

University Senate Plenary

November 22, 2019



University Senate

Proposed: November 22, 2019

Adopted: November 22, 2019

PROPOSED AGENDA

University Senate

Friday, November 22, 2019 at 1:15 p.m.

104 Jerome Greene Hall (Law School)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Adoption of the minutes of October 25, 2019
3. President's report
4. Executive Committee chair's report
5. New business:
 - a. Resolution to Establish a Program Leading to a Dual Master of Arts in Islamic Studies and Master of Arts in Muslim Cultures (Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Aga Khan University, London) (Education Committee)
 - b. Committee reports:
 - i. Annual Reports:
 - Alumni Relations
 - Housing Policy
 - Information and Communications Technology

MEETING OF OCTOBER 25, 2019

In the absence of President Lee Bollinger, Executive Committee chair Jeanine D'Armiento (Ten., P&S) called the Senate to order shortly after 1:15 pm in 614 Schermerhorn. Eight-six of 107 senators were present during the meeting.

Minutes and agenda. The agenda was adopted with two opposed; the opponents did not state their objection. The minutes of September 20 were adopted as proposed.

Executive Committee chair's remarks. Sen. D'Armiento said the president was away. She invited senators to email any questions for him to her, and she would seek answers before the next plenary.

Sen. D'Armiento said a few senators had been elected since the September plenary. She welcomed them collectively.

Old business. Sen. D'Armiento pointed out that the Senate considered two resolutions at the previous plenary, without voting on either. Both were on the agenda for action now.

Resolution to Rename the Pharmacology Department (Education Committee). Sen. D'Armiento said this resolution would revise the University Statutes, and therefore required the support of a super-majority of three fifths of the entire membership of the Senate. In September the Senate fell one short of that threshold and could not vote. At the present meeting it had already cleared that threshold.

Sen. Letty Moss-Salentijn (Ten., CDM), co-chair of Education, said Pharmacology wants its name to reflect its modern focus on cellular and molecular approaches, with enhanced attention to the translational implications of its research. The proposed new name is Department of Molecular Pharmacology and Therapeutics.

Sen. Andrew Hsu (Stu., GSAS/PS) said the Department of Pharmacology, based in the Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons, is listed twice in the Statutes, in Chapter 4 (The Departments) and in Chapter 15, (Faculties of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences). Sen. Hsu said the present proposal called for changing the name of the department in Chapter 4, but not in Chapter 15. As the Senate representative of the students of the Department of Pharmacology, Sen. Hsu expressed shock that he had not been informed of this change before it was on the Senate agenda. He asked if anyone had consulted with GSAS students or faculty.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn considered it unlikely that GSAS had been consulted.

Sen. Anne Taylor (Admin.), Vice Dean for Academic Affairs at P&S, said a number of uptown departments are part of GSAS, and she was unsure how the rules apply to them. Does GSAS have

to be consulted when a name is changed for a department whose home is in a particular uptown school? She didn't know.

Sen. Sharyn O'Halloran thought both chapters of the Statutes should be changed in a situation of this kind, and that process should normally include consultation with both units.

Sen. Taylor said she understood the courtesy of such a protocol.

Sen. Hsu read briefly from the Statutes about GSAS (Chapter 15, Section 153): "The programs of study shall include the advanced instruction and the research in the disciplines of social sciences, humanities, and pure sciences as offered by the following departments," including Pharmacology. Since the name change is inspired by the need for a new direction in research, Sen. Hsu said, the faculty should weigh in on this proposal.

Sen. Hsu quoted from the supporting letter from the department chair to P&S Dean Goldman: "The Department of Pharmacology has a long history of research excellence in classical pharmacology," etc., and it is changing its name because of its research into "cellular metabolism, epigenetics, chemical biology, the cellular proteome, drug discovery and medicinal chemistry."

Sen. Greg Freyer (NT, Public Health) said the name change reflects an evolution in priorities that was at least 20 years in the making. What would be the impact of this change on GSAS?

Sen. Hsu asked whether the reference to Pharmacology in Chapter 15 should also be changed to reflect the name change.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the name change would be routinely recorded throughout the Statutes wherever the name appears. She asked to hear from the tenured member of the Pharmacology Dept. in the room.

Sen. D'Armiento asked whether Sen. Hsu simply wanted to see the name changed wherever it appears in the Statutes, or whether he wanted something else.

Sen. Hsu said that for the moment he only wanted to know whether Chapters 4 and 15 would both be changed.

Sen. Michael Rosen (Ten., P&S) said he had resided in the Department of Pharmacology since 1969. He said molecular and cellular approaches had been at the center of research in the department for at least two decades, and the resolution would simply align the name with the current reality.

Sen. Hsu said that since there was no consultation with the faculty or students of GSAS, the Senate, by voting for the resolution in its present form, would be admitting that Chapter 15 is outdated. He moved to table the resolution until the situation with Chapter 15 is resolved. If Pharmacology does not belong in Chapter 15, he said, the Senate could then vote simply on changing Chapter 4.

Sen. Rosen asked to speak. Sen. D'Armiento, after consulting with the parliamentarian, asked if Sen. Rosen was speaking to the motion to table.

Sen. Rosen said many senior tenured faculty members (like himself) at P&S are tenured in GSAS. So a courtesy call to GSAS might have been appropriate, but it was a fact that the representatives of GSAS in the Department of Pharmacology unanimously approved the name change. So instead of taking up more time and waiting for every t to be crossed, he called for a vote on the resolution.

Sen. Maya Tolstoy, Acting EVP for Arts and Sciences, said she couldn't imagine that that the A&S faculty would have any objection to the name change.

Sen. D'Armiento asked Sen. Hsu whether he was willing to withdraw his motion after Sen. Tolstoy's statement.

Sen. Hsu said he was not.

Sen. D'Armiento asked the Senate to vote on Sen. Hsu's motion, which she understood to be calling for tabling the name change resolution until November 22, the date of the next plenary.

By show of hands, the Senate rejected the motion to table, with only 8 in favor and many more opposed—too many to count, Sen. D'Armiento determined. There were 4 abstentions.

Sen. D'Armiento proceeded to the original resolution to rename Pharmacology. By show of hands, the Senate approved the resolution by a count of 75-3, with 2 abstentions.

Resolution to Amend the University Statutes to Provide More Time for Eligible Faculty Who Are New Parents to Prepare for Tenure (Faculty Affairs). Sen. Moss-Salentijn, speaking now as co-chair of Faculty Affairs, said this resolution encountered a number of questions when it was first presented to the plenary on September 20. So the provost's office went over the language again. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Latha Venkataraman made a number of revisions, and so did Faculty Affairs, with help from Associate Provost Pearl Spiro.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn explained what was new about the present resolution: it would lift the limit set in a 1994 policy on the number of years that a faculty member could add to his or her tenure clock to take care of newborn or newly adopted children. That limit had been two years, one for each of a total of two children. Now faculty parents were entitled to add a year to their tenure clock for any child (or set of children) born or adopted while the parent is on the tenure track.

Sen. Moss-Salentijn recalled that a question came up at the September about whether each child in a set of multiple births entitle the faculty member to an additional year off the tenure clock. The answer was no, and the language of the proposed Statutory amendment had to be adjusted to say that the faculty member receives one more year to prepare for tenure for each newborn or newly adopted child *or set of children*.

The language of Statutory passage 71 (b) 2 was also adjusted to make clear that faculty are entitled to no more than one year of leave for each child or set of children.

Another question concerned the case in which both parents of a newborn or newly adopted child are on the tenure track. Do they both receive an additional year to prepare for tenure? Sen. Moss-Salentijn said the two parents cannot both be primary caregivers at the same time. The parents have to decide who is primary caregiver for which part of the first year.

Still another question concerned the professional obligations that faculty members must maintain while on parental workload relief. The answer is that they are excused from certain duties, but they must remain available for consultations to enable their students to keep pace in their research.

Sen. D'Armiento invited discussion.

Sen. Susan McGregor (NT, Journalism) noted that the present policy applies only to faculty on the tenure track. She said Faculty Affairs, of which she is a member, pointed out in discussion that Columbia has no comparable policy or University Statute to extend deadlines for major reviews for such non-tenure-track faculty as professors of practice.

Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) returned to the question (#3 on the question-and-answer sheet accompanying the resolution) of the role of the primary caregiver. How much actual caregiving is required to entitle a faculty member to a year off the tenure clock? Why would they get a full year off if they're only primary caregiver for a semester?

Sen. Moss-Salentijn said this provision was not part of the Statutory amendment or the present resolution. She said this question deserved further discussion. Her sense was that a full year of added time to prepare for tenure for both parents of a newborn or newly adopted child might be excessive.

Sen. Greg Freyer (NT, Public Health), co-chair of Faculty Affairs, said the current policy is that non-tenured faculty who aren't on the tenure track receive the same 13-week parental leave that all employees get. He said he would prepare a resolution to expand the right of non-tenured faculty to parental leave.

Determining that there was no more discussion. Sen. D'Armiento called for a vote. The Senate approved the resolution 81-0 with 1 abstention.

Sen. Anne Taylor (Admin., P&S) praised the resolution, but also suggested that other related issues still require attention. She mentioned childcare support for faculty parents who have to attend academic meetings related to their work. This remains a problem, particularly for Medical Center faculty, despite university subsidies for childcare.

New business

Sen. D'Armiento said the presentation of the next two resolutions would include a few speakers who were not senators. To allow these people to speak, the Senate would have to suspend its regular rules. She asked if there were objections to hearing from these outside speakers. There were none.

Resolution to Recognize Indigenous Peoples' Day (Student Affairs Committee, Diversity Commission). Co-chairs Jonathan Criswell (GS), Jacqueline de Vegvar (P&S), and Claire Kao

(Bus.) presented the resolution for SAC, and Sens. Kao and Yamile Marti (NT, SW) represented the Diversity Commission. Sens. de Vegvar and Kao said SAC had collaborated not only with the Diversity Commission in preparing the resolution, but also with student leaders of the Native American Council, whom she introduced.

NAC co-president Lael Tate, a senior in Columbia College, began by affirming that Columbia is occupying and benefiting from land stolen from the Lenape people. She said NAC has over 70 members from indigenous tribes and nations across the Americas who do a lot of cultural building and political organizing. She said the goal of the resolution was to have the University take responsibility for the celebration of its indigenous students.

Kellian Anise Staggers, a sophomore in Columbia College and NAC's political chair, spoke next. A member of the Navajo nation, she spoke briefly in Navajo. She said, in English, that Indigenous Peoples' Day is an opportunity for indigenous people across the continent to celebrate their continuous existence and their indigeneity. She said more than 100 cities, states and universities recognize IPD.

The third speaker, Abigail Hickman, spoke briefly in Cherokee, and identified herself as a citizen of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma. She comes from Norman, OK, which is now part of the jurisdictional land of the Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma, and historically the land of the Wichita and Quapaw peoples. Ms. Hickman said she was formerly political chair of NAC, and now community chair. She was also affiliated with Native American Heritage Month and Manhattan House, the residential organization on campus for indigenous students.

Ms. Hickman said NAC made a concerted outreach effort for IPD that included more than 600 statements of support from students. NAC also took over the Instagram accounts for Columbia Undergraduate Admissions, Columbia College, and SIPA, reaching some 3000 students over the course of IPD on October 14. NAC had also received resolutions of support from all four Columbia undergraduate programs—Columbia College, SEAS, General Studies, and Barnard. Ms. Hickman said no organization that NAC approached had raised any moral objections to the NAC initiative or the way it was being pursued. She said NAC wanted IPD to be an expression of support for what she called *indigenous excellence*. She hoped that IPD would help indigenous students in the future to recognize Columbia as an institution that supports its indigenous students.

Ms. Tate thanked the Diversity Commission and the Student Affairs Committee for their support. There was applause.

Discussion. Sen. Daniel Savin (Research Officers) said the resolution did not clearly identify a particular land mass of indigenous territory. Was it referring to territory in the region near Columbia, or in the Americas, or around the world?

Ms. Tate responded that NAC, in its collaborations with SAC, wanted to address indigeneity in broad terms, as a global phenomenon, particularly since Columbia is now identified as a global institution. She said there are multiple groups in North America and South America, as well as Australia and even Europe, who claim to be indigenous, and NAC wanted to recognize the struggles of all of them. She said Columbia's population also includes indigenous students from around the world.

Sen. Andrzej Rapaczynski (Ten., Law) said he supported the idea of IPD, but expressed concern about the implications of celebrating it on the same day as Columbus Day. He said the supporting material for the present resolution seemed to suggest that the goal of the initiative was simply to affirm IPD, and not to publicly condemn Columbus Day. Sen. Rapaczynski said such a distinction should be made explicit. In fact, the supporting material also said that “the historical record of Christopher Columbus makes it clear that the moral cost of recognizing him as an individual with honor outweighs any initial benefits.” The supporting statement also seemed to acknowledge that there was some initial benefit in recognizing Italian-Americans through a mistaken recognition of Christopher Columbus. But among the states and other institutions that now recognize IPD, several have made statements linking Columbus to a genocidal enterprise. He said it would be appropriate on IPD to organize a discussion of the moral meaning of Christopher Columbus, but he expressed discomfort that such a discussion would also be a news event, particularly for a university named Columbia. He offered what he hoped was a friendly amendment to the resolution—to put a comma after the clause “Therefore be it resolved that Columbia University recognize Indigenous Peoples’ Day on the second Monday of October every year,” and add the words “to be celebrated concurrently with Columbus Day in appreciation of the deep ethnic and cultural diversity underlying the history of the United States.”

Ms. Tate said Columbia does not now recognize either Columbus Day or Indigenous Peoples’ Day. She said the goal of the resolution was not to cut down Columbus Day or the celebrations that are specific to some communities, but to celebrate the resilience of indigenous peoples. She argued that including a concurrent celebration of Columbus Day in this resolution would really undercut its power and its support for indigenous students. She said Columbus is a very violent figure for many people, and including his name in the resolution would defeat its purpose.

Sen. Rapaczynski said he was concerned precisely about the idea of an implicit condemnation of Christopher Columbus in the resolution. He thought it would be a mistake for the Columbia Senate—and in some measure Columbia University itself—to adopt a resolution implying that Christopher Columbus is someone who needs to be condemned rather than celebrated. Such a resolution would not be neutral.

Sen. Rapaczynski noted that the United Nations observes IPD on a different day from Columbus Day. But in the United States many people chose to observe IPD on the same day, to make a point of replacing Columbus Day with IPD. He recognized that in a formal sense IPD is not replacing anything, but the Senate should make clear that Columbus Day is meant to recognize a significant part of America’s cultural heritage.

Sen. Heven Haile (Stu., CC) said there’s no way to recognize the history of indigenous people without including the violence committed upon them by Christopher Columbus. She found it deeply disturbing that indigenous students might have to compromise even further from the initial statement that they made. Sen. Haile said this resolution is the least Columbia can do to recognize what indigenous people have gone through, and as with the history of other oppressed peoples, there’s no way to be neutral. There will always be extra ways to dilute their statements further. She said the least Columbia could do would be to recognize that it has profited from the exploitation of Native American people. There was applause.

Sen. Suzanne Goldberg (Admin.), EVP for University Life, thanked the members of NAC for their hard work, and recognized the thoughtful deliberations of the Student Affairs Committee and the Diversity Commission. She recalled that when she began her present role as head of University Life in January 2015, one of her first tasks was to address student petitions to have a plaque on campus recognizing the Lenape people. That seemed like a simple task, but turned out to be quite complex. She expressed appreciation for all the work that went into that plaque.

Sen. Neslihan Şenocak (Ten., A&S.SS), an historian, said that she would strongly oppose any Senate resolution celebrating Columbus Day. She praised the work that students had done to make IPD a reality at Columbia, and particularly on the same day as Columbus Day, so that the memory of the latter celebration can be erased.

Sen. Mike Ford (Stu., GSAS/Hum) made a motion to pass the resolution without the proposed amendment.

Sen. D'Armiento said Sen. Rapaczynski's amendment was already on the table, and had priority.

Sen. Criswell, a SAC co-chair, expressed pride in his committee's work on the resolution. He said there was pushback and there were compromises that SAC accepted with a view to bringing this initiative to completion. He strongly supported the resolution without further amendment.

Sen. D'Armiento determined that there was a second to the motion to amend the resolution, and asked Sen. Rapaczynski to read his proposed amendment again.

The Senate then rejected the proposed amendment by a vote of 64-6, with 4 abstentions.

Sen. D'Armiento then called for a vote on the original resolution. The Senate approved the resolution by a count of 68-0 with 4 abstentions. There was applause.

Resolution to Encourage Voting in Our Community and Across the Country (External Relations and Student Affairs committees). Sen. D'Armiento said it was fitting to take up this resolution in the 50th year of the Senate, which recommended a University holiday on Election Day in its first two years. Two committees now wanted to reaffirm the commitment to civic engagement.

Sen. D'Armiento introduced Prof. Ester Fuchs of Political Science, whose expertise encompasses urban and American politics, including elections.

Prof. Fuchs thanked Sen. D'Armiento for the introduction, and thanked Sen. O'Halloran for helping to make sure that this issue got the attention it deserves. She said the present resolution comes at a time when American democracy is challenged at the highest levels of the government.

She endorsed the resolution's sentiment that civic engagement is critical to the success of democracy and is also a central tenet of Columbia's mission. She said a healthy democracy is predicated on the electorate's faith in the integrity of its voting system. Election results must be accepted by the losers as well as the winners. Such consent is crucial to assuring that everyone will abide by the laws enacted by the elected government. When large numbers of people feel alienated

or think that the system is illegitimate, the very foundation of democratic governance is threatened. At a time when some city and state governments are purging their voting rolls and passing voter suppression laws, it is vital to make it easier to register, to learn about the candidates, and to vote. Prof. Fuchs said nothing in the U.S. Constitution says it should be hard for people to vote, contrary to the views of those who seek to suppress voting. Speaking as a political scientist, she said research shows that voter participation can be increased by making it easier to learn about candidates. The better informed people are, the more likely they are to vote. Online social networks can be leveraged to influence the vote, in both good and bad ways.

Prof. Fuchs said students, including her own, are acting on this research, and organizing local registration campaigns. They have traveled to swing congressional districts to help get out the vote during Columbia's election breaks, and there has been a continuous voter information campaign.

She recounted the story of her efforts to create whosontheballot.org, a non-partisan website and a mobile app with basic information about all upcoming local elections for New York City voters. These efforts also involve partnerships with good-government advocacy groups.

Sen. D'Armiento called up Sen. de Vegvar, as well as student senators Ramsey Eyre (CC) and Tanner Zumwalt (Law), who had worked on the resolution.

Sen. Eyre said the current period includes forceful and troubling challenges to democratic norms and institutions, from climate change to pervasive racial and gender inequality, to attacks on universities, freedom of the press and even the act of voting itself. Columbia faculty and students are carrying out vital research on these problems.

Sen. Eyre said Columbia, as a private university with a public mission, has a responsibility not only to study social problems, but also to try to solve them. This means that civic engagement is a crucial institutional value, and there is no more foundational act of civic engagement in a democracy than voting in local, state and national elections. He described the resolution before the Senate as both a statement of values and a call to action.

Sen. Eyre highlighted two student initiatives: Columbia Votes, represented at the present meeting by Columbia College student Maria Castillo, which works to register students and to educate voters; and Columbia Voting Week, run by the Columbia Political Union, which does similar work. Also present was Tricia Shimamura, Director of Government Relations, whose office provides resources to make it easier for all members of the Columbia community to vote.

Sen. D'Armiento invited discussion.

Sen. Hsu praised the resolution. He said many of his constituents in GSAS come from countries without full democracies. People in the U.S. are privileged to have the opportunity to vote.

Sen. Gordon Slater (Stu., Arts) expressed skepticism about the resolution. He asked why it sounded like public relations, touting Columbia's historic and President Bollinger's specific support of civic engagement, a vague term that seemed to include activities unrelated to voting. He said his own constituents might also debate this claim. In recent years Columbia responded to a student election to form a union by taking complaints to the NLRB. Students have also heard the

president of Barnard say she would not respect a student council vote on the Divest Boycott Sanction (DBS) movement regardless of the results.

Sen. Eyre responded that there may be legitimate debate about whether Columbia has been a standard bearer of civic engagement in the past. But the point of the present resolution was to look forward—to encourage greater participation by the Columbia community in future local, state and national elections, and to reaffirm the value of civic engagement.

Sen. D’Armiento added that the resolution expressed the commitment of the University Senate to civic engagement and voting.

Sen. Slater said he understood these points, but remained skeptical of the need for a statement from President Bollinger.

Sen. Eyre said the point of that statement was to show that the commitment to civic engagement comes from the highest level of the university. But that statement was just one more piece of evidence to support the Senate’s own affirmation of civic engagement as an institutional priority.

Sen. de Vegvar noted again the relevance of the 50th anniversary of the Senate to this measure.

Sen. Joel Krejmas (Stu., CDM) supported the resolution but said its definition of community should extend beyond the Columbia population to surrounding communities, including the Upper West Side and Washington Heights. He said for many outside Columbia, the challenge of civic engagement and voting is much greater than for Columbia students and faculty and employees. He thought the resolution should call on the Columbia community to live up to President Bollinger’s statement of Columbia’s responsibility to bring the values of academic knowledge and respect for truth to American society and the world.

Sen. D’Armiento said Columbia’s Office of Government and Community Affairs does provide outreach to the surrounding community, which is why the reference to the community in the resolution was a broad one.

Sen. O’Halloran thanked Prof. Fuchs for her work not only for Columbia but for all of New York City. She cited this effort as entirely in line with President Bollinger’s affirmation of a fourth part of the University’s mission—an intensive effort to apply lessons learned from research and the classroom to accomplish improvements in the outside world.

Sen. O’Halloran also mentioned the 50th anniversary of the University Senate, an institution dedicated to shared governance. She said nothing is more important than the integrity of our voting system. Whatever the outcome, people will abide by it if the process is fair. The Senate has found this in its own recent experience—another reminder of the importance of Prof. Fuchs’ work.

Sen. D’Armiento determined that the Senate was ready to vote. By show of hands, the Senate approved the resolution, 65-1, with 3 abstentions.

Reports.

Special Report of the Elections Commission. Miranda Rehaut, a third-year law student now in her second year as Elections Commission chair, said the Commission received a complaint shortly after the election for Executive Committee chair on September 6. In keeping with Section 9 of the Senate Elections Code, she was now reporting to the Senate on the outcome of the Commission's investigation and adjudication of this complaint.

The first part of her report concerned the Commission's decision to void the September 6 election. As it explained in its October 7 letter to the Senate, the group has only met in recent years on an ad hoc basis, but it quickly convened to speak with both candidates, to hear testimony from many senators who voted in the election, and to render a decision.

Although the complaint alleged a number of procedural irregularities, Ms. Rehaut said the Commission's investigation quickly found a much more egregious violation of the Senate Bylaws. They clearly state that the Executive Committee chair must be elected by the Senate as a whole, yet in recent years the Executive Committee chair has been elected only by the tenured faculty caucus. This gross violation of the bylaws has resulted in the disenfranchisement of a majority of senators. Entire caucuses have been denied the right to vote on who holds this important position in the Senate.

Once the Commission learned of this violation, Ms. Rehaut said, its members felt they had no choice but to step in and right this wrong. The violation of the Bylaws was so great and the stakes of this election so high that the group felt compelled to void the election. Whoever serves as Executive Committee chair for the next year and a half must have the full support of the Senate, especially during the present term, as the President consults with the Executive Committee on the appointment of a new Provost. Ms. Rehaut said the Commission did not believe this consultation would be possible after an election that blatantly violated Senate bylaws and in doing so disenfranchised a large portion of the Senate.

Ms. Rehaut regretted that the Elections Commission did not become aware of this ongoing violation of the Bylaws until a complaint was filed. She said that traditionally the Elections Commission has only acted after receiving a complaint, but recent events have convinced the group that this must change. Current members of the group are committed to instituting a regular review of elections compared against the Elections Code and the Bylaws to ensure that ongoing violations of the Statutes are addressed before complaints are made. She also encouraged all senators to communicate more frequently with the Elections Commission, and announced a new email address, electionscommission@columbia.edu. She encouraged senators to contact the group frequently about election procedures and practices. She said the Elections Commission takes very seriously the integrity of the Senate and its elections and intends to use this unfortunate situation as an opportunity to improve elections practices going forward.

On a more positive note, Ms. Rehaut expressed enthusiasm that the new election for Executive Committee chair would be the most inclusive one run in recent years, and looked forward to further inclusivity going forward.

Ms. Rehaut invited questions.

Sen. Freyer asked whether he was correct in thinking that the restrictions on campaigning spelled out in the Commission's rules for the special election applied only to the candidates, not to any other senators. Ms. Rehaut said that understanding was correct.

Sen. Freyer also commented that the procedure in the election that the Elections Commission had voided was one the Senate had followed for many years. The only difference in the latest election was its outcome.

Sen. O'Halloran, who had been a candidate in the latest election and had complained to the Elections Commission about the procedures followed, thanked the Commission for its work and its commitment to upholding the integrity of the Senate.

She said the statement that the last election was carried out in the same way as previous elections was not correct. She said procedures in earlier elections were even worse. At one point the Executive Committee chair was elected only by the six tenured faculty members elected to the Executive Committee. Sen. O'Halloran said that when Sen. Applegate was chair of the Tenured Caucus he pushed to expand the franchise to all faculty members because in the bylaws it was clear that the electorate for the Executive Committee chair was larger than just the tenured delegation on the Executive Committee. Sen. O'Halloran said that after the Executive Committee Chair election in 2017 she asked for a review of those policies by the Elections Commission and by Sen. Debra Wolgemuth (Ten., P&S), who was then chair of the tenured caucus. Unfortunately that review did not happen before the 2019 election, and the concerns raised previously were not really addressed. Therefore, she said, the only way forward for her, given not only the egregious violations of the Senate by-laws (as well as the University Statutes), but also the numerous concerns from other members of the Senate about not receiving ballots, and not understanding when, where and how to vote, was to lodge a complaint seeking a thorough review.

Moreover, Sen. O'Halloran said, it was absolutely clear that the Senate needed to change its policies and procedures to allow for the expansion of suffrage and the inclusion of every vote. She said the chair of the Executive Committee represents everyone, not just the tenured faculty. That person has to address concerns of students, research officers, tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, and administrators. She said it is absolutely necessary for that person to represent the interdisciplinary nature of the University and the different constituencies that that involves.

Sen. O'Halloran called for taking this situation as a wonderful opportunity to do what the Senate did in its very first election of the Executive Committee chair, which took place at the Senate's very first plenary. She expressed satisfaction that the Senate was going back to its origins, even if it took 50 years to do that.

Sen. Andrew Hsu noted with interest that a complaint calling for the participation of the entire Senate plenary in the election of the Executive Committee chair did not come up until there was a competitive election with two candidates. He said that in previous years, when Sen. O'Halloran was Executive Committee chair, nothing was done about that elections process. There was applause.

Sen. O'Halloran said Sen. Hsu's comment was incorrect. She said again that she did try to expand the suffrage by having the Executive Committee chair elected not just by the six tenured members

of the Executive Committee, but by the whole tenured faculty caucus. She said it was necessary to involve the Elections Commission in deliberations on whether to return to the involvement of the whole plenary in this election. She said the language in the relevant documents was not entirely clear. She stressed that she attempted on a regular basis to expand the suffrage and to be an Executive Committee chair who represented all of the constituencies. She repeated that expanding the electorate for the Executive Committee chair happened under her purview, and that more fundamental changes required the intervention of the Elections Commission. She said that whatever the outcome of the special election, she was pleased that the Senate would have a process it can be proud of, with transparency and integrity.

Ms. Rehaut noted in response to Sen. Hsu's comment that the 2019 election of the Executive Committee chair was the first one that prompted a complaint of this kind.

Sen. Applegate (Ten., A&S/Pure Sciences) said he was a professor of astronomy, and had served in the Senate for more than 20 years. He had been attending tenured caucus meetings for most of that time. He said he was responsible for a number of the elections that were run incorrectly. He admitted that he did not look at the Elections Code to figure out how to run the elections. He simply assumed that the people who had run them before him—Paul Duby, the previous Executive Committee chair, and Karl Kroeber before him—were old Senate hands who knew what they were doing, so he copied what they did. He said he was distressed by some of the language of the recent discussion, which seemed to suggest that people were intentionally disenfranchised or pushed out. In his own experience running these elections, none of that ever happened.

He said the situation he found himself in was rather similar to those of academic departments that develop a way to make decisions by consensus and don't look at their own bylaws, and then it's not until somebody complains about a decision that was contentious and not reached by consensus that people look at the by-laws and discover they've been proceeding incorrectly for 25 years.

Sen. Applegate said he was as much to blame as anyone for the present situation. He said the Elections Commission had done a good job of addressing it. He said the question of how this situation developed was an interesting story but not particularly relevant now. He said there was now a clear way forward, and the Senate should concentrate on that.

Ms. Rehaut stressed that the Elections Commission found absolutely no intentional wrongdoing in its investigation. It also fully stood behind the Senate staffers who ran the election, and expressed full confidence that the staff would continue to run elections fairly and competently.

SAC co-chair Jonathan Criswell acknowledged the frustration of students and other senators who were not able to participate in past elections of the Executive Committee chair. He added that the Elections Commission had taken serious steps to rectify the situation, and had met with the leadership of SAC and other concerned groups. But he asked what can be done to protect the right of all senators to vote in these elections in the years to come, so such problems don't reemerge.

Ms. Rehaut appreciated the question. Her personal view was to treat this issue as something akin to reapportionment of Senate seats, which is listed in the University Statutes as a requirement every five years. She said she would be leading the reapportionment effort in the spring of 2020. She said the Senate could amend Statutes to require the Commission to meet regularly (at intervals

for the Senate to determine) to review the bylaws and Statutes, and to determine whether current elections are compliant. As the current chair she was committed to making that happen, but she acknowledged that she couldn't determine what would happen after her graduation.

Sen. Mike Ford (Stu., GSAS/Hum) asked whether the Elections Commission really had the bandwidth to do this kind of review. He said he and other students had recently tried to work with the Elections Commission on an election, and they were told that the effort had to be postponed because the Elections Commission was too busy with other matters.

Ms. Rehaut took the point. She said the Commission had been fully consumed with the present complaint and the special election, and wasn't able to adjudicate other matters. She said the Senate should consider whether to enlarge the Elections Commission or to make the roles clearer. She said that traditionally the chair has been a full-time law student, and it was possible that future full-time law students might not have time for the job. Now in her third year of Law School, Ms. Rehaut had some time, but she thought it was fair to ask whether the Commission is constituted to deal with every complaint that comes up. She also noted that it has been very rare to have two significant issues come to a head at the same time. Normally the Commission sees no issues at all. In her first year as Commission chair, she did not encounter any complaints or even questions. So over time the problem might not be that serious.

Sen. Savin, co-chair of the Structure and Operations Committee, suggested that it was time to refer the main election issues to his committee, and for the Senate to move on to its next agenda item.

Sen. D'Armiento asked Ms. Rehaut to proceed to the second part of her report--plans for the special election.

Ms. Rehaut said the Commission's top priority at the moment was to complete the special election promptly, so an Executive Committee chair could be in place in time for the November plenary, and the Senate could get back to its regular business. At the same time the Commission wanted to make sure there would be no irregularities.

Ms. Rehaut emphasized that the present focus was not on procedures for future regular Executive Committee chair elections. Making the right decisions on that issue would require time and a lot of input from stakeholders, and she looked forward to that process. She said the Commission had already spoken with Senate staff about ways to improve procedures. But final decisions will have to come later. The instructions that would be sent out about procedures and campaigning rules for the special election would not be precedential.

Ms. Rehaut said the Elections Commission earlier in the week had sent out a timeline and rules for the special election, including campaigning. The group was working closely with the Senate staff to ensure that the election would proceed quickly, smoothly, and above all fairly. Voting would be open to all senators entirely by electronic ballot. The Commission would be using Qualtrix, a program that has been used in recent elections with some success. The Commission has been assured that the voting will be anonymous and secure. And because of past concerns about ballots going to spam folders, the Commission will make sure that election notifications come through regular Senate communication channels from the Elections Commission email address.

Ms. Rehaut said the Elections Commission was looking forward to a successful completion of the election on November 20. If more than two candidates enter the race, the candidate who receives the most votes among the total affirmative votes cast will win. There will not be a runoff in a race among three or more candidates unless none of the candidates receives more than one third of the votes; in such a situation the Elections Code requires a run-off.

Sen. Robert Pollack (Ten., A&S/Pure Sciences) suggested an adjustment in the procedure, to provide for a run-off in the event that three or more candidates run and none receives a *majority* of the votes in the first round. He thought the intention of including all senators in the election would be undercut if a first-place candidate in a three-candidate field received only 40 percent of the vote, and were allowed to represent the whole Senate.

Ms. Rehaut appreciated the question, but said the Commission was dealing with two competing priorities. One was to have a full, inclusive election; the other was to resolve the present situation as quickly as possible. And when the Commission considered what a run-off would mean in the way of staff effort and how it would affect turnout, there was little enthusiasm for the idea. In the unlikely event that a leading candidate could not secure even a plurality of more than one third of the votes cast, the Commission would follow the Elections Code and conduct a run-off.

Sen. D'Armiento thanked Ms. Rehaut for her report. There was applause.

Libraries Committee annual report. Sen. D'Armiento said it was now almost 3 pm, and the co-chairs of the Libraries Committee had graciously agreed to defer their annual report.

She chose to proceed with the benefits presentation on the agenda, since Columbia officers would have to make their benefits selections for 2020 before the next plenary.

Benefits Open Enrollment Overview. Michael Bloom, AVP for Benefits and Compensation in Human Resources, presented his report, referring to a set of PowerPoint slides that were projected on the screen.

At the end of his 10-minute presentation, Mr. Bloom invited comments. There were none.

Sen. D'Armiento thanked Mr. Bloom for the presentation.

She adjourned the meeting at about 3:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Mathewson, Senate staff

University Senate

Proposed: November 22, 2019

Adopted: November 22, 2019 with
unanimous support

RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A PROGRAM LEADING TO A DUAL MASTER OF ARTS IN ISLAMIC STUDIES AND MASTER OF ARTS IN MUSLIM CULTURES (GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES AND AGA KHAN UNIVERSITY LONDON)

WHEREAS heightened world interest in Muslim societies has strengthened the need to train academic specialists in Islamic studies, as well as to expand the knowledge of people seeking careers in government and public service, international relations, cultural organizations, development, and

WHEREAS Columbia and the Aga Khan University (AKU) in London have proposed a dual master's program that will award two degrees: the MA in Islamic Studies from Columbia's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the MA in Muslim Cultures from the AKU, and

WHEREAS the AKU brings important strengths to a joint academic enterprise in these disciplines, particularly since the launch of its distinguished Institute for the Study of Muslim Civilizations in 2002, which also draws students from well-developed regional networks in South Asia, Central Asia, East Africa and other parts of the world, and

WHEREAS applicants to Columbia's existing MA in Islamic Studies program, based in the Middle East Institute, have expressed a clear interest in dual programs in related fields, and

WHEREAS the Senate Education Committee has enthusiastically endorsed the proposed dual program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Senate approve the establishment of the dual Master of Arts in Islamic Studies (GSAS) and Master of Arts in Muslim Studies (AKU);

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Senate Education Committee will review the program five years after its launch.

Proponent: Education Committee

Description of the Proposed Program

1. Purpose

1.1. Describe in one to two paragraphs the purpose of the proposed program, its target audience, its content, and its format/pedagogical approaches.

The purpose of the Dual MA Program with the Aga Khan University's Institute for the Study of Muslim Civilizations (AKU-ISMC) in London is to create an unmatched graduate program in Islamic studies and the study of Muslim societies. The Aga Khan University and Columbia University are institutions of high standing in the field of Islamic Studies, and faculty members have already established successful links through research and joint faculty initiatives.

Launched in London in 2002, after careful groundwork studies by an international commission of distinguished academics, AKU-ISMC builds on Aga Khan University's unparalleled global reach to produce research and train MA students in nuanced understandings of Muslim cultures and societies, past and present. Its MA graduates have gone on to top PhD programs at the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, University College London, Princeton University, University of Chicago and Rice University, and to jobs in development, policy, journalism and cultural organizations. Among the notable recent achievements of its faculty, Associate Professor Sarah Bowen Savant received a €2 million grant in January 2018 from the European Research Council for a pioneering digital initiative focused on early Arabic texts.¹ In partnership with University of Edinburgh Press, AKU-ISMC has also created a prolific publication arm.

The Dual MA is supported by the directors of both AKU-ISMC and the Middle East Institute at Columbia, and by the Provosts of Columbia University and Aga Khan University. Brinkley Messick (Director, Middle East Institute), Lisa Anderson (Special Lecturer and Dean Emerita, School of International and Public Affairs and member of Aha Khan University's Board of Trustees) and Kathryn Spellman Poots (Visiting Associate Professor and Faculty Advisor at the Middle East Institute, Columbia University and Associate Professor on leave from AKU-ISMC) met in London with Leif Stenberg (Director of AKU-ISMC) and faculty members at AKU-ISMC to discuss the details of this Dual MA program.

The Dual MA program will provide a cross-disciplinary path and multifaceted approach to the study of Islam and Muslim peoples and societies through a global framework. It will anchor student academic formation in practical and textual methodologies in Islamic Studies and it will encourage critical examination and historical comparison in addressing contemporary issues in the Muslim world through the widest range of theoretical and practical perspectives. Beyond jointly admitting and advising students, faculty engagement across the two universities will be fostered through joint research initiatives.

¹ For a list of AKU-ISMC Faculty, visit: <https://www.aku.edu/ismc/faculty/Pages/home.aspx>

The Dual MA program's target audience includes (for Columbia) a previously untapped student demographic, notably international students from the regions where the Aga Khan development networks are highly active and well known, including South Asia, Central Asia, East Africa and parts of North America. The Dual MA program will be ideal for applicants who intend to pursue a career in academia or as an intellectual foundation for those who plan to work in fields such as journalism, public service, cultural organizations, human rights, or political advocacy.

The Dual MA program is designed so that it may be completed in two and a half consecutive years: Part 1 (Semester 1 and Semester 2) at Columbia and Part 2 (Semester 3, Semester 4 and Semester 5) at Aga Khan University. Students will be registered as full-time students for Part 1 at Columbia and Part 2 at Aga Khan University. Semester 5 students will have full-time non-resident research student status. Students who complete the Dual MA program will be awarded two degrees: the MA in Islamic Studies from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the MA in Muslim Cultures from Aga Khan University.² To be awarded the two degrees, students must successfully complete the following requirements (laid out in the Aga Khan University – Columbia University Dual MA Student Handbook): (1) fulfillment of the existing degree requirements for the MA in Islamic Studies in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; (2) progression from Columbia University to Aga Khan University; (3) fulfillment of the degree requirements for the MA in Muslim Cultures at Aga Khan University; (4) approval of the master's thesis, submitted to both Aga Khan University and Columbia University. The MA in Islamic Studies at Columbia University is not awarded until the requirements for the MA at Aga Khan University are completed successfully and the thesis has been approved.

Admission and advising of students will be handled jointly. During Part 1 students work with faculty to develop research ideas and a proposal for their MA thesis project. The MA thesis is written during Part 2 and submitted to program administrators at AKU-ISMC and the Middle East Institute at Columbia University for approval. As such, students' academic development is jointly administered by faculty and staff at both universities.

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

The new Dual MA program builds on the existing Islamic Studies MA Program (ISMA) administered by the Middle East Institute since 2014. In 2017, the Islamic Studies MA Program was significantly redesigned based on feedback from the 2016-17 ARC Review³ that called for

² The Awarding Body of the two-year MA in Muslim Cultures is The Aga Khan University - Karachi, Pakistan. AKU-ISMC's 30-credit MA is under review by the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan.

³ The External Committee wrote: "A rigorous MA degree in Islamic Studies...is a potential differentiator of Columbia and the MEI. The need for the interdisciplinary study of Islam and the Middle East cannot be overstated, and it behooves Columbia, with its rich intellectual resources and eminent legacy to lead in this area."

Columbia to reinvigorate Islamic studies through the development of a more interdisciplinary MA degree. The result is the rebuilt Islamic Studies MA Program, a program that is global in scope. The Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences voted in May 2018 to approve the reduction of required credits for the single MA degree from 36 to 30 points, and to require four credits for the Master's thesis course instead of variable (two to four) credits. Along with active advising and careful course planning with a newly appointed Academic Program Director, the stand-alone Islamic Studies MA Program and the first year of the Dual Aga Khan University – Columbia University degrees will be more efficient, coherent and attainable to complete.

The Dual Aga Khan University – Columbia University degrees pair stand-alone programs at Aga Khan University and Columbia University in order to enhance both programs. The progression of the core courses makes Part 1 and Part 2 of the connected Dual Degree program an organic and integrated whole. The Dual degree students will gain invaluable access to both Aga Khan University and Columbia University faculty members and to the distinctive academic resources of the two universities. Students pursuing the Dual MA as a terminal degree may activate the two universities' networks for job placement, while the applications of students continuing on to a PhD may be supported by faculty members from both universities.

In the 2018 Islamic Studies MA Program admissions cycle at Columbia, a number of applicants indicated that, as their second choice on the application, they applied to dual degree programs (religion and journalism, international and world history). Seeing this demonstrated interest in dual degree programs, the Islamic Studies MA Program staff met with Steve Coll, Dean of the Graduate School of Journalism, and Line Lillevik of the dual International World History/London School of Economics MA/MSc program, to study the dual MA degree programs they administer.

The Aga Khan University-Columbia University Dual MA will not duplicate any existing MA program at Columbia and will contribute to Columbia's effort to expand its reach in the world.

2. Need

2.1. Why is the proposed program needed locally, statewide or nationally?

With heightened world interest in Islam and Muslim societies, and with attention to the increasing strand of western negativity surrounding these topics, there is a strong need to train specialists in Islamic Studies to work not only in academia, but also in government, international relations, development and the media. The proposed Dual MA program will bridge the established academic and institutional resources of the two universities to create new formats for this necessary local and international scholarship.

Current Islamic Studies MA Program students ask about opportunities to complement their coursework with international study, and they are equally interested in language/cultural immersion and/or internships in Muslim majority societies. Both will be much more feasible for dual MA program students, given the extensive interregional networks of Aga Khan University.

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

As stated above, applicants in the 2018 Islamic Studies MA Program admissions cycle often indicated that they had applied, as a second preference, to a dual degree program (International World History dual MA/MSc with London School of Economics; Religion and Journalism; etc.). Islamic Studies MA Program administrators believe that the Aga Khan University-Columbia University Dual MA program will be of interest to such applicants.

2.3. If the program is career or professionally oriented, have persons in the profession or career requested establishment of the program? Have the employment needs of professionals in the field been taken into account when designing the program?

The Dual MA program is suitable both for students pursuing careers in academia and for those interested in professional fields such as journalism, public service, cultural organizations, human rights, or political advocacy. Faculty advisors at both institutions will help students tailor their coursework to their career objectives. Aga Khan University, in particular, has a very strong commitment to and record of student placement in its overseas development networks.

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

To our knowledge, the proposed dual degree would be the first of its kind on the eastern seaboard.

**UNIVERSITY SENATE ALUMNI RELATIONS COMMITTEE
2018-2019 ACADEMIC YEAR FINAL REPORT**

The Alumni Relations Committee of the University Senate focused on three major areas in 2018-2019:

- fine-tuning projects in partnership with the Columbia Alumni Association (CAA);
- exploring ways for alumni to support student-led campus initiatives;
- understanding communication strategies between the University and its alumni.

Background:

The Alumni Relations Committee consists of seven members. Although many Columbia alumni remain on the faculty, staff, and administration of the University, the majority of the approximately 355,000 alums are external to the University. The value of alumni lies in the support that they provide to the students, faculty, administration, and inner workings of the University (through monetary donations, volunteer activities, mentoring students, attendance at events, etc.). The mandate of the Alumni Relations Committee is to partner with and act as a liaison to the administration and alumni groups, encourage more effective communication with alumni, and stimulate alumni loyalty and support for the University.

The Columbia Alumni Association (CAA) is the committee's most valuable partner. Conceived approximately fifteen years ago with the overreaching ideal of forming "One Columbia", the CAA board has alumni representation from sixteen schools and two affiliates, national and international regional clubs, and special interest groups. Donna MacPhee, CAA President and Vice-President of Alumni Relations, is a longstanding member of the Alumni Relations Committee, members of her team are frequent committee guests, and alumni senators have a dual appointment to the University Senate and the CAA Board, with the intent that this will inform and better represent the interests of the large and diverse population of alumni.

In recent years, the Alumni Relations Committee has looked to furthering support and engagement with current students, in their roles as future alumni, by partnering with the Student Affairs Committee (SAC). This partnership resulted in the concept of *CU there!* in 2017. *CU there!* events take place both globally and locally, and students connect informally with alumni via the regional clubs and other alumni groups, at a variety of locations including global centers, international and national alumni clubs.

I. CAA Initiatives:

The Alumni Relations Committee continued to discuss building the *CU there!* brand in 2018-2019, by improving its communication and marketing to the student and alumni populations. The CAA hosted three *CU there!* events last year, including a partnership with special interest groups

(SIGs), culminating in a multicultural night at the Columbia Alumni Center. In addition, the CAA held three well-attended *CU there!* events this past summer. The events continue to broaden in scope, with students now registered from every school within the University. The first event of the 2019 academic year was held at the School of Nursing on the CUIMC campus, with very positive feedback.

Plans for 2019-2020: The CAA is planning to track *CU there!* to determine if it leads to earlier engagement among graduating alumni. Discussions include expanding branding to thematic *CU there!* events — for example speaker series aimed at life skills (how to find an apartment, personal finance etc.); special interest events to bring together the Columbia community including industry-specific gatherings (e.g., finance, entrepreneurship, law, medicine, real estate etc.); events targeting young alumni and student families; combining with sports events, arts and cultural events, or around Climate Change / sustainability interests et cetera.

Students as future alumni:

In September of this year, the CAA expanded its outreach to students by forming an additional group, the Student Leadership Advisory Council (SLAC). This student group mirrors the CAA board, with representation from all 18 schools, matching the diversity of the growing international student population. Eleven countries and fifteen states are represented, with undergraduates, graduate and professional students, doctoral and dual degree students, all of whom attend Columbia either full time, part time and one on-line. Twenty-five student groups including student government, activities councils, community outreach, peer mentoring/counseling and the Food Pantry at Columbia are represented.

Plans for 2019-2020: The focus of SLAC will be in three areas: to educate the students that the alumni community exists and they should be part of it, inform and encourage them to take advantage of *CU there!* both locally and internationally, and to ease the transition from student to alumni status. SLAC will be an additional student voice to the CAA with the goal of informing where the CAA can have the greatest impact.

II. Supporting Student Efforts

The Alumni Relations Committee also looked to student groups to identify potential topics that may be of broad interest to members of the alumni community.

Campus Sustainability:

The Campaign for Carbon Neutrality had been featured in the *Columbia Daily Spectator*, and captured the interest of committee members because of Columbia University's clear commitment to Climate Change research, the presence of the Earth Institute, the Lamont-Doherty campus, and

multiple educational programs and majors related to Climate Change and/or Sustainability throughout the University. The Alumni Relations Committee hosted a presentation by Meredith Harris BC'21 and Arianna Menzelos CC'21, representing the Energy and Environment Committee of the Columbia Roosevelt Institute. Their campaign gained widespread support across the Columbia community among students on both the undergraduate and graduate level, and faculty members at the Earth Institute, with 85 percent of student councils supporting the idea that Columbia's campuses should strive to reach carbon neutral status by 2030.

The Alumni Relations Committee additionally hosted as a follow-up, representatives from the Office of Environmental Stewardship (Assistant Vice President Jessica Prata) and the Earth Institute (Professors Michael Gerrard and Jason Smerdon). AVP Prata summarized the progress that Columbia had already made to become more sustainable, and clarified the current University goals in the areas of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction, energy, transportation, waste and behavior change. Two of the greatest barriers to campus sustainability, where the University Senate may be able to help, might involve programming to help change campus culture, and obtaining adequate funding to convert the heating and cooling systems present in the old infrastructure. Sixty percent of GHG emissions stem from the antiquated heating and cooling systems, and research is currently underway to determine what is needed to retrofit these systems. Pertinent to the Campaign for Carbon Neutrality, the Office of Environmental Stewardship is working on a feasible date for net-zero carbon emissions in its next report expected in 2020.

Plans for 2019-2020: The newly elected SAC senators have shown broad interest in tackling the issues surrounding campus sustainability in conjunction with campus planning and members of the Alumni Relations Committee and the committee will continue to support these efforts.

Encouraging community at Columbia University Irving Medical Center (CUIMC)

The Committee hosted two CUIMC students who spoke about the difficulty building community between the various schools at CUIMC. Sarah Joseph, Ph.D. candidate and CUIMC liaison to the Interschool Governing Board (IGB) and Columbia Graduate Council President, and Jacqueline de Vegvar (Senator, P&S) and SAC Co-Chair 2019-20) spoke to SARC about these issues. They acknowledged and appreciate the creation of Haven Plaza, but felt there was more that needed to be done.

Senator de Vegvar presented information detailing the need for dedicated student space on the Washington Heights campus. A dedicated place to congregate would be conducive to building community. Sarah Joseph (who also chaired the Festifall celebration on the Morningside campus in 2018) in partnership with SAC and the CAA, also planned a spring event in Manhattanville, to further the idea of "One Columbia" across campuses.

Plans for 2019-2020: Building morale and community at CUIMC are two issues that the Alumni Relations Committee hopes to tackle in the coming year. The first CUIMC CU there! brought students from the four CUIMC schools together socially (College of Dental Medicine, Mailman School of Public Health, School of Nursing, Vagelos College of Physicians and Surgeons) with the overwhelming feedback that they appreciated the CAA coming to Washington Heights. Recently, Senator Jonathan Susman raised the idea of a clinician cafeteria on the CUIMC campus to help build community and ease the rapidly escalating burnout (estimated at 51% nationally in 2017) among clinicians in the current medical climate. This idea is rapidly gaining traction in the medical literature as beneficial to patient care, allowing clinicians a “bump-ability” factor with their colleagues, to talk about clinical issues of shared concern in a more relaxed environment. At the national level, there is emphasis on patient volume as a marker of productivity, and clinicians are increasingly viewed as employees of a corporation. Ironically, the importance of well-designed working spaces that consider the needs of its employees takes its cues from successful companies such as Google and Goldman Sachs, since many clinician lounges have long disappeared.

III. Communication with University Alumni:

One of the challenges of alumni is in understanding and digesting the myriad of communications they receive from the University and elsewhere. Many hear from their school-based alumni organizations, or other institutes at Columbia in the form of newsletters; many read the Spectator or BWOOG, others the newsfeed posted on social media by their classmates, or a variety of Columbia publications.

To this purpose, the Alumni Relations Committee hosted a presentation by Shailagh Murray, Executive Vice President for Public Affairs. EVP Murray is a former political aide and journalist who served as Senior Advisor to President Obama and as Deputy Chief of Staff and Communications Director for Vice President Joe Biden. EVP Murray spoke about the need to overcome the “silo structures” present in Columbia’s decentralized organization, by streamlining communications to help the University deliver a cohesive message both internally and externally. This initiative will hopefully create unity amongst the different schools by encouraging a shared identity within the Columbia community, that is, “One Columbia”, the ultimate goal of the Alumni Relations Committee.

Respectfully submitted by:

Sen. Daniel D. Billings DNP, AGNP-BC
NRS '15 '17 '18

Sen. Michelle Estilo Kaiser MD MPH
CC '87 MSPH '92 VPS '97

Co-chairs, University Senate Alumni Relations Committee

Other Members and Contributors

Art Benoit, Student, Law

Hanbin (James) Dan, Research Officers

Jacqueline de Vegvar, Student, College of Physicians & Surgeons

Hartley du Pont, Alumni

Michael Garrett, Alumni

Izzet Kebudi, Student, Columbia College

Dorothea Lasky, Faculty, School of the Arts

Sharon Liebowitz, Alumni

Donna MacPhee, VP of Alumni Relations

Jessie Mygatt, Assoc. Director, Alumni Relations

Joshua Schenk, Student, Columbia College

**COMMITTEE ON HOUSING POLICY
ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19**

This year the Housing Policy Committee considered a wide variety of issues. We expect that a number of these issues will reach the full University Senate in the 2019-20 academic year.

- 1. Housing Mobility Program.** 2018-19 saw the sixth round of the Housing Mobility Program, a program in which the administration invites Columbia faculty and other tenants to negotiate terms for giving up their apartments. The Columbia rental apartments are attractive for faculty because they tend to be modestly priced, well maintained, and there is no taxable subsidy. Once in Columbia housing, eligible faculty members can stay in their apartment for their entire life. In each round, an average of around 30 applications are received. About 25 percent of applicants have received offers to downsize or move out of Columbia Housing. Among those offers, fifty percent were for downsizing and fifty percent for relocation out of Columbia housing. As of 2018, over 150 people had applied to the Housing Mobility Program.
- 2. Manhattanville Housing.** Under the Manhattanville agreements, Columbia is required to provide 822 housing units. Who this housing should be for is not specified. It must be within the Manhattanville footprint, but not within one building. When the 822 units are in place, the nearby retail spaces should become more attractive. As this housing is at least five years away, it will not solve immediate housing issues, but provides an opportunity to alleviate some pressing issues over an intermediate time frame.
- 3. Postdoc Housing:** Postdoc housing was discussed at a joint meeting with members of the Senate's Research Officers Committee (ROC) and throughout the academic year. In particular, incoming international postdocs have a very difficult time finding housing due to a lack of credit history, access to certified checks in USD and salary/guarantor requirements for New York City. It was also noted that Columbia housing stock is highly constrained. The members of both committees would like to find a way to help all postdocs. Currently, the University provides approximately 420 units for approximately 1000 postdocs, which is less than local peer institutions, such as Memorial Sloan Kettering and New York University, which guarantee housing for their postdocs. The Office of Work/Life has various mechanisms in place to assist Columbia employees find housing, but these are not widely used by postdocs. The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs has information for postdocs on how to find housing in New York City, but does not have individuals that can assist with finding housing. Columbia Residential provides an off-

campus housing website that lists subleases, roommate postings and units for rent in the Columbia adjacent areas, but is minimally staffed. One idea to assist new incoming postdocs would be to increase the number of units assigned to postdocs from 420 to 450, and at the same time limit leases to one year. In this way, new postdocs would have one year to find alternate solutions, obtain a credit history, learn the city and gain better insights into the process of finding a safe and affordable apartment. Members of ROC agreed to work with the Housing Policy Committee to draft a formal proposal that would be discussed at this academic year's joint meeting.

4. Intergenerational Housing:

Sen. Robert (Bob) Pollack (Professor of Biological Sciences, and Director of University Seminars) sought the committee's input on the idea of intergenerational housing. An intergenerational residence program would connect retired faculty with undergraduate students interested in serving as companions to those in retirement. Students would have the opportunity to affect positively the lives of these elderly individuals, while benefitting from the mentorship of retired faculty. All students in the program would be selected from the existing "At Your Service" Program at Columbia, an organization that places volunteers with residents at Terence Cardinal Cooke Health Care Center (TCC), a skilled nursing facility located at Fifth Avenue and 105th Street. During the course of the spring 2019 semester, Jonathan Criswell met with personnel from Campus Services, Financial Services, the Housing Policy Committee and others. It became clear that the option of pursuing intergenerational housing in brownstones was not workable, due to various obstacles, including accessibility and lack of availability. There seemed to be potential in pursuing an apartment unit dedicated to intergeneration housing, but administrators said that it would be necessary to conduct a survey of the targeted population, before a building to meet their needs could be identified. Administrators were concerned about liability, and broadly, the psychological, sociological and gerontological concerns of such a program, which would require consultation with professionals. The Intergenerational Housing proposal has merit but faces several hurdles. Currently, the project is suspended while the project proponent is on sabbatical.

5. Housing maintenance

Several senators raised the issue of housing maintenance. It was reported that Facilities staff is often slow to make needed repairs in the CUIMC towers and that most repairs are not feasible by ordinary technicians. Examples mentioned included walls that bulge and crumble, old windows that rattle and allow snow to blow in, laundry machines that are breaking down, and air conditioning/heating units that are binary in function and struggle to control climate. On the other hand, the University has spent \$70-80 million on renovations over the past three years, including changing boilers in over 100 buildings. It was pointed out that Facilities started using a computerized system two years ago to track

all requests for maintenance, including undergraduate and graduate housing. However, implementation and acceptance has not been uniform across the campus. The hope is that additional training of staff and increasing awareness of students and faculty will improve this situation. In addition, Facilities issues surveys when the students arrive and leave, as well as an annual State of Good Repair (SOGR) Report. The committee agreed that there is a need to further investigate this matter, and decided to review the SAC Quality of Life survey concerning housing maintenance.

- 6. Columbia Residential Overview:** In spring 2019, Columbia University Facilities and Operations provided an overview of the state of University Apartment Housing. As of November 2018, Columbia University owned 141 buildings, encompassing 5,797 apartments with a total tenant count of 7,525. 92 percent of the buildings were constructed before World War II. Students comprised 61 percent of housing stock (3,527 students -- not including dormitories), half of which are multiple occupancy. This is followed by Officers of Instruction (14.3% - 945), and statutory tenants (5.8% - 470). Of the officers of instruction, 50 percent (468) come from the School of Art and Sciences, 15 percent (143) from the Medical Center and 10 percent (94) from the School of Engineering.

2018-2019 Guest Speakers

- Robert (Bob) Pollack; Professor of Biological Sciences, and Director of University Seminars (Sen.; A&S/PS)
- Members of the Research Officers Committee
- Members of the Campus Planning and Physical Development Committee

2018-2019 Senate Housing Policy Committee Members and Contributors

- Athena Guizar Ablang; Student, School of General Studies
- Ian Beilin, PhD, Research Collections and Services Librarian (Senator)
- Jonathan Criswell, Student, School of General Studies (Senator)
- Donald Davis, PhD; Ragnar Nurkse Professor of Economics, Co-Chair
- William Duggan, PhD; Senior Lecturer in Business; Co-Chair (Senator)
- Andreas H. Hielscher, PhD; Professor of Biomedical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and Radiology (Physics); Co-Chair (Senator)
- Joel Krejmas, Student, College of Dental Medicine (Senator)
- Carrie Marlin, Associate Provost for Administration and Planning
- Regina Martuscello, PhD; Associate Research Scientist (Senator)
- Michael Rosenthal, PhD; EPIC
- Lynne Sagalyn, Ph.D., Special Lecturer in Business and Earle W. Kazis and Benjamin

Schore Professor Emerita of Real Estate

- Paola Valenti, PhD; Senior Lecturer in International and Public Affairs (Senator)
- James Wang, Vice President, Facilities
- Weiping Wu, Ph.D.; Professor of Architecture, Planning and Preservation; Director of the MS Urban Planning Program in the Faculty of Architecture, Planning and Preservation (Senator)

Respectfully submitted,

Andreas H. Hielscher, PhD

**INFORMATION AND COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY POLICY COMMITTEE:
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2018-19**

Our committee held eight regular meetings in 2018-19 and one polite protest on the Senate floor.

The committee meetings followed a now-familiar pattern, taking up a number of issues laid out in CUIT VP Gaspare LoDuca's informal annual State of CUIT review in October. He mentioned ongoing efforts to replace the Student Information and the Rolm Phone systems, which both date from a decade or more before the turn of the millennium, and to achieve a fully wireless campus. He referred the committee to his new colleagues Erik Pupo at the Medical Center and David Beaver in Procurement. He also spoke frankly about serious but not so far highly successful efforts to redress the persistent gender imbalance (roughly 80/20) in the CUIT ranks.

Our committee saw a demonstration of the successor to the Rolm phone at our first meeting this fall--a communication system from Ring Central that offers voice, video (through Zoom), and text that is being added across the University at the rate of about 4000 units a year.

In his own meeting with the committee in early October of 2018, Erik Pupo spoke candidly about the challenges of his first 10 weeks as Chief Information Officer for the Medical Campus. These include the conversion to Epic as the new system for the transfer and storage of electronic medical records, which will take until 2020. More generally, Mr. Pupo cited an urgent need to centralize and rationalize uptown IT systems, to improve security and efficiency, and to foster innovation.

In November the committee met with Mr. Beaver, who after three months in the job was tackling problems with Columbia Purchasing that some old hands have come to see as perennial--the difficulty of getting new vendors set up in the system, exasperating requisition forms, overpriced items from approved Columbia vendors, sluggish delivery rates. Mr. Beaver left the University in the middle of last year, and a new VP for Procurement has not been appointed yet.

In April we heard from two administrative groups that had accomplished significant efficiencies in their operations. A Treasury team led by Patricia Reid and Katie Todd had found a better way to track employee turnover in university banking operations, forecast cash levels, handle service requests, and guard against bogus merchant accounts. And University Registrar Barry Kane reported on the successful launch of a new system called Course Management--part of a larger overhaul of the old Student Information System--which enables academic departments to do much

of the work of managing their own courses, with sharp increases in efficiency. Both teams offered unstinting praise for their collaborators from CUIT, particularly Mr. LoDuca.

In March committee member Maneesha Aggarwal reported on the rapid growth since its launch in 2017 of the Emerging Technologies Consortium, a monthly forum for presenting new work done at Columbia in Artificial Intelligence, Augmented Reality, Virtual Reality, and other modalities.

The committee had hoped to look systematically at issues of data security and privacy with General Counsel in March, but that meeting did not quite come off. Instead, the group held a preliminary version of that discussion, with two committee members--Mr. LoDuca and CUIT's Network Security Director Joel Rosenblatt--ably filling in. We're hoping for a meeting with General Counsel in the spring.

It was the launch of the planning process for a new online travel and business expense reimbursement system (TBERS)--outlined for the committee at our February meeting in a presentation by half a dozen Treasury administrators--that led to our 15 minutes of notoriety at the plenary. The run-up to the new TBERS included no regular planning committee roles for faculty or student travelers, or for the staff that would have to use the new system, and *that* state of affairs gave some of us disturbing flashbacks to the troubled rollout of the ARC system (Accounting and Reporting at Columbia) in 2012. At the March 8 plenary a committee spokesperson (and co-chair) discussed these frustrations, and appealed to Provost Coatsworth to intervene. This mild outburst led to a series of good conversations with EVP for Finance Anne Sullivan, and the creation of an advisory committee of 15 faculty from around the University. In April our committee spoke to one of those faculty members--Ed Guo, chair of Biomedical Sciences, who was pleased with the advisory committee's initial meeting. We will check in with this new planning process in the course of this year.

For the IT Committee,

Sens. Julia Hirschberg (Ten., SEAS) and Matthew Jones (Ten., A&S/Social Sciences), co-chairs

INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE: 2018-19

Ten.	Andrew Einstein	P&S	
Ten.	Sen. Julia Hirschberg	SEAS	Co-chair
Ten.	Sen. Matthew L. Jones	A&S/SS	Co-chair
Ten.	Itzik Pe'er	SEAS	
Ten.	Sen. Henry Spotnitz	P&S	
Stu.	Sen. Darold Cuba	GSAS/SS	
Stu.	Sen. Andrew Hsu	GSAS/PS	
Libraries	Sen. Teresa Harris	Curator, Avery Library	
Admin. Staff	Sen. Joel Rosenblatt	Morningside/Lamont; CUIT	
Research Officers	Sen. Nancy J. LoIacono	Public Health	
Administration	Maneesha Aggarwal	CUIT	
Administration	Gaspere S. LoDuca	CUIT	
Alumni.	Stephen Negron	President, LegalTech Consulting	
 <u>Observers</u>			
Administration	Ellen Binder	Assoc. VP, A&S Financial Operations	
Administration	Barry Kane	University Registrar	
Administration	Sandesh Tuladhar	Asst. Provost, Online Education	