced massive logistical problems, and students had to be moved out of their dorms. She encouraged administrators (and Senate committees like Campus Planning) to think over the summer about developing plans for contingencies like these going forward, including a plan for better communication.

Janie Weiss's comment in the Chat. Sen. D'Armiento said she wanted to respond to a comment in the Chat that she had missed earlier, during the discussion of police on campus. It was the following statement from Janie Weiss, a former administrative staff senator from the Medical Center and currently a non-senator member of the Rules Committee:

I've yet to hear from my colleagues how the violent occupation of a University building should be handled. The University waited 3 weeks before bringing in the police precisely because of Columbia's tradition of not involving them. How should the dozens of non-affiliated protesters, not subject to our disciplinary procedures, have been removed? Or are you suggesting that they shouldn't have been?

This statement on the NYPD [by the Diversity Commission] is an inversion of reality. It's more concerned about the feelings and perceptions of those violating University rules than the actual disruptions to campus functions. Are you okay with 100 individuals, all of whom were aware of the disciplinary process, causing the cancellation of Commencement? Do the sensitivities of protesters justify inaction against the sensitivities of fellow students?

Sen. D'Armiento said the questions raised in the Chat by Ms. Weiss were complex. She said Sen. Howley had said there are actually experts on the question of how to manage such situations, and how to remove people. She said the discussion earlier in the meeting was not about the Hamilton Hall occupation, but about the 15-17 days that followed, when police remained on campus. Was that necessary? Sen. D'Armiento said there were many questions to answer about the occupation of Hamilton Hall, along with challenges posed by the protests. She said Senate groups would be working on these issues over the summer.

She said some senators were arguing that there are other methods besides the police for addressing such situations. There have to be intermediate steps before using riot police. She said no one in the Senate was saying that people should break into buildings or violate property or hurt people.

Sen. Marco Tedesco (Research Officers) said that the External Relations and Research Policy Committee was now discussing the impact of recent events on the Columbia community. He invited any interested senator to join these conversations, including Sen. Pizmony-Levy.

Sen. George raised the issue of access for non-affiliates to other parts of the Morningside neighborhood through the Columbia campus. On the west side of campus is Broadway, and on the east side is a hospital, a public resource, which many people reach by crossing the campus. If the campus is closed, people have to walk several extra blocks to get to the other side.

Sen. Orlove said Campus Planning would be pleased to underscore that point.

Sen. Niall Bolger (Ten., A&S/Natural Sciences) spoke of the impact that closing campus had had on some members of the Columbia community. It had changed the work of his department (Psychology), the Center for Justice, and other units on campus. He wanted to make sure the administration understood that people conducting federally funded research working with human subjects had taken a big hit in the last two months. His own research had ground to a halt. Fifteen experiments scheduled on campus for couples were all lost. He said a colleague needed an intervention from the A&S Dean of Science to get a baby into a research lab on campus. Setbacks like these were a serious problem for the University. Columbia cannot function this way.

Sen. Adrian Brügger said much of his work as a professional research officer and director of the largest laboratory on the Morningside campus had also ground to a halt. This was particularly frustrating for two reasons. When the campus shut down this spring, the Engineering School provided the list of essential employees that it had used during the pandemic. Sen. Brügger was on that list. But this standing was somehow lost in the course of the current shutdown, and he was suddenly unable to function during a crucial stretch. He hoped that the University would at least create a process to avoid snafus like this during times of crisis.

Sen. Brügger said that for research officers, setbacks like these were not just inconvenient. Access for field researchers to their labs was absolutely essential. Research officers were being existentially threatened in their work. They owed their various funding agencies progress, and some were now likely in violation of commitments they had made to the agencies.

Sen. Howley followed up on his colleagues' comments. He said he supervises about 60 instructors in Columbia College in the Literature Humanities course. They spoke up loudly when classes were moved to hybrid, and then all-remote instruction, with little warning. The instructors felt suddenly unable to provide students a space to be together at a time when they were especially isolated and divided and confused. Sen. Howley said the physical space of campus serves a vital function, and should be accessible. In a university that is not very supportive of faculty and staff with families, the open green space on campus provides a valuable place to bring kids to play. He said that if the University is serious about not only restoring community, but being a community, there must be clarity about access to this common space.

Sen. Jeffrey Wayno, a newly elected representative from the Libraries, said the current situation also made it harder for non-Columbia people to come to the Morningside campus—some from far away, at considerable expense—to use Columbia's libraries for their research. There are workarounds to allow access for some of these people. But abruptly cutting off access was very inconvenient for them, and had also disrupted the research of colleagues at affiliated institutions.

Sen. Nachum Sicherman (Ten., Bus.) said COO Cas Holloway was present at the meeting. Why not ask him about this situation?

Sen. D'Armiento said she did not want to ask Mr. Holloway to take questions about this subject at the present meeting. She said Senate groups, including Campus Planning, would be studying these issues and talking to him, but did not need the answers yet.

Sen. Slaughter said the Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee should be really involved in making decisions about Columbia's physical plant, and not just receiving information

about those decisions afterwards. He hoped that this point had been made in the present discussion, whether it was explicit in the committee's statement or not. After reading the committee's mandate, he could understand why the statement requests information so respectfully. Sen. Slaughter said he was particularly concerned about the impact of a completely empty campus.

Sen. D'Armiento said the Senate was trying to get involved in planning efforts, with a process in which all stakeholders are communicating, rather than a high-level decision that hasn't considered all the relevant issues.

Sen. Bernofsky said the present meeting had not bolstered her hopes that the Senate had a partner in its commitment to shared governance. The agenda had addressed DEI statements that had not been put into practice, and committees that had been shut out of decision making. She couldn't even get a yes-or-no answer to her question about the posting of NYPD at the campus gates.

She said the University was now in a crisis of confidence—evident in the Arts and Sciences Faculty's recent vote of no confidence in President Shafik—that required urgent corrective action. She did not see a way out of this crisis without a major change in the approach to shared governance. Her remarks were one more appeal to the administration not just to say they believe in shared governance, but to share governance.

Prompted by Sen. D'Armiento, Sen. Donaldson provided a few final words. He said he had been taking careful notes; his committee was already aware of many of the items mentioned. Campus Planning was trying to maintain a constructive and conciliatory approach in its discussions with the administration over the summer, not harping on past mistakes, but looking forward. He hoped to have a good report for the Senate in September, in keeping with the spirit of the committee.

Sen. D'Armiento said a number of committees would be working through the summer, and there would be a summer plenary.

**Adjourn.** Sen. D'Armiento wished Senate parliamentarian Brendan O'Flaherty a happy birthday, and adjourned the meeting shortly after 2:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff